



## **Handwriting Examination**

### **Test No. 25-5241/5 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 200 participants: 98 for 25-5241, and 102 for 25-5245 and are compiled into the following tables:

	<u>Page</u>
<u><a href="#">Manufacturer's Information</a></u>	<u><a href="#">2</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Summary Comments</a></u>	<u><a href="#">3</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Table 1: Examination Results</a></u>	<u><a href="#">4</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Table 2: Conclusions</a></u>	<u><a href="#">10</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Table 3: Additional Comments</a></u>	<u><a href="#">30</a></u>
<u><a href="#">Appendix: Data Sheet</a></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 content in the questioned item.

SAMPLE PREPARATION: During production of the dictated known writing, the 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.

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-b	Alana Hunter	Known: course of business and dictated exemplars	Female, right-handed
K2a-b	Cate Bane	Known: course of business and dictated exemplars	Female, right-handed
Q1	Cate Bane	Threatening Note with handprinted text	K2 writer

## **Summary Comments**

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

In Table 1, participants were asked, "To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing on the threatening note?" The responses are summarized as follows. Of the 200 participants, 199 (99.5%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the handprinted text on Q1, where one of these participants did not provide a response in Table 1: Examination Results, but did report and identify the K2 writer in Table 2: Conclusions. Of those 199 participants, 184 (92%) also excluded the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E") as the source of the handprinted text on Q1. Fifteen participants provided no response regarding the K1 writer. One participant excluded both writers.

# Examination Results

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

TABLE 1- Handprinting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
26KJKH- 5245	E	A	4XWFNY- 5245	E	A
2BNKKC- 5245	E	A	64GXJL- 5245	E	A
2CFLF2- 5241	E	A	64R4D3- 5245	E	A
2CJ4LD- 5245	E	A	67YCMM- 5245	E	A
2H9L3A- 5241	E	A	68YDN8- 5241	E	A
2J6YMG- 5245	D	B	6AKWUC- 5245	E	A
2MG2CX- 5245	E	A	6HE6CG- 5245	D	A
2YTG96- 5245	E	A	6K77EY- 5245	D	B
38XRUN- 5241	E	A	6YJJP6- 5241	E	A
3C2EXQ- 5241	E	A	6ZRXNK- 5241	E	A
3F6LPG- 5241	E	A	6ZUEDH- 5245	E	A
3HMAXA- 5241	E	A	773YYU- 5241	E	A
3KR3PM- 5245	D	B	78AE9K- 5245	E	A
3KRZ4P- 5241	E	A	78BGUJ- 5245	E	A
3TKFM2- 5245		A	7BBHZ8- 5245	D	A
3Z3JXA- 5245	E	A	7C4HVX- 5245	D	B
49MDZJ- 5241	E	A	7CY3ED- 5241	E	A
49W798- 5241	E	A	7F6J2L- 5245	D	B
4PGW97- 5241	E	A	7TQR29- 5245	E	A
			7UN9UW- 5241	E	A

TABLE 1- Handprinting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
7UVPJG- 5245	E	A	BCR892- 5241		A
7YQJGH- 5241	E	A	BNFFJB- 5241	E	A
7ZR9CE- 5245	D	A	BY4B4X- 5241	E	A
82W2EE- 5241	E	A	BZ2E2E- 5245	E	A
8C2ZGY- 5241	E	A	C2KUNR- 5241	E	A
8HT92T- 5241	E	A	C8M6AD- 5241	E	A
8UH64R- 5245	E	A	CJ7DJD- 5241	E	A
8XK8Q8- 5241	E	A	CN3ZEM- 5241		A
92XBD4- 5245	E	A	D7VK9D- 5245	E	A
94MNTZ- 5241	E	A	DAG6F3- 5245	E	A
96GCCV- 5245		A	DATYXM- 5245	E	A
9E49FH- 5241	E	A	DE9JWW- 5245	E	A
9LVPJF- 5241	E	A	DLX7J9- 5241	E	A
9PV2FF- 5241	E	A	DPRVAU- 5241	E	A
9VAKTT- 5241	E	A	DUYCPA- 5241	D	B
A2RF6G- 5241	E	A	E2HWCM- 5245	E	A
A6DZC7- 5241	E	A	E46J6A- 5245	D	A
A9RZ8C- 5245	E	A	EDM4X9- 5241	E	A
ABJVUL- 5241		A	EH6F33- 5245	D	A
AJWV9U- 5245		A	EMT87P- 5245		A
BC7RX6- 5245	E	A	EMVPDZ- 5245	E	A

TABLE 1- Handprinting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
EMZ7BY- 5241		A	JHTATU- 5245	E	A
F8KBRW- 5245	E	A	JJD8T8- 5241	E	A
FHYML7- 5245	E	A	K4P9TX- 5241	E	A
FPEBEM- 5241	E	A	K6U34N- 5245	E	A
FTZVJQ- 5245	E	A	K7NQMJ- 5245		A
FU7JEA- 5241	E	A	KBNUJC- 5245	E	A
FXR34K- 5241	E	A	KKCQHT- 5245	E	A
GC2CZ8- 5245	E	A	KLLVX3- 5245	E	A
GYMVLP- 5245	E	A	LAZAFX- 5241	E	A
H2947A- 5241	E	A	LCYYUF- 5245	E	A
HBRH3K- 5241	E	A	LFCW4N- 5241	E	A
HETLU8- 5241	E	A	LUVKBZ- 5241	E	A
HHCXDA- 5245	D	B	LVYLKY- 5241	E	A
HJ6MXQ- 5241	E	A	LZFKPR- 5245	E	A
HJQ3B9- 5245	E	A	M4CR4L- 5245	E	A
HVF7BR- 5245	E	A	MBWND3- 5245	E	A
HVZZV3- 5245	D	A	MEEQEG- 5241	E	A
HW9VV9- 5245	E	A	MJG2Z3- 5241	E	A
JAVKCP- 5241	E	A	MVKBW6- 5241	E	A
JEPE87- 5241	E	A	MYJLR6- 5241	E	A
JHLANK- 5241	E	A	N48NBV- 5241	E	A

TABLE 1- Handprinting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
NEDBM3-5245	D	B	QTJDXL-5245	E	A
NME66U-5241	E	A	QZMFZ2-5241	E	A
NMYLKW-5241	E	A	RHXR8H-5245	D	B
NPC7LX-5241	D	B	RR79UG-5241	E	A
NTBHGX-5245	E	A	RTZWDC-5245		A
NUKPKQ-5241	E	A	T4UMFV-5241	E	A
NYGBDE-5241	E	B	T6CGEK-5245	E	A
P3D3G6-5241	E	A	T7KUX8-5241	E	A
P4N643-5245	E	A	TDHJGW-5245	E	A
PCJ2TQ-5245	E	A	TDKFJF-5241	E	A
PM2NZ7-5245	E	A	U4RDYJ-5241	E	A
PM4D64-5245	D	B	UHBZ9G-5245	E	A
PP949X-5245	D	B	UVZYXY-5241	E	A
PQ8LVT-5241	E	A	V237G8-5245	E	A
PQY6CZ-5241	E	A	V64CUT-5241	E	A
PRVJ2E-5245			V6KDUA-5241	E	A
Q39Z8Q-5241	E	A	V7NAVQ-5241	E	A
Q7CXFX-5245	D	A	VJKAYT-5245	D	B
Q7FYPW-5241	E	A	VLBB3V-5241	E	A
Q9XHL2-5241	E	A	VNWFCE-5245	E	A
QENW8N-5245	E	A	VT4URR-5241	E	A

TABLE 1- Handprinting on Q1

WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1		WebCode- Test	Handprinting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
VTNJ4X-5245	E	A	YDVBHP-5241	E	A
VU6GXH-5245	E	A	YFRGD2-5241		A
VW8L6B-5245	E	A	YG3JYY-5241	E	A
VY68NN-5241	E	A	YHYXND-5245	E	A
W6WM6L-5245	E	A	YLMLTK-5241	E	A
WBL6KH-5245	E	A	YNME3N-5245	E	A
WCD6F9-5245		A	Z4C6DC-5245	E	A
WCUEBU-5241	E	A	Z68MGX-5245	E	A
WFDGC9-5245		A	Z6PLQP-5245	D	B
WFFYHJ-5241	E	A	ZFNAND-5245	E	A
WFKFH4-5241	E	A	ZGGAJ4-5245	E	A
WJCR89-5245		A	ZJMQYM-5245	E	A
WUE6AU-5245	E	A	ZM9A4Q-5245	D	A
WXZPGJ-5245	D	B	ZVYTM7-5245	E	E
WYV9JK-5241	E	A			
X2FLHE-5245	E	A			
XG7NVC-5241	E	A			
XR6KWD-5245	D	B			
XRN47Q-5241	E	A			
XV3YLN-5241	E	A			
XZAD4L-5241	E	A			



**Response Summary - Handprinting on Q1**Total Participants: **200***To what degree can it be determined if either of the known writers contributed to the body of questioned writing on the threatening note?*

Response	Handprinting on Q1	
	K1	K2
A	0	181
B	0	17
C	0	0
D	24	0
E	161	1

**Response Key:**

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

*\*Response totals for K1/K2 may not match the total number of participants, if a participant did not provide responses for both writers.*

# Conclusions

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
26KJH-5245	- The questioned threatening note was not written by Alana Hunter. - The questioned threatening note was written by Cate Bane.
2BNKKC-5245	From the comparison conducted between the questioned item Q1 and the undisputed items K1 (Alana Hunter) and K2 (Cate Bane), it is observed that the undisputed item K2 presents coincidences and dissimilarities with the questioned item Q1, as well as an absence of significant contradictory elements. Concordances are noted in terms of size, shape, rhythm, direction, slant, speed, cohesion, attack and release points, as well as typical gestures. Therefore, after conducting a detailed study of the graphic characteristics of the questioned writing "Q1" and its comparative analysis and comparison with the undisputed writings "K1" and "K2", the technical personnel responsible for preparing this report have reached the following conclusion: - Mrs. Cate BANE is the author of the questioned writing, referenced as "Q1".
2CFLF2-5241	Preliminary Inspection A preliminary inspection is initially carried out on the submitted elements of doubt Q1 and undoubted elements k1 a, k1 b, and k2 a, k2 b, to verify compliance with the requirements for this type of inspection, such as originality, contemporaneity, similarity, and abundance established in the Handwriting Inspection Protocol. This verification establishes that the necessary requirements for the inspection have been met. Comparative inspection of texts. An inspection was carried out on the Q1 (Dubitated) manuscripts, revealing highly identifiable graphonomic characteristics in their graphic structures, including shape, order, size, direction, inclination, cohesion, and ideographies, as well as the association of the different elements that constitute the texts under inspection. Subsequently, an assessment is made of the reference samples provided K1a and K1b in the name of Alana Hunter, K2 a and K2 b, in the name of Cate Bane in order to establish the formal, structural and dynamographic values that identify each scribe, finding in said manuscripts representative and highly identifying aspects given the ability of each scribe to configure the different signs that make up the reference samples, the dispositive constancy in the graphic space of the texts, the forms 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 rise to each one of them, the above, based on the analysis carried out on all the manuscripts texts sent as reference of each sampler. Considering the above, the general and specific knowledge of the most representative graphic elements at the formal, structural, and dynamic levels that individualize the texts under study in question, through the application of the comparative graphonomic method, where each of the aspects and sub-aspects that comprise it is analyzed, finding notable correspondences with the comparison models (texts) provided on behalf of Cate Bane, especially in the intrinsic, that is, all those handwriting aspects specific to the writer, which are generated automatically and unconsciously, and which allow for the identification of the graphics. To what extent can it be determined whether any of the known writers contributed to the body of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) in the credit card application? K1 Alana Hunter - E K2 (Cate Bane) - A Q1 Threatening Note Q1 Threatening Note
2CJ4LD-5245	There are fundamental, significant similarities between the handwriting on Item No. Q1 and the known writing submitted for Cate Bane. Item No. Q1 was written by Cate Bane.
2H9L3A-5241	1. It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned handwriting on Exhibit Q1 was NOT executed by the K1 (a-b) specimen writer. 2. It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned handwriting on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2 (a-b) specimen writer.
2J6YMG-5245	In my opinion, there is strong evidence to support the proposition that Cate Bane wrote out the questioned note Q1.
2MG2CX-5245	The examinations in this were conducted in accordance with accepted methodology in the field of Questioned Documents and following industry standards. The questioned note on item Q1 was written by the same person whose course of business and request exemplars were provided as items K2a and K2b, Cate Bane. Alana Hunter (K1a and K1b) is eliminated as the author of the questioned note (Q1).

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
2YTG96-5245	From the analysis carried out on the writing under study that appears in the threat note and based on the general, morphological characteristics and groups of identifying graphic gestures, the questioned writing was written by Cate Bane.
38XRUN-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question on the "Threatening Note" marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" and "K1b". I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question on the "Threatening Note" marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b".
3C2EXQ-5241	The evidence provides extremely strong support for the belief that the writer of specimens K2a and K2b, purportedly Cate Bane, wrote the questioned writing on Q1 rather than someone else.
3F6LPG-5241	After analysis and comparison of the respective materials i came to the following conclusions: 1. The writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b" (purported to be of one "Cate Bane"). 2. The writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of specimen writing on the documents "K1a" and "K1b" marked (purported to be of one "Alana Hunter").
3HMAXA-5241	FIRST: The questioned document contained in the threatening note, subclassified as Q1, does not originate from the same graphic source as the documents used for comparison belonging to Ms. Alana Hunter. SECOND: The questioned document contained in the threatening note, subclassified as Q1, does originate from the same graphic source as the documents used for comparison belonging to Ms. Cate Bane.
3KR3PM-5245	A definite conclusion could not be made as to whether or not ALANA HUNTER, K1a and K1b, prepared the questioned writing on Q1. However, dissimilarities were observed to indicate that Q1 was probably not prepared by HUNTER. A definite conclusion could not be made as to whether or not CATE BANE, K2a and K2b, prepared the questioned writing on Q1. However, characteristics in common were observed to indicate that Q1 was probably prepared by BANE.
3KRZ4P-5241	1. Examination, comparison, and evaluation of the handwriting on the questioned document and the known writing exemplars resulted in the following opinions: a. Q1 handwriting on Laboratory item #5, Invoice #Q201425 was written* by the author Cate Bane of the known writing exemplars K2a-K2b, Laboratory item #3-4, Invoice #Q201425. b. Q1 handwriting on Laboratory item #5, Invoice #Q201425 was not written* by the author Alana Hunter of the known writing exemplars K1a-K1b, Laboratory item #1-2, Invoice #Q201425.
3TKFM2-5245	Source Identification It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by CATE BANE, Item 3 (K2a, K2b).
3Z3JXA-5245	Cate Bane (K2a and K2b) wrote the questioned note (Q1). Alana Hunter (K1a and K1b) did not write the questioned note (Q1).
49MDZJ-5241	In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 1 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a" and "K1b": 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" and "K1b". 2 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b": 2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was executed by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b".
49W798-5241	1. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the questioned hand printing on the questioned threatening note i.e. Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K1 (a-b) specimen writer (Alana Hunter). 2. It has been concluded that the questioned hand printing on the questioned threatening note i.e. Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2 (a-b) specimen writer (Cate Bane).

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
4PGW97-5241	The writer of the known handwriting on Item K2 wrote the questioned handwriting on Item Q1. The writer of the known handwriting on Item K1 did not write the questioned handwriting on Item Q1.
4XWFNY-5245	From the analysis of each known group -that is Hunter's exemplars (K1a, K1b) and Bane's exemplars (K2a, K2b)- and from the comparison of these samples with the questioned document, the writing on the threatening note was definitely not attributable to Ms. Alana Hunter; Ms. Hunter's complete lack of involvement in the writing of the four lines under examination is undoubtedly attested by the detection in the threatening note of multiple unjustifiable differences with regards to the characteristics of Ms. Hunter's authentic handwriting. Conversely, the writing on the questioned threatening note was certainly attributable to Ms. Cate Bane; the four lines written on the note reveal the complex set of writing indicators that characterize the shape and structure of Ms. Bane's handwriting, so that the questioned threatening note results entirely and certainly written by Ms. Cate Bane.
64GXJL-5245	The questioned note (Q1) was written by Cate Bane (K2) and was not written by Alana Hunter (K1).
64R4D3-5245	Based on my extensive examination and comparison of the documents and handwriting received, it is my professional opinion that that I have identified the person who wrote the Cate Bane handwriting on the "K2a" and "K2b" documents as the person who wrote the anonymous handwriting on document "Q1."
67YCMM-5245	A comparative handwriting examination of Items Q1 and K1 and K2 resulted in the following findings: The writer who prepared the known writing on K1a-b (Alana Hunter) did not prepare the questioned writing on Q1. This finding is based on the absence of corresponding characteristics and the presence of significant differences in handwriting characteristics between the questioned and the known writings. The writer who prepared the known writing on K2a-d (Cate Bane) prepared the questioned writing on Q1. This finding is based upon the agreement of significant individualizing handwriting characteristics with the absence of any significant differences between the questioned and the known writings.
68YDN8-5241	Result In the sample analyzed, identified with Q1 corresponding to questioned writing on the threatening note, that read "Do not come to school tomorrow. The day will end with a big bang"; the general, specific, and individualizing handwriting characteristics are consistent with the writings collected and dictated exemplars for Cate Bane. Interpretation The questioned writing were written by Cate Bane.
6AKWUC-5245	Following a thorough examination of all submitted documents, it is my opinion that the handwriting in the questioned document marked Q1 significant similarities with the handwriting found in the known documents marked K2a and K2b. Therefore, it is concluded that the questioned writing on the threatening note on Q1 was WRITTEN by same individual responsible for the writings in K2a and K2b (Cate Bane).
6HE6CG-5245	The questioned writing was produced by the writer of the exemplars attributed to Cate Bane (K2).
6K77EY-5245	In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that Q1 was produced by the K2 specimen writer, over the proposition that it was produced by someone other than the K2 specimen writer. In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that Q1 was produced by someone other than the K1 specimen writer, over the proposition that it was produced by the K1 specimen writer.
6YJJP6-5241	There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned handwriting on exhibit 'Q1' was not authored by the same Alana Hunter whose known handwriting was provided on exhibits 'K1a' and 'K1b'. There is conclusive evidence to show that the questioned handwriting on exhibit 'Q1' was authored by the same Cate Bane whose known handwriting was provided on exhibits 'K2a' and 'K2b'.
6ZRXNK-5241	2.1.) I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" to "K1b". 2.2.) I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" to "K2b".
6ZUEDH-5245	1. The Evidence Description below is clarified as follows: Exhibit 1(1) – Digital image of exemplars by HUNTER Exhibit 1(2) – Digital image of standards by HUNTER Exhibit 1(3) – Digital image of exemplars by BANE Exhibit 1(4) – Digital image of standards by BANE Exhibit 1(5) – Digital image of questioned note 2. The questioned handwritten entries reproduced on Exhibit 1(5) and the known writing attributed to BANE have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. The questioned handwritten entries reproduced on Exhibit 1(5) and the known writing attributed to HUNTER have significant characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered extremely unlikely that HUNTER is the writer of the questioned entries on Exhibit 1(5).
773YYU-5241	Cate Bane wrote the handwritten text on the threatening note.
78AE9K-5245	Alana Hunter can be excluded from Q1 handwriting, it was written by Cate Bane.
78BGUJ-5245	The handwritten inscriptions on the disputed document, "Threatening note," submitted for examination, were executed by suspect K2 - Cate Bane, whose handwriting samples were submitted.
7BBHZ8-5245	There is a strong probability that the questioned handwriting, depicted in the Q1 copy, was prepared by the writer of the K2a and K2b known writing.
7C4HVX-5245	To the level of highly probable, it is concluded that the writer of the submitted known K2 specimens wrote the questioned entry on Exhibit Q1. To the level of highly probable, it is concluded that the writer of the submitted known K1 specimens did not write the questioned entry on Exhibit Q1.
7CY3ED-5241	I found the evidence to provide support for the proposition that the writing in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing marked as "K2", and not the writer of the specimen marked as "K1".
7F6J2L-5245	There is a strong probability that the writer submitted as known of K2, Cate Bane, wrote the questioned Q1 entries. The author of the writing submitted as K1, Alana Hunter, probably did not write the questioned Q1 entries.
7TQR29-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
7UN9UW-5241	In order to comply with the request, a graphological inspection was carried out using the comparative graphonomic method using an optical instrument (magnifying glass) to examine the disputed elements (Q1) versus the undisputed elements (K1a, K1b, K2a, and K2b). For the graphonomic inspection, aspects such as order, size or dimension, pressure, speed, direction, linear displacement, inclination, cohesion or connection, shape, and idiographism were taken into account, establishing the following: Unique handwriting provenance of the doubtful manuscripts contained in document Q1 compared to the undisputed Cate Bane manuscripts contained in documents K2a and K2b. Non-unique handwriting provenance of the doubtful manuscripts contained in document Q1 compared to the undisputed Alana Hunter manuscripts contained in documents K1a and K1b.
7UVPJG-5245	In the report we are using hypotheses. H1. The questioned handwriting was written by person K1/K2 H2. The questioned handwriting was not written by person K1/K2, but by an other person. The conclusion is normally: The results of the examination are extremely more probable when the questioned handwriting was written by person K2 (Cate Bane) than it was written by an other person. The results of the examination are extremely more probable when the questioned handwriting was not written by person K1 (Alana Hunter) than it was written by her.
7YQJGH-5241	1. There is sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" to "K1b". 2. There is

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	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".
7ZR9CE-5245	For these examinations (comparing the questioned note Q1 to the known sample material of two separate K writers), the following propositions were considered: P1. The questioned note Q1 was written by the writer of the known sample material. P2. The questioned note Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the known sample material. In relation to known writer K1 (Alana HUNTER): In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition P2 that the questioned note Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the K1 sample (Alana HUNTER) over the proposition P1 that the questioned note Q1 was written by the writer of the K1 sample. In relation to known writer K2 (Cate BANE): In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition P1 that the questioned note Q1 was written by the writer of the K2 sample (Cate BANE) over the proposition P2 that the questioned note Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the K2 sample.
82W2EE-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support that the writing in question in the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing in the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b" and was not written by the writer of the specimen writing in the documents marked as "K1a" and "K1b".
8C2ZGY-5241	Once the graphological analysis was carried out between the cursive manuscripts visible in the threat note and the calligraphic contributions and extra-process documents of Cate Bane (K2a, b), it was possible to demonstrate extrinsic and intrinsic graphonomic coincidences such as interliteral and interverbal spacing, text arrangement, height, size (dilation), linear displacement, inclination, links, stroke shape, start and end points; in addition to the development of certain very particular and identifying graphs of the writing of the student Bane, which allows us to conclude that these manuscripts were created by the student Cate Bane. Therefore, it is ruled out that the threatening note was written by the student Alana Hunter
8HT92T-5241	1. The questioned writing, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (Threatening Note), does not have the same handwriting origin as the writings provided as reference material for comparison by Ms. Alana Hunter. 2. The questioned writing, recorded in the document identified as Q1 (Threatening Note), has the same handwriting origin as the writings provided as reference material for comparison by Ms. Cate Bane.
8UH64R-5245	FIRST. The questioned handwritten entries contained in the Q1 threatening note, sample "Item Q1", have not been produced by the author of samples "Item K1a" and "Item K1b", Alana Hunter. SECOND. The questioned handwritten entries contained in the Q1 threatening note, sample "Item Q1", have been produced by the author of samples "Item K2a" and "Item K2b", Cate Bane.
8XK8Q8-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
92XBD4-5245	The questioned writing on the threatening note - was written by Cate Bane (K2) and was not written by Alana Hunter (K1).
94MNTZ-5241	On comparison, I found,: 1.The questioned writing on the Threatening Note form (Q1) was not written by the writer of K1a and K1b (Alana Hunter) 2.The questioned writing on the Threatening Note form (Q1) was written by the writer of K2a and K2b (Cate Bane)
96GCCV-5245	It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1), was prepared by Cate Bane, Item 3 (Item K2a, K2b).
9E49FH-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
9LVPJF-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 as "K1a" and "K1b". The evidence supports the proposition that the handwriting in question on the document marked

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b".
9PV2FF-5241	In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 8.1 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a and K1b": 8.1.1 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. 8.2 In respect of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a and K2b": 8.2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing.
9VAKTT-5241	The writings in the document under review are the product of K2's hand
A2RF6G-5241	Findings Methods A visual examination and comparison of the submitted items was completed. Questioned to Known Comparisons Item #3 was written by Cate Bane, the purported writer of Item #2 (Source Identification). There are significant similarities between the questioned and known writing. Item #3 was not written by Alana Hunter, the purported writer of Item #1 (Source Exclusion). There are significant differences between the questioned and known writing. Remarks All items are available for return. If additional items are to be submitted, please re-submit the original items in their original BCI labeled packaging.
A6DZC7-5241	1. Threatening note (Item Q1) was written by Cate Bane according to dictated exemplars and course of business (Item K2a and K2b). 2. Threatening note (Item Q1) was not written by Alana Hunter according to dictated exemplars and course of business (Item K1a and K1b).
A9RZ8C-5245	1. The Exhibit Description below is clarified as follows: Exhibit 1(1) - Digital image of a questioned note (Q1) Exhibit 1(2-3) - Digital images of knows by HUNTER (K1a-K1b) Exhibit 1(4-5) - Digital images of knows by BANE (K2a-K2b) 2. The questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to BANE have significant characteristics in agreement. The possibility of observing the same combination of characteristics in agreement from another writer is considered extremely low. 3. The questioned handwritten entries on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to HUNTER have significant characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered extremely unlikely that HUNTER is the writer of the questioned entries on Exhibit 1(1).
ABJVUL-5241	The threatening note was written by Cate Bane.
AJW9U-5245	HANDWRITING Source Identification It was determined that the questioned writing on the Item 1 (Q1) note was prepared by CATE BANE, writer of Item 3 (K2a/b). Additional assessments and observations have been made regarding the submitted items and recorded for possible future comparisons.
BC7RX6-5245	Following a thorough examination of all submitted documents, it is my opinion that the handwriting in the questioned document marked Q1 significant similarities with the handwriting found in the known documents marked K2a and K2b. Therefore, it is concluded that the questioned writing on the threatening note on Q1 was WRITTEN by same individual responsible for the writings in K2a and K2b (Cate Bane).
BCR892-5241	1. Los llenados manuscritos plasmados en el Indicio Item Q1.- Una hoja blanca a rayas con escritos en tono negro, con respecto a los elementos de cotejo Indicio Item K1a.- Ejemplares dictados para Alana Hunter e Indicio Item K1b.- Curso de negocios para Alana Hunter NO SON DE UN MISMO ORIGEN GRAFICO. 2.- Los llenados manuscritos plasmados en el Indicio Item Q1.- Una hoja blanca a rayas con escritos en tono negro, con respecto a los elementos de cotejo Indicio Item K2a.- Ejemplares dictados para Cate Bane e Indicio Item K2b.- Curso de negocios para Cate Bane SI SON DE UN MISMO ORIGEN GRAFICO. 1. The handwritten entries found in Evidence Q1—a white lined sheet with black writing—are NOT from the same source, in relation to the comparison items Evidence K1a—copies dictated to Alana Hunter and Evidence K1b—business course for Alana Hunter. 2. The handwritten entries found in Evidence Q1—a white lined sheet with black writing—are NOT from the



TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	same source, in relation to the comparison items Evidence K2a—copies dictated to Cate Bane and Evidence K2b—business course for Cate Bane.
BNFFJB- 5241	1. The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K1a" and "K1b". 2. The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b".
BY4B4X- 5241	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 questioned document Q1 with the identified documents K2a, K2b.
BZ2E2E- 5245	The handwriting characteristics of item Q1 are consistent with those of items K2a and K2b, what providing evidence that Cate Bane wrote the threatening note. However, the handwriting characteristics of items K1a and K1b differ from those of item Q1, what eliminating Alana Hunter as the author of the threatening note.
C2KUNR- 5241	Initially, the compliance with the requirements for the study of the doubted and indubited material was verified, finding that they meet with originality, abundance and similarity. As regards coetaneity it is understood that the facts are close since according to the report the incident was immediately notified, to which it is understood that the material in question and the samples are from the same period. Subsequently, using optical instruments such as magnifiers and analysis equipment such as the video comparator, the graphological features of study items K1 a-b Alana Hunter's handwriting samples were analyzed dynamics, was found not to contain identifying elements matching the handwriting and signature of the note in question. Graphic features of study items K2 a-b Cate Bane handwriting samples were subsequently analyzed, which when compared with the graphological features of the handwriting appearing in question note item Q1, was found to present abundant identifying elements matching the handwriting and signature of the question note size, proportions, shape, beginnings and endings of the strokes, spatial location, inclination and dynamics which allows us to conclude that the note of doubt item Q1 was written by Cate Bane and that it was not written by Alana Hunter.
C8M6AD- 5241	6.2.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the questioned handwriting marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b" (Cate Bane); 6.2.2 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the questioned handwriting marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" and "K1b" (Alana hunter).
CJ7DJD- 5241	The writing in item Q1 (threatening note) belongs to the same graphic origin as the writing in item K2a (example of dictation by Cate Bane) and K2b (notes of writing by Cate Bane).
CN3ZEM- 5241	FIRST: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE HANDWRITING CONTAINED IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT IDENTIFIED AS DC1 (THREATENING NOTE), IN COMPARISON WITH THE COMPARISON ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS EC1 AND EC1-A (DICTATION COPIES AND BUSINESS COURSE NOTES): DOES NOT CORRESPOND TO ALANA HUNTER. SECOND: IT IS ESTABLISHED THAT THE HANDWRITING CONTAINED IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT IDENTIFIED AS DC1 (THREATENING NOTE), IN COMPARISON WITH THE COMPARISON ITEMS IDENTIFIED AS EC2 AND EC2-A (DICTATION COPIES AND BUSINESS COURSE NOTES): DOES CORRESPOND TO CATE BANE.
D7VK9D- 5245	Based on the calligraphic material, the analyses performed, and the technical reasoning outlined above, it is determined that: 1.- GRAPHICAL UNIPROCEDENCE between the disputed writings in of a fragment of a sheet with pre-printed horizontal lines, of text "Do not come to school / tomorrow. / The day Will end with / a big bang" (Q1) and the undisputed writings of Ms. CATE BANE, appearing on folio K2a and K2b. 2.- NO GRAPHICAL UNIPROCEDENCE between the disputed writings in of a fragment of a sheet with pre-printed horizontal lines, of text "Do not come to school / tomorrow. / The day Will end with / a big bang" (Q1) and the undoubted writings of Mrs. ANA HUNTER, seen in the writing



TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	documents K1a and K1b.
DAG6F3-5245	The writing of the questioned document, item Q1, showed many similarities to the writing of Cate Bane in items K2a and K2b. My observations lead me to conclude that item Q1 was written by Cate Bane.
DATYXM-5245	The findings extremely strongly favor the Q1 (threatening note) and K2a and K2b (Cate Bane) writing being from the same source rather than from different sources.
DE9JWW-5245	Existing questioned handwriting on the threatening note was written by Cate Bane
DLX7J9-5241	1. I found evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question marked as "Q1" was written by the same writer of the specimen writing marked as "K2a" and "K2b". 2. I found evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the same writer of the specimen writing marked as "K1a" and "K1b".
DPRVAU-5241	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is the opinion of this examiner, based on the examinations and comparisons conducted between the questioned writings (Q1) depicted on the questioned note and the known writings evidence, said to be produced by Cate Bane (K2a, K2b), the questioned writings present on the questioned note (Q1) were produced by the same writer who produced the known writings in K2a and K2b, Cate Bane. Opinion Reached: Did Produce</li> <li>It is the opinion of this examiner, based on the examinations and comparisons conducted between the questioned writings (Q1) depicted on the questioned note and the known writings evidence, said to be produced by Alana Hunter (K1a, K1b), the questioned writings present on the questioned note Q1 were not produced by the same writer who produced the known writings in K1a and K1b, Alana Hunter. Opinion Reached: Did Not Produce</li> </ul>
DUYCPA-5241	There are indications that Cate Bane may have written the questioned document, Q1. There are indications that Alana Hunter may not have written the questioned document, Q1.
E2HWCM-5245	– The questioned writing on the Threatening Note (Q1) was written by Cate Bane (K2). – The questioned writing on the Threatening Note (Q1) was not written by Alana Hunter (K1).
E46J6A-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 Cate Bane wrote the questioned writing on Item 1 (Identification). There are indications that Alana Hunter did not write the questioned writing on Item 1 (Indications Did Not Write). This is not conclusive and is not to be construed as a definitive elimination of the writer. 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.
EDM4X9-5241	2. After analysis and comparison, I reached the following conclusions: 2.3 I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the disputed writing marked "Q1" was written by one writer. 2.3.1 Evidence suggests that the writer of the specimen writing marked "K2a" and "K2b" wrote the disputed writing on the document marked "Q1". 2.3.2 Evidence suggests that the writer of the specimen writing marked "K1a" and "K1b" did not write the disputed writing on the document marked "Q1".
EH6F33-5245	There is a probability bordering on certainty that the entire configuration of findings compiled, discussed and assessed as having high evidential value is in complete conformity with the hypothesis that the questioned document has been written by Cate Bane, in all respects.
EMT87P-5245	It was determined that the Item 1 questioned writing (Q1) was prepared by Cate Bane, writer of Item 3 (K2a-b).
EMVPDZ-5245	The range of variation exhibited in the Q1 and the known K2 have significant similarities.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
EMZ7BY-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
F8KBRW-5245	Significant similarities in the formation and the relative positioning, size and slant 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.
FHYML7-5245	The K1 writer has been eliminated as the writer of the Q1 handprinting. "Elimination" is an opinion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents (Q1, K1, and K2) provide very strong evidence supporting non-authorship. The K2 writer has been identified as the writer of the Q1 handprinting. "Identification" is an opinion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents (Q1, K1, and K2) provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship.
FPEBEM-5241	UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the text of doubt (school threat Q1) and the writing samples of student CATE BANE.
FTZVJQ-5245	Taking into account the general, morphological characteristics and groups of identifying graphic gestures, the writing that appears in the threatening note was written by Kate Bane.
FU7JEA-5241	1. There is sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing marked as "K2a" and "K2b". 2. There is sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question was not written by the writer of the specimen writing marked as "K1a" and "K1b".
FXR34K-5241	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NON-UNIQUE PROCEDURE MANUSCRITICAL between the questioned item [written in original, in block letters with black ink on a notebook sheet with lines (item in good condition identified as Q1)] and the undoubted items [one (01) letter-sized folio, unnumbered, with reference pattern samples of handwritten writing (graphs in original, made in black pen) completed by Mrs. Alana Hunter identified as K1a and one (01) letter-sized folio, unnumbered, with extra-process material of reference pattern samples of handwritten writing (graphs in original, made in black pen) by Mrs. Alana Hunter identified as K1b]</li> <li>• MANUSCRITICAL UNIPROCEDENCE between the questioned item [written in original, in block letters with black ink on a notebook sheet with lines (item in good condition identified as Q1)] and the undoubted items [one (01) letter-sized folio, unnumbered, with reference pattern samples of handwritten writing (graphs in original, made in black ballpoint pen) completed by Mrs. Cate Bane identified as K2a and one (01) letter-sized folio, unnumbered, with extra-process material of reference pattern samples of handwritten writing (graphs in original, made in black ballpoint pen) by Mrs. Cate Bane identified as K2].</li> </ul>
GC2CZ8-5245	The evidence provides very strong support for the hypothesis that the questioned Q1 note was written by K2.
GYMVLP-5245	Cate Bane can be identified as the author of the Item Q1 threatening note. Alana Hunter can be eliminated as the author of the Item Q1 threatening note.
H2947A-5241	1. indentation 2. allograph of 'i' 3. size of 't' 4. allograph of 'b'
HBRH3K-5241	Once both doubted and undoubted manuscripts have been examined, the aspects of graphonomy analysis have been observed one by one, such as: Order, size, pressure, speed, direction, cohesion and shape; It was found that between the Doubtful or Questioned manuscript there is total agreement with the undoubted or standard manuscripts, provided by CATE BANE. The above given the agreement in the way the signs are constructed, how they are associated and the particular way in which heights and dilations are handled. The above allows us to conclude that Cate Bane wrote the doubt manuscript. On

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	the other hand, within the comparative analysis carried out between the manuscript of doubt, compared to the standard or undoubted manuscripts contributed by ALANA HUNTER, no concordant identifying elements were found; on the contrary, the construction of the spelling units, their association and proportions were different. The above allows us to conclude that the manuscript of doubt was not written By Alana Hunter
HETLU8-5241	1. Using the Handwriting Analysis method, it is determined that the threatening note WAS NOT WRITTEN by Alana Hunter. 2. Using the Handwriting Analysis method, it was determined that the threatening note was WRITTEN by Cate Bane.
HHCXDA-5245	It has been concluded that the writer of Item K1—submitted as the known writing of Alana Hunter—probably did not prepare the questioned writing on Item Q1. The evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having been written by different individuals; however, it falls short of the “virtually certain” degree of confidence. It has been concluded that the writer of Item K2—submitted as the known writing of Cate Bane—probably prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1. The evidence contained in the handwriting points rather strongly toward the questioned and known writings having been written by the same individual; however, it falls short of the “virtually certain” degree of confidence.
HJ6MXQ-5241	Purpose – To determine 1) Whether, or not, Writer K1 wrote the questioned writing on Q1. 2) Whether, or not, Writer K2 wrote the questioned writing on Q1. Wording The handwriting of Writer K2 displayed a number of significant similarities in the fundamental features of pictorial appearance, construction, letter proportions, connections, formatting, skill level, and complexity of the writing when compared to the questioned writing on Q1 with no significant, fundamental and repeated differences. Consecutively, the handwriting of Writer K1 displayed a general pictorial dissimilarity in some of the more subtle internal and fundamental features, as well as the more obvious features and habits, when compared to the questioned writing on Q1, in addition to a lack of significant similarities or consistency in the observed features. Accordingly, there is a strong probability that the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to Cate BANE (K2) wrote the handwriting on the questioned document Q1.
HJQ3B9-5245	Based on the submitted documents presented as originating from Alana Hunter and Cate Bane (K-1 and K-2, respectively), the optical and comparative analyses have established the following: - The handwriting on Q-1 originates from the writer of K-2, Cate Bane. - The handwriting on Q-1 does not originate from the writer of K-1, Alana Hunter.
HVF7BR-5245	Gaps between the words, gaps between the letters are compatible within Q1 and K2. The most notable indications of similarities are that the opening-closing point for the letter “o” is in the same direction; at the 1 o’clock direction and that the forming upper part of letter “o” narrowly and forming lower part widely. Cross strokes of the letter “t” in Q1 and K2 are intersects with the following letter . It has been observed that most of Cate Bane writings of “to” is indicating this fact. The lower / upper portion of letter “g”, the shape of “g” writing style of “g”, begining point of “g” and ending point of “g” is compatible between Q1 and K2.
HVZZV3-5245	In my opinion, the evidence provides strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing Q1 was written by someone other than the writer of the known material K1a – K1b, rather than by the writer of the known material. In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing Q1 was written by the writer of the known material K2a – K2b, rather than by someone other than the writer of the known material.
HW9VV9-5245	LA ESCRITURA CUESTIONADA MARCADA COMO Q1 CORRESPONDE CON LA ESCRITURA DE COTEJO MARCADA COMO K1a Y K2a.
JAVKCP-5241	The writer of the known writings on K2a-b wrote the questioned writings on Q1. The writer of the known writings on K1a-b did not write the questioned writings on Q1.
JEPE87-5241	Based on the submitted documents presented as originating from Alana Hunter (K1) and Cate Bane (K-2), the optical and comparative analyses have established the following: - The handwriting on Q-1

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	originates from the writer of K-2, Cate Bane. - The handwriting on Q-1 does not originate from the writer of K-1, Alana Hunter.
JHLANK-5241	UNIQUE MANUSCRIPT PROVENANCE between the text of doubt (school threat Q1) and the writing samples of student CATE BANE. NON-UNIQUE HANDWRITING PROVENANCE between the text of doubt (school threat Q1) and the writing samples of student ALANA HUNTER
JHTATU-5245	It is concluded that the fixed statement in the questioned document "Threatening Note" (Q1) were written by Cate Bane (K2a).
JJD8T8-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" was written by "Cate Bane" (the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2b") and not by "Alana Hunter" (the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a" to "K1b"), therefore eliminating her as the writer.
K4P9TX-5241	Following a detailed examination of the questioned document (Q1) and the reference samples of Alana Hunter (K1a,b) and Kate Bain (K2a,b), it was determined that the questioned document was not written by Alana Hunter (K1a,b), but by Kate Bain (K2a,b). The questioned document (Q1) was compared with reference samples from Alana Hunter (K1a,b) and Kate Bain (K2a,b). The samples were analyzed and compared with those of Kate Bain (K2a,b). The examination focused on the following characteristics: Class characteristics: pronunciation, degree of cohesion, letter size and slant, line form/shape and writing direction. Individual characteristics in following letters: „w~, „D“, „b“, „d“, „y“, „r“, „n“, „e“, „o“, „to“, „he ~
K6U34N-5245	Conclusion 1. The writing marked as Q1, when compared and analyzed with the writing provided for comparison by C. Alana Hunter marked as K1a and K1b, does NOT come from the same graphic source. Conclusion 2. The document identified as Q1 is questioned when compared and analyzed with the document provided for comparison by C. Cate Bane, identified as K2a and K2b, if it comes from the same graphic source. Conclusión 1. La escritura señala cuestionada como Q1 al ser comparada y analizada con la escritura proporcionada para cotejo de la C. Alana Hunter señalada como K1a y K1b NO proviene del mismo origen gráfico. Conclusión 2. La escritura señala cuestionada como Q1 al ser comparada y analizada con la escritura proporcionada para cotejo de la C. Cate Bane señalada como K2a y K2b SI proviene del mismo origen gráfico.
K7NQMJ-5245	Results of Examinations: HANDWRITING Source Identification It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by CATE BANE, Item 3 (K2a, K2b). ADDITIONAL EXAMINATIONS Additional observations and assessments have been made regarding the submitted items and recorded for possible future examinations.
KBNUJC-5245	The findings strongly support the proposition that the threatening note was written by Cate BANE, as opposed to the proposition that another person, including Alana HUNTER, has written the threatening note.
KKCQHT-5245	[No Conclusions Reported.]
KLLVX3-5245	1. The evidence description is further clarified as follows: Exhibit 1(1) - Digital image of a Questioned Document Exhibit 1(2-3) - Digital images of Known writing by HUNTER (K1a-b) Exhibit 1(4-5) - Digital images of Known writing by BANE (K2a-b) 2. The original questioned entries reproduced on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to BANE 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 original questioned entries reproduced on Exhibit 1(1) and the known writing attributed to HUNTER have significant characteristics that are not in agreement. It is considered extremely unlikely that HUNTER is the writer of the questioned entries on Exhibit 1(1).
LAZXFX-5241	In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 1. The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	of specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "k2b". 2. The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a" and "K1b".
LCYYUF- 5245	The handwriting on the THREATENING NOTE, identified as Q1, was not written by ALANA HUNTER. The handwriting on the THREATENING NOTE, identified as Q1, was written by CATE BANE.
LFCW4N- 5241	Results indicate with great certainty that the questioned letter was written by K2. Results indicate with great certainty that the questioned letter was not written by K1.
LUVKBZ- 5241	Examination and comparison of questioned item #Q1 with known items #K1a, #K1b, #K2a and #K2b resulted in the following opinion: - Item #Q1 was written by the writer of items #K2a and #K2b, Cate Bane. The conclusions expressed in this report are defined in the SWGDOC Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners and are as follow: - identification (definite conclusion of identity)—this is the highest degree of confidence expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The examiner has no reservations whatever, and although prohibited from using the word "fact," the examiner is certain, based on evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question.
LVYLKY- 5241	1. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K1a" to "K1b", alleged to be of Alana Hunter. 2. I found sufficient evidence to support the stated proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" to "K2b", alleged to be of Cate Bane.
LZFKPR- 5245	1. The person who wrote the known items of handwriting marked as K2a and K2b, also wrote the questioned item of handwriting marked as Q1. 2. The person who wrote the known items of handwriting marked as K1a and K1b, did not write the questioned item of handwriting marked as Q1.
M4CR4L- 5245	The questioned handwriting in the questioned document Q1 was written quickly and without visible elements indicating intentional distortion. Questioned handwriting is middle degree of writing, middle font size, rounded shape, expressed upper and lower depassants, horizontal direction of writing above the line, vertical slant of writing, etc. The questionable handwriting of the Q1 text was compared with the undisputed handwriting of Alana Hunter (K1) and Cate Bane (K2). The analyzes established similarities between the questioned handwriting (Q1) and the handwriting of Cate Bane (K2). The similarities are reflected in general and individual characteristics. They have the same degree of writing, writing slope, font size, letter proportion, placement of text in space (written line), writing speed, etc. The similarities is also reflected in the way of writing the letters of letter parts and the connections between letters: D, o, n, t, c, m, e, t, s, h, l, r, w, T, d, y, b, g, a, me, to, he, etc.
MBWND3- 5245	The questioned handwriting has been fluently completed, with no evidence of features commonly associated with copying or disguise. A number of similarities were noted between the questioned writing and the handwriting specimens attributed to Cate Bane (K2). These similarities were in features such as writing and formatting styles, size and size relationships, slope, individual letter constructions and inter-letter connections. Based on these similarities, it is my opinion that the author of the specimens attributed to Cate Bane (K2) completed the handwriting on the questioned note (Q1).
MEEQEG- 5241	NON-UNIQUE MANUSCRITICAL PROVENANCE between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text (threatening note Q1) and undoubted ones (handwriting samples K1a) and extra-procedural writings (notes attached to a letter-sized sheet of paper K1b) provided by Alana Hunter. MANUSCRITICAL UNIPROCEDENCE between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text and signature (threatening note Q1) and undoubted handwritten samples (K2a) and extra-procedural writings (notes attached to a letter-sized sheet of paper K2b) provided by Cate Bane.
MJG2Z3- 5241	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" and "K1b" 2. I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the questioned handwriting on

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b"
MVKBW6-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
MYJLR6-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
N48NBV-5241	I have examined the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 and the specimen handwriting of each of the specimen writers on K1 and K2. I have examined features such as style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions and constructions. The questioned handwriting in Item Q1 displays some similarities in pictorial features, skill and speed, as well as dissimilarities in features including character spacing, some proportions and some character constructions, when compared with the specimen K1 handwriting. No evidence of disguise or simulation has been observed. The questioned handwriting in Item Q1 displays similarities in features such as style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions and character constructions, when compared with the specimen K2 handwriting. No significant differences or evidence of disguise or simulation have been observed. I have evaluated the quantity, quality, and complexity of the questioned and specimen handwriting on Items Q1, K1 and K2, and the similarities and dissimilarities observed where applicable to each Item K1 and K2 separately. I have assessed the evidence against each of the propositions. P1 The writer of the specimen material wrote the questioned material. P2 Another writer wrote the questioned material. I have assessed the likelihood of observing the similarities and dissimilarities as low if the specimen writer K1 wrote the questioned handwriting (with natural/intentional variation), and very high if another writer wrote the questioned handwriting (with similarities due to chance match). I have assessed the likelihood of observing the similarities and lack of dissimilarity as very high if the specimen writer K2 wrote the questioned handwriting, and very low if another writer wrote the questioned handwriting (with similarities due to chance match). As a result of my examination and evaluation of the evidence, in my opinion the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the specimen K2 writer wrote the questioned Q1 handwriting, as opposed to another writer (including specimen writer K1).
NEDBM3-5245	The comparison of the questioned document to the know material of Alana HUNTER revealed significant deviations. In contrast to this result, the comparison to the known material of Cate BANE showed significant matches. Therefore, Cate BANE is the writer of the questioned document.
NME66U-5241	FIRST.- The writing stamped on the document called THREAT NOTE, identified as evidence Q1 in its respective Chain of Custody record; DOES NOT COME FROM THE GRAPHIC ORIGIN WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS UNDOUBTED IN THE NAME OF C. ALANA HUNTER. SECOND.- The writing stamped on the document called THREAT NOTE, identified as evidence Q1 in its respective Chain of Custody record; DOES COME FROM THE GRAPHIC ORIGIN WITH THOSE ELEMENTS INDICATED AS UNDOUBTED IN THE NAME OF C. CATE BANE.
NMYLKW-5241	The handwriting found on the threatening note located in a common area of Metal Bridge High School DOES CORRESPOND with the handwriting provided as comparison material from CATE BANE, as shown in her writing exercises and business transaction notes.
NPC7LX-5241	The writer of the known writing on K1 probably did not write the questioned writing on Q1. The writer of the known writing on K2 probably wrote the questioned writing in item Q1.
NTBHGX-5245	The two propositions that were considered are as follows: P1 The questioned writing was written by the writer of the known material P2 The questioned writing was written by someone other than the writer of the known material. It is my opinion that: 1. Based on the observed similarities and no significant differences, the evidence provides very strong support for the Proposition P1 that the questioned document, Q1, was written by the writer of the Cate BANE handwriting specimens over the alternative Proposition P2. 2. Based on the observed differences, the evidence provides very strong support for the Proposition P2 that the questioned document, Q1, was not written by the writer of the Alana HUNTER handwriting specimens over the alternative Proposition P1.



TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
NUKPKQ-5241	Q1 was WRITTEN by cate bane and was not written by Alana hunter
NYGBDE-5241	After an examination of documents submitted at this time and based on a reasonable degree of professional certainty, it is my opinion that Q1 was probably written by the same person who wrote the K2a-K2b known writing samples. The range of variation exhibited in the questioned and the known writings contain some significant similarities. The writer of the K1a-K1b known samples can be eliminated as having written the Q1 questioned writing.
P3D3G6-5241	On comparison, I found as follows : (i) The questioned handwriting on Q1 showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting on K1a and K1b. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens ("Alana Hunter"). (ii) The questioned handwriting on Q1 showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting on K2a and K2b. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens ("Cate Bane").
P4N643-5245	The questioned handwriting has disconnected lower case letters with some connected characters. Handwriting is fluent, of good quality and naturally written, with dynamic lines. The characters are medium-sized and vary in their vertical axis. The letters are disconnected, but some letter combinations („to“, „me“) are connected. The known handwritings of K1 have some similar general characteristics with the questioned handwriting, but differed in proportions, width, size, slant and connectedness. There were differences in the starting position of the lines. When comparing the specific characteristics, the differences were more significant, so that person was eliminated. Between the Q1 and K2 specimens there were similarities in general characteristics – style and legibility, fluency, size, proportions, width, slope, spacing. There were no relevant differences but many significant similarities in individual characteristics. Some similar individual features on the letters: “b”, “d” (length of vertical strokes, shape of the oval), “D”, “o”, “r”, “t”, “y”, (shape of letters), “g” (lengths of the loop), “i” (position and form of the dot), “Th” (position of “h”), connection between of “to” and “me”.
PCJ2TQ-5245	Based on the physical examination and comparison of the Item 001 (Q1) questioned document with the submitted Alana Hunter [Items 002 (K1a) and 003 (K1b)] and the Cate Bane [Items 004 (K2a) and 005 (K2b)] known writing, the following was determined: It was determined that Cate Bane [Items 004 (K2a) and 005 (K2b)] wrote the Item 001 questioned document. It was determined that Alana Hunter [Items 002 (K1a) and 003 (K1b)] did not write the Item 001 document.
PM2NZ7-5245	The findings of the forensic handwriting examination provide extremely strong support that the writing on the questioned document (Q1) was also written by the writer of the K2 specimen material. The findings also provide extremely strong support that the writing on the questioned document (Q1) was not written by the writer of the specimen K1 material.
PM4D64-5245	It is probable the writer of K2 is the author of Q-1. It is probable the writer of K1 is not the author of Q-1.
PP949X-5245	In my opinion; There is limited handwriting evidence that Cate Bane (K2) is the author of the handwritten note (Q1). There is limited handwriting evidence that someone other than Alana Hunter (K1) is the author of the handwritten note (Q1).
PQ8LVT-5241	I found the evidence to provide support for the proposition that the writing in question marked as (“Q1”) was written by the writer of the specimen writing marked “K2”. and not the writer of the writing of the specimen marked as “K1”
PQY6CZ-5241	We are of the opinion Cate Bane wrote the threatening note Q1. We are of the opinion Alana Hunter didn't write the threatening note Q1.
PRVJ2E-5245	It is highly probable that Cate Bane, the writer of K2a-K2b, prepared the writings appearing on the Q1 note.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
Q39Z8Q-5241	Handwriting in Q1 was written by Cate Bane - K2.
Q7CXFX-5245	Based on the visual examination and comparison of the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q1 with the known entries depicted on Exhibits K1a, K1b, K2a, and K2b, the following was determined: • Cate Bane (Exhibits K2a and K2b) wrote the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q1. • Alana Hunter (Exhibits K1a and K1b) probably did not write the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q1. This qualified finding is necessitated by the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing which were not fully represented in the known.
Q7FYPW-5241	In light of the above analysis and comparison, I concluded the following: 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" and "K1b"; 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" and "K2b".
Q9XHL2-5241	The author of the K1 known handwriting did not write the questioned handwriting appearing on Q1. There is disagreement in a combination of significant, individualizing handwriting characteristics. The author of the K2 known handwriting wrote the questioned handwriting appearing on Q1. There is agreement in a combination of individualizing handwriting characteristics and an absence of any significant differences.
QENW8N-5245	Was written by and was not written by
QTJDXL-5245	Level of conclusion +3: The results strongly support that Cate Bane (K2) has written the questioned writing. (The results are at least 6 000 times more probable if the main hypothesis is true compared to if the alternative hypothesis is true.) Level of conclusion -2: The results support that Alana Hunter has not written the questioned writing. The results are at least 100 times more probable if the alternative hypothesis is true compared to if the main hypothesis is true). The scale used for evaluative reporting at the Swedish National Forensic Centre (NFC), is a nine level scale: +1-+4, 0, -1 -- -4. The magnitude of the likelihood ratio determines the level of conclusion.
QZMFZ2-5241	A forensic, comparative examination using magnification and lighting revealed the following: The author of Exhibits K2a and K2b, Cate Bane, wrote the handwriting appearing on the note (Exhibit Q1). The author of Exhibits K1a and K1b, Alana Hunter, did not write the handwriting appearing on the note (Exhibit Q1).
RHXR8H-5245	In my opinion my findings provide very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing shown on the threatening note Q1 was produced by someone other than the K1 author (Alana HUNTER) . In my opinion my findings provide very strong support for the proposition that the questioned writing shown on the threatening note Q1 was produced by the K2 author (Cate BANE) rather than by some other person.
RR79UG-5241	There are several significant differences in handwritten characteristics between QD and the specimen handwriting marked as k1a and k1b. So, Qd was not written by Alana Hunter. There are several significant similarities in handwritten characteristics between QD and the specimen handwriting marked as k2a and k2b. So, Qd was not written by Cate Bane.
RTZWDC-5245	Source Identification It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by CATE BANE, Item 3 (Item K2a-b).
T4UMFV-5241	IDENTIFICATION: It was determined that the questioned writing on document Q-1 was written by the writer of K-15 through K-28, Cate Bane, due to similarities of handwriting habit.
T6CGEK-5245	The examination showed that the questioned note Q1 (Threatening Note) was written by one individual, with no indication that more than one person contributed to its writing. Significant similarities were found



TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	between Q1 and the known writing of Cate Bane, with no significant unexplained differences. It is the opinion of the examiner that Cate Bane wrote the questioned note. The handwriting of Alana Hunter shows fundamental differences in the way letters are formed, how they connected, and in their relative proportions. Therefore, she did not write Q1.
T7KUX8-5241	First: The handwriting found in the fragment of the white notebook matches the handwriting used for comparison, identified as K2a and K2b, belonging to Cate Bane. Second: The handwriting found in the fragment of the white notebook does not match the handwriting used for comparison, identified as K1a and K1b, belonging to Halana Hunter.
TDHJGW-5245	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".
TDKFJF-5241	Examination and comparison of exhibit Q1 to exhibits K1a-b and K2a-b 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-b and K2a-b were scanned/photocopied for preservation by Forensic Document Examiner XXX. The questioned handwriting present on Q1 when compared with exhibits K1a-b were written by the author of K2a-b (Cate Bane). The questioned handwriting present on Q1 when compared with exhibits K2a-b were not written by the author of K1a-b (Alana Hunter.)
U4RDYJ-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
UHBZ9G-5245	K1 did not write the Questioned Note but K2 did write the Questioned Note.
UVZYXY-5241	There are many similarities and no significant differences between the handwriting in Q1 (threatening note) and the known handwriting of K2 (Cate Bane). The nature of the similarities is such that, in our opinion, Cate Bane is responsible for the handwriting in the threatening note (Q1).
V237G8-5245	The handwritten text on the threatening note (Q1), was written by K2 (Cate Bane).
V64CUT-5241	Source Identification: Handwriting comparison disclosed that there are numerous significant similarities and no significant dissimilarities between the handwriting characteristics on Exhibit 5 and the known writing samples of Bane on Exhibits 3 and 4. As a result, there is extremely strong support for the proposition that Bane wrote the handwriting on Exhibit 5 and there is no support for the proposition that the handwriting on Exhibit 5 was written by a different writer. Source Exclusion: Handwriting comparison disclosed that there are numerous significant dissimilarities and a few similarities between the handwriting characteristics on Exhibit 5 and the known writing samples of Hunter on Exhibits 1 and 2. As a result, there is extremely strong support for the proposition that Hunter did not write the handwriting on Exhibit 5 and there is extremely limited support for the proposition that the handwriting on Exhibit 5 was written by Hunter.
V6KDUA-5241	It is concluded that Cate Bane "K2a,K2b" wrote the manuscript in the questioned document "Q1."
V7NAVQ-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked "Q1" were written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b" and not written by the writer of the specimen material marked "K1a" and "K1b".
VJKAYT-5245	1. Indication of incompatibility between Q1 and K1. 2. Compatibility in writing features between Q1 and K2, but not to a degree allowing complete identification.
VLBB3V-5241	In my opinion, the handwriting evidence very strongly supports the proposition that Cate Bane (the writer of K2) is the author of Q1. In my opinion, the handwriting evidence very strongly supports the proposition that Alana Hunter (the writer of K1) is not the author of Q1.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
VNWFCE-5245	The body of questioned writing on the threatening note was written by K2(Cate Bane). The body of questioned writing on the threatening note was not written by K1(Alana Hunter).
VT4URR-5241	I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked K2a and K2b. I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked Q1 was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting marked K1a and K1b
VTNJ4X-5245	The body of questioned writing on the threatening note(Q1) Was WRITTEN by Cate Bane (K2).
VU6GXH-5245	Results of the examination strongly support the proposition that Q and K1 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 was not written by the same person. Results of the examination strongly support the proposition that Q and K2 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 was written by the same person.
VW8L6B-5245	Cate Bane wrote the questioned handprinted entry.
VY68NN-5241	The empirical observations derived from the forensic examination of the materials at hand support the proposition that the writing in question "Q" was written by the writer of specimen writing "K2".
W6WM6L-5245	1. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Handwriting on Questioned Threatening Note (Q1) with course of business writing of Alana Hunter (K1a) and with dictated exemplars of Alana Hunter on (K1a), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Questioned Threatening Note (Q1) is not written by Alana Hunter. Therefore, Alana Hunter is not the author of the Questioned Handwriting on Questioned Threatening Note (Q1). 2. After careful examination and comparison of the Questioned Handwriting on Questioned Threatening Note (Q1) with course of business writing of Cate Bane (K2b) and with dictated exemplars of Cate Bane (K2a), it is concluded that the Questioned Handwriting on Questioned Threatening Note (Q1) is written by Cate Bane. Therefore, Cate Bane is the author of the Questioned Handwriting on Questioned Threatening Note (Q1).
WBL6KH-5245	Q1 was written by K2. Q1 was not written by K1.
WCD6F9-5245	Source Identification It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by Cate Bane, Item 3 (K2a, K2b).
WCUEBU-5241	Source Identification - Substantial similarities were noted between the questioned writing in item Q1 and the known samples in item K2. Item Q1 was written by the writer of the samples attributed to Cate Bane in item K2. Source Exclusion - Substantial differences were noted between the questioned writing in item Q1 and the known samples in item K1. Item Q1 was not written by the writer of the samples attributed to Alana Hunter in item K1.
WFDGC9-5245	HANDWRITING (Cate Bane) Source Identification It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by CATE BANE, Item 3 (K2a, K2b).
WFFYHJ-5241	The comparisons between the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 and the known specimens on Items K1a and K1b, and Items K2a and K2b, respectively, showed the following:(1). There were significant dissimilarities observed between the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 and the known specimens on K1a and K1b, in their writing style, size and shape of the letters, left margin, relative proportions of letter combinations 'to' and 'The', and the individual letter constructions. (2). There were significant similarities observed between the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 and the known handwritings on Items K2a and K2b in their writing style, size and shape of the letters, left margin, relative proportions of letter combinations 'to' and 'The'. Furthermore, the range of variation of construction of letters 'a, b, d, g, h, i,

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	l, n, o, r, t' in the questioned handwritings were also observed in the known specimens on Items K2a and K2b. Based on the findings, in my opinion, the questioned handwriting on Item Q1 was written by the writer of the known specimens on Items K2a and K2b (Cate Bane), not by the writer of the known specimens on Items K1a and K1b (Alana Hunter).
WFKFH4-5241	[No Conclusions Reported.]
WJCR89-5245	It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (Q1) was prepared by CATE BANE, Item 3 (K2a, k2b).
WUE6AU-5245	1. The handwriting in the threatening note under study, identified as Q1, is graphically heterogeneous with the genuine handwriting of Ms. Alana Hunter. 2. The handwriting in the threatening note under study, identified as Q1, is graphically monogenetic with the genuine handwriting of Ms. Cate Bane.
WXZPGJ-5245	It is my conclusion that the Cate Bane of the known material Exhibits K2a and K2b highly probably also wrote the threatening note (Exhibit Q1). I am virtually certain that the Exhibit K2a, K2b and Q1 writings were written by the same individual.
WYV9JK-5241	In as much as it is possible to examine copies in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Cate Bane (K2) wrote the questioned writing on the note given laboratory designation Q1.
X2FLHE-5245	It is probable that Writer K2, Cate Bane, did write the questioned threatening note described as Item Q1. This conclusion reflects the limitation associated with examining non-original documents. Furthermore, it acknowledges the underlying assumption that the known writing accurately represents the full range of variation of Cate Bane's writing. It is probable that Writer K1, Alana Hunter, did not write the questioned threatening note described as Item Q1. This conclusion reflects the limitation associated with examining non-original documents. Furthermore, it acknowledges the underlying assumption that the known writing accurately represents the full range of variation of Alana Hunter's writing.
XG7NVC-5241	As a result of examination and comparison based solely on the material submitted the following conclusions and observations are opinions based upon my experience, education and training and are as follows: 1) The Q1, K1a-b, K2a-b documents were scanned for preservation. 2) A VSC (Video Spectral Comparator) examination using various microscopic, infrared, ultraviolet, and alternate light source examination techniques was performed on the Q1 document. The ink was consistent throughout the Q1 document. 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 Q1 document was written by the author of the K2a-b documents, Cate Bane. 5) The Q1 document was not written by the author of the K1a-b documents, Alana Hunter.
XR6KWD-5245	Cate Bane probably wrote the questioned note, item Q1. Alana Hunter probably did not write the questioned note, item Q1.
XRN47Q-5241	In our opinion, the threatening note (Q1) has been written by Cate Bane (K2).
XV3YLN-5241	Comparison of the questioned handwriting in Q1 with the control handwriting written by Cate Bane (K2) revealed similarities in writing attributes relating to indentation, proportion of strokes, construction details of letters, and proportion between letters. On the other hand, comparison of the questioned handwriting in Q1 with the control handwriting written by Alana Hunter (K1) revealed discrepancies in writing attributes relating to construction details of letters, writing movements, connection and proportion between letters. In view of the evidence found, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting in Q1 were written by Cate Bane (K2) but not by Alana Hunter (K1).
XZAD4L-5241	In respect of the questioned writing on the document marked "Q1": The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was not executed by the author of the specimen writing on the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	documents marked "K1a" and "K1b". The evidence supports the proposition that the questioned writing was executed by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b".
YDVBHP-5241	The base collation writing inserted in the base collation documents identified as PT-25-5241-25-BC-1-4. (K1-A, ALANA HUNTER), PT-25-5241-25-BC-2-4. (K1-B, ALANA HUNTER), and the questioned writing inserted in the questioned document identified as PT-25-5241-25-Q-1-1 DO NOT CORRESPOND. While the base collation writing inserted in the base collation documents identified as PT-25-5241-25-BC-3-4. (K2-A, CATE BANE) and PT-25-5241-25-BC-4-4. (K2-B, CATE BANE) and the questioned writing inserted in the questioned document identified as PT-25-5241-25-Q-1-1, IF APPLICABLE.
YFRGD2-5241	After analyzing the known writings of K1a and K1b (Alana Hunter) and the writings of K2a and K2b (Cate Bane), as well as the writings of the threatening note Q1, it was concluded that the writings of the known K2a and K2b correspond to the writings of Q1.
YG3JYY-5241	The disputed handwriting on the "Threatening Note" was written by Cate Bane, and not by Alana Hunter.
YHYXND-5245	1) There are dissimilarities in the features, habits, characteristics, and elements of comparison that make up the formation of strokes, letter formation, beginning and end of strokes, size, slant, connection, and angles when comparing the handwriting in document Q1 with documents K1a and K1b. 2) There are similarities in the features, habits, characteristics, and elements of comparison that comprise stroke formation, letter formation, stroke beginnings and endings, size, slant, connections, and angles when comparing the handwriting in document Q1 with documents K2a and K2b.
YMLTK-5241	I FOUND THE EVIDENCE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSITION THAT THE WRITING IN QUESTION MARKED "Q1" WAS WRITTEN BY THE WRITER OF THE SPECIMEN WRITING MARKED "K2".
YNME3N-5245	The items listed in this Certificate of Analysis were assessed and examined based on methodology described in the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) Test Methods (unless otherwise noted). The methodology used included macroscopic, microscopic, and handwriting examinations. Handwriting Opinions Regarding Alana Hunter It is highly probable that Alana Hunter, Items K1a and K1b, was not the writer of the questioned hand printing on the note in Item Q1, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named "25-5245_Q1". The presence of class characteristics was a limitation to the handwriting comparison. Handwriting Opinions Regarding Cate Bane Cate Bane, Items K2a and K2b, was the writer of the questioned hand printing on the note in Item Q1, which was depicted in the electronically submitted image named "25-5245_Q1".
Z4C6DC-5245	25-- 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.
Z68MGX-5245	Based upon an examination of the above listed items, the evidence supports the opinion that the questioned writing appearing on Q-1 was prepared by the same individual that prepared the known-comparison writing samples that appear on K-2a and K-2b. The terminology "was prepared by" (identification) as it appears in the SWGDOC (Scientific Working Group for Forensic Document Examination) published standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners is defined as a definite conclusion of identity. This is the highest degree of confidence expressed by document examiners in handwriting comparisons. The examiner has no reservations whatever, and although prohibited from using the word "fact," the examiner is certain, based on the evidence contained in the handwriting, that the writer of the known material actually wrote the writing in question.
Z6PLQP-5245	There are a number of significant similarities between the questioned writing shown by Q1 and the known writing of K2 and no significant differences. In my opinion, the findings provide strong support for the proposition that Q1 was written by K2 rather than the alternative proposition that some other person was responsible. Despite some general similarities, there are a number of differences between the

TABLE 2

WebCode- Test	Conclusions
	questioned writing shown by Q1 and the known writing of K1. In my opinion, the findings provide strong support for the proposition that Q1 was written by someone other than K1 rather than the alternative proposition that K1 was responsible.
ZFNAND-5245	After a detailed comparison of the handwriting found in the Aleppo Data Memorandum (the subject of this examination), which was discovered at Metal Bride High School and referred to by the code (Q1), with the handwriting samples of the student Alana Hunter (symbolized as K1) — consisting of [K1a: Dictated Exemplars] and [K1b: Course of Business] — and the handwriting samples of the student Cate Bane (symbolized as K2) — consisting of [K2a: Dictated Exemplars] and [K2b: Course of Business] — the following conclusions were reached: 1. A significant level of agreement was found between the handwriting in the memorandum (Q1) and the handwriting of the student Cate Bane, represented by the comparison samples [K2a & K2b]. 2. This agreement was observed across all major elements of comparison, including but not limited to: • The nature, form, and characteristics of the written words. • The linear level, degree, and line size observed within the writing. • The linear characteristics, writing rhythm, and distinctive features that demonstrate both the uniqueness and the common features shared between the questioned handwriting (Q1) and the known samples (K2a & K2b). The data in the memorandum (the subject of the examination) and the handwriting of the student Cate Bane, in the corresponding comparison models [K2a, K2b], revealed the following points of agreement: 3. Agreement in the writing style, which reflects the structure and unique formation of the letters. 4. Consistent spatial distribution between the words. 5. Alignment of the text, beginning uniformly from the left margin. 6. The writing generally exhibited a vertical orientation. 7. Distinct individual characteristics were observed in the formation of letters.
ZGGAJ4-5245	FIRST.- The questioned deed identified as Q1A, which is in the questioned document Q1, described previously in its corresponding section, based on the results obtained it is determined that the deed DOES NOT CORRESPOND with the base deed of comparison identified as C1A provided by Ms. ALANA HUNTER. SECOND.- The questioned deed identified as Q1A, which is in the questioned document Q1, described previously in its corresponding section, based on the results obtained it is determined that the deed DOES CORRESPOND with the base deed of comparison identified as C2A provided by Ms. CATE BANE.
ZJMQYM-5245	Cate Bane, Item K2a-b, has been identified as the writer of the questioned material appearing on Item Q1. Alana Hunter, Item K1a-b, has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned material appearing on Item Q1. Conclusion definitions: The conclusion, "has been identified," means that there is agreement in all individualizing characteristics and there are no significant, inexplicable differences between the questioned and know writing. The conclusion, "has been eliminated," means that there are significant differences between the questioned and known writing.
ZM9A4Q-5245	Visual and microscopic examinations of Exhibits K1a, K1b, K2a, K2b, and Q1 were conducted. The questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1 were compared with the known hand printing on Exhibits K1a, K1b, K2a, and K2b. The writer of Exhibits K2a and K2b (Cate Bane) wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibits K1a and K1b (Alana Hunter) probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known hand printings, the evidence falls short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion.
ZVYTM7-5245	I found that there is a critical and stable difference between the questioned document Q1 and the specimens K1 and K2, so I conclude that the writer of the questioned document Q1 was not the same as K1 and K2

# Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
2BNKKC-5245	As typical gestures can be highlighted: • Letter “e” in both items Q1 and K2 is simplified, omitting the oval, and its ending descends below the baseline. • Letter “t” features a crossbar executed in a saber-stroke manner. • Letter “o” in both items abruptly decreases in size and tends to be open. • Letter “b” is executed in a fragmented manner. • Letter “g” is formed with an inflated foot and an open central body. • Letter “d” features a crest shaped like a sail. • Letter “l” includes a harpoon in the lower zone.
2MG2CX-5245	No significant differences were noted between the questioned (Q1) note and the extended printed writing attributed to Cate Bane (K2a and K2b). Ms. Bane's writing agrees with the questioned note in spacing, slant, line placement, proportions, letter formations and connection of strokes. Although there is a general pictorial resemblance with Ms. Hunter's extended writing (K1a and K1b) and the questioned note (Q1), the significant differences in heights of letters, spacings, and connections of strokes, far outweigh any similarities that may be present.
64R4D3-5245	Furthermore, it is my professional expert opinion that I have eliminated Alana Hunter as the author of the Q1 document.
6AKWUC-5245	Following a thorough examination of all submitted documents, it is my opinion that the handwriting in the questioned document marked Q1 exhibits significant differences when compared to the handwriting in the known documents marked K1a and K1b. Therefore, it is concluded that the questioned writing on the threatening note on Q1 was NOT WRITTEN by the same individual responsible for the writings in K1a and K1b (Alana Hunter)
6YJJP6-5241	Methods of analysis used included physical visual examination, sketching features and side by side comparison of the general and individual handwriting characteristics. The known handwriting of Alana Hunter on 'K1a' and 'K1b' was examined and inter-compared to ascertain if it was made by one and the same person prior to comparison with the questioned handwriting on 'Q1'. More differences than similarities were observed between the 'Q1' and the known handwriting on 'K1a' and 'K1b' including the internal and external proportions of letters, relative inter-letter spacing in the words e.g 'Do', 'bang', the nature of connectivity of letters e.g o-r in the word 'tomorrow'. The differences formed the basis for the conclusion that 'Q1' was not written by Alana Hunter. The known handwriting of Cate Bane on 'K2a' and 'K2b' was examined and inter-compared to ascertain if it was made by one and the same person prior to comparison with the questioned handwriting on 'Q1'. More similarities than differences were observed between the 'Q1' and the known handwriting on 'K2a' and 'K2b' including internal proportion of letters e.g (D,o,t,w,d), the nature of connectivity between letters e.g t-o, m-e in 'come', external proportion of letters, relative inter-letter and inter-word spacing e.g in words big bang. The similarities between 'Q1' with Cate Bane's handwriting were very distinctive in nature hence providing evidence of same authorship.
6ZRNXN-5241	3.1.) Differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” (Threatening Note) and the specimen handwriting purported to be of “Alana Hunter” marked as “K1a” to “K1b”. 3.2.) Significant similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the handwriting in question marked as “Q1” (Threatening Note) and the specimen handwriting purported to be of “Cate Bane” markedly as “K2a” to K2b”.
7C4HVX-5245	The term "highly probable" is a published standard term for stating conclusions. It is defined as meaning that the examiner is "virtually certain" that the questioned writing and the submitted known specimens are from a common source (associative conclusion) or not from a common source (dissociative conclusion). This conclusion reflects a very high level of confidence.
7YQJGH-5241	1. There are differences in terms of design and execution between the specimen handwriting marked as “K1a” to “K1b” the questioned handwriting marked as “Q1”. 2. There are similarities in terms of design and execution between the specimen handwriting marked as “K2a” to “K2b” the questioned handwriting marked as “Q1”.



TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
7ZR9CE-5245	As directed in the Data Sheet, I have assumed that the non-original material Q1, K1a, K1b, K2a and K2b are true and accurate representations of the original material. I have also assumed that the relative timing between the questioned and known material is reasonable in the context of the case. In relation to the comparison between questioned note Q1 and K1 writing (Alana HUNTER), the examination is somewhat limited by the amount of questioned writing available, particularly as some characters are absent, or present only once or twice in the questioned note.
8HT92T-5241	Scientific method taking into account the phases of: observation, indication or signaling of the distinctive characters (individualizing characteristics), confrontation and identity judgments.
9VAKTT-5241	In our examination, it was observed that the formation form, habits, slope, direction, course and sequence were compatible with the comparisons of K2.
ABJVUL-5241	According to the results of the analysis performed on the items under study, the handwriting present in the document "threatening note" belongs to Cate Bane.
BC7RX6-5245	Following a thorough examination of all submitted documents, it is my opinion that the handwriting in the questioned document marked Q1 exhibits significant differences when compared to the handwriting in the known documents marked K1a and K1b. Therefore, it is concluded that the questioned writing on the threatening note on Q1 was not written by the same individual responsible for the writings in K1a and K1b (Alana Hunter)
C2KUNR-5241	which allows us to conclude that the note of doubt item Q1 was written by Cate Bane and that it was not written by Alana Hunter.
D7VK9D-5245	Given that both the questioned and undisputed documents are in digital files, the development of this report is conditioned on the assessment of the handwriting by visualizing it on screen. The instruments mentioned would be those regularly used for this type of study when the documents are submitted in physical and original form.
DATYXM-5245	Significantly similar handwriting features include the following: spacing between words and letters, letter forms, letter size and proportions, letter design and method of construction, initial and terminal strokes, i-dot placement, cross-stroke of the "t", and overall writing pattern.
DLX7J9-5241	1. There are similarities in respect of elements of style and execution between the specimen writing marked as "K2a", "K2b" and the questioned writing marked as "Q1". 2. There are differences in respect of elements of style and execution between the specimens writing marked as "K1a", "K1b" and the questioned writing marked as "Q1".
DPRVAU-5241	If this evidence was truly "original" - ink to paper, side light examination would have been conducted on the front and back sides of the questioned document as well as the collected course of business writings from the two subjects. After the side light examinations, electrostatic detection apparatus (ESDA) examinations would be conducted, with a control included within each examination. All ESDA examinations that do not develop any impressions will be photographed and all ESDA examinations that do develop impressions will be saved by sandwiching the toner developed impressions with a cover sheet that is much like contact paper, purchased from Foster Freeman to be specifically used for this purpose. Lastly the questioned document would be examined, front and backside, using all the various combinations of alternate light sources and filters available when using the Video Spectral Comparator (VSC).
DUYCPA-5241	A proper handwriting comparison requires, from any and all subjects, an extensive and contemporaneous representation of the same characters and words in the same style present in the questioned handwriting. Additionally, a greater number of known standards are usually necessary to establish a range of natural variation of the writer. If you would like to continue your investigation from a handwriting standpoint, it might be useful to obtain additional verbatim handwriting exemplars from the subjects. Furthermore, it might be useful to collect extended known writing attributed to the subjects that has been written in the normal course of business, contemporaneous to the questioned document. This may include correspondence written by the subjects.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
E46J6A-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.
EDM4X9-5241	3. Analysis and Comparison of the respective material revealed the following: 3.1. Similarities in respect of design and execution were identified between the disputed writing marked "Q1", and the specimen writing marked "K2a" and "K2b". 3.2 Differences in respect of design and execution were identified between the disputed writing marked "Q1" and the specimen writing marked "K1a" and "K1b".
EMT87P-5245	Additional observations and assessments have been made regarding the submitted items and recorded for possible future comparisons.
EMZ7BY-5241	2- Cate Bane was the one who wrote the data on the threatening notes (Q1)
FPBEM-5241	The handwriting authorship of the school threat note (Q1) by student CATE BANE was based on the following graphonomic coincidences: 1. Right slant and upper closure of the letters "o" 2. Descending line box in the word "come" 3. Shape of the letter "h" and connecting movement with the lowercase "e" in the word "The" 4. Upper right abbreviation of the "a" 5. Interliteral and interverbal spaces 6. Connecting the letters "to"
GYMVLP-5245	Fair test.
HETLU8-5241	Analysis 1. The handwriting analysis method was used to answer the established questions: 1. Analyzing first the questioned writing Point Q1, consisting of Threatening Note, preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 2. Analyzing comparative writing Article K1a, consisting of dictated copies for Alana Hunter and Point K1b consisting of business course for Alana Hunter, preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 3. Comparison of extrinsic reference points (PREs) and intrinsic reference points (PRIs). 4. Analysis of results, evaluation of each of the results of the confrontation (comparison/questioning), finding no associations. 5. In conclusion, the Q1 writing (Threatening Note) WAS NOT WRITTEN by Alana Hunter. Analysis 2. 1. Analyzing first the questioned writing Point Q1, consisting of Threatening Note, preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 2. Analyzing comparative writing Article K2a, consisting of dictated copies for Cate Bane and Point K2b consisting of business course for Cate Bane, preliminary analysis, analysis without optical instruments, analysis with optical instruments and analysis with video spectral comparator. 3. Comparison of extrinsic reference points (PRE'S) and intrinsic reference points (PRI'S). 4. Analysis of results, evaluation of each of the results of the confrontation (comparison/questioning), finding associations. 5. Conclusion, the Q1 writing (Threatening Note) was WRITTEN by Cate Bane.
HHCXDA-5245	The examination was limited by the age of the known writers and lack of dates for collected known exemplars and the questioned document. Young writers are not likely to have fully established individualized handwriting characteristics and variation can change quickly due to growth, trends, fads, and experimentation.
HVF7BR-5245	It was also noted that the variations among the compared writings are also similar. For instance, the letter "B" is formed in some instances with a "pen lift", resulting from two separate pen movements, whereas in other instances it is executed in a single continuous stroke without a pen lift. In this respect, the questioned writing and the reference writings (k2) are consistent within themselves and mutually compatible in terms of execution characteristics.



TABLE 3

WebCode- Test	Additional Comments
HW9VV9- 5245	AL SER IMAGENES LAS MUESTRAS ANALIZADAS, EL ESTUDIO NO SE ENCUENTRA COMPLETO.
JHLANK- 5241	Through direct observation and with the support of the optical instrument (10x magnifying glass) and equipment (document comparator); appropriate to advance this type of studies, the comparative inspection of the texts located in the disputed document Q1 (threatening note) was carried out against texts K2a and K2b provided by Mrs. Cate Bane, in order to identify morpho-structural and dynamic aspects, as well as to determine possible similarities or differences in the graphonomic characteristics. For this purpose, graphic aspects and sub-aspects were taken into account, such as: widening order in the second and fourth lines with respect to the right margin, normal interverbal and interliteral spacing, shape of the letter "h" and connecting movement with the lowercase "e" in the word "The", execution of the letter "D" and the letter "b" in two graphic times, verticalized inclination, sinuous linear displacement, among others. Where it was observed that the texts of document Q1 correspond with the texts of documents K2a, b, provided by Mrs. Cate Bane.
JHTATU- 5245	By comparing the handwriting of the fixed statement in the questioned document "Threatening Note" (Q1) with the handwriting on the dictated exemplars of Alana Hunter (K1a) and Cate Bane (K2a), as well as the "Course of Business" comparison samples (K1b and K2b) containing corresponding letters and words, the following was established: The handwriting in Cate Bane's exemplar (K2a) and "Course of Business" comparison sample (K2b) is consistent with the handwriting in the statement written in the "Threatening Note" (Q1). This consistency is observed in the individual handwriting characteristics, including letter formation, beginning and ending strokes, letters connections, and the relative positioning of letters characters. Based on these findings, it is concluded that Cate Bane (K2a) wrote the statement contained in the "Threatening Note" (Q1).
JJD8T8- 5241	Analysis and Comparison of the respective material revealed the following facts: 1.1 Significant similarities in respect of elements of style were identified between the handwriting in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting contained on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2b". 1.2 Significant dissimilarities in respect of elements of style were identified between the handwriting in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting contained on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1b".
KLLVX3- 5245	Limited comparability of the known standards for both individuals in comparison to the Q. Exemplars were fine but would prefer to still have the 3 pages of known for each individual.
LCYYUF- 5245	According to the accreditation certificate, the following scopes were applied: Component/parameter: Physical comparison. Qualitative determination. Equipment/technology: General microscopy, Imaging and Visual. The policy "In cases of proficiency tests, the guidelines proposed by the service providers shall be considered" from the Test Method Manual for signature analysis was applied.
LZFKPR- 5245	The examination and comparison of the submitted items of handwriting was completed using a Photoshop-based digital analysis. The opinions are based on the similarities and dissimilarities found in various general and individual characteristics between questioned item and known items.
MEEQEG- 5241	A comparative inspection is carried out between the doubted text in the document (threatening note Q1), against the undoubted spellings (handwriting samples K1a) and extra-procedural writings (notes attached to a letter-sized sheet of paper K1b) provided by Alana Hunter, where with the support of optical and lighting aids, the graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects were inspected, such as: morphology, dimension, cohesion, linear displacement, inclination, proportionality, initiation and termination points, speed and identifying and individualizing elements, among others; evidencing discrepancies between the graphonomic characteristics of the doubted text (threatening note Q1) and undoubted handwriting samples (K1a) and extra-procedural writings (K1b). Likewise, a comparative inspection was carried out between the questioned text contained in the document (threatening note Q1) and the standard comparison material (handwriting samples K2a) and extra-procedural writings (notes attached to a letter-sized sheet of paper K2b) provided by Cate Bane. With the help of optical and lighting aids, graphonomic aspects and sub-aspects were inspected, such as: morphology, dimension, cohesion, linear displacement, inclination, proportionality, initiation and termination points, speed, and identifying and

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	individualizing elements, among others; observing concordances between the graphonomic characteristics of the disputed text (threatening note Q1) and undoubted handwriting samples (K2a) and extra-procedural writings (K2b).
NMYLKW-5241	There is a correspondence of characteristics of elements of general order, formal and graphic gesture of the questioned writings embodied in the threatening note with the writings provided as confrontation material of CATE BANE.
NTBHGX-5245	In performing a handwriting examination, features of the questioned entries are examined and listed before examining and listing the features of the specimen writer. A comparison of the features is undertaken and any similarities as well as dissimilarities between the two bodies of writing are noted. The similarities and/or dissimilarities then constitute evidence that support one of two mutually exclusive propositions regarding the authorship of the questioned entries. Also expressed is the examiner's opinion regarding the degree of support provided to the Proposition. This is expressed as one of five categories: Very Strong Support, Strong Support, Moderate Support or Inconclusive
NYGBDE-5241	The identification of an individual as the author of questioned writing is based upon a finding by the examiner in class and individual characteristics sufficient in number and force for the examiner to base an opinion of identity to a reasonable degree of certainty. Such findings were found in this case.
P3D3G6-5241	Although limited text was observed in the questioned handwriting, the similarities observed between the text in Q1 and the specimens from Cate Bane were highly distinct enabling a high level of confidence for positive identification.
PM4D64-5245	Limitations are present associated with reproduced handwriting.
T4UMFV-5241	By identifying, I do not have to exclude any other authors
T6CGEK-5245	The examination included analysis of letter formation, rhythm, slant, spacing, and connections. The questioned writing is consistent with Cate Bane's known samples, particularly in the formation and connection of the letters: "o", "s" and "c". The "o" shows a similar shape and proportional connection with adjacent letters, while the "s" and "c" display comparable curvature and linking strokes. No significant differences were noted. In contrast, Alana Hunte's writing differs in the way letters are formed, how they connect, and in their relative proportions. Overall, the evidence supports that Cate Bane authored Q1, and Alana Hunter is excluded.
UVZYXY-5241	Given our conclusive result for Cate Bane being responsible for the handwriting in Q1, we would not comment in our report that Alana Hunter was not responsible for the handwriting in Q1.
V6KDUA-5241	For this analysis, the comparative graphoscopic method was used, employing the following equipment: Regula 5001MK microscope and Regula 4308 spectral video comparator, where the extrinsic and intrinsic analysis of the sample in question "Q1" was performed against the comparison elements "K2a, K2b." Characteristics: 1. Convex stroke on the right side of the capital letter "D" in the word "Do." 2. Angularity in the gamma of the lowercase consonants "n" in the words "not, end, bang." 3. Sharp final stroke of the uppercase consonant "C" in the word "Come." 4. Upper link between the lowercase consonant "t" and the lowercase vowel 'o' in the words "to, tomorrow." 5. Verticality in the formation of the lowercase consonant "l" in the words "school, will." 6. Initial hook feature in the lowercase consonant "d" in the words "day, end." 7. Leftward placement of the dot above the lowercase vowel "i" in the word "big." 8. Elongated loop with ample space between the two parallel lines that form the lowercase consonant "g" in the word "bang." Observations: With regard to the results of the comparison of the manuscript in the disputed sample "Q1" with the comparison samples 'k1a' and "K1b" in the name of Ms. Alana Hunter, these were not used in the expert report because Mr. Kate Bane was identified. It should be noted that everything was documented with the proper chain of custody to ensure the receipt, analysis, storage, and transfer of the evidence in this case.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
VJKAYT-5245	1. Relatively little questioned text. 2. Relatively common writing features in the questioned text and the known samples.
WUE6AU-5245	1. Images taken of the study subjects, stored, and kept safe, which are available to the authorities. 2. The study is done on copies, which is a limitation as it does not allow for the study of important graphic aspects such as pressure and depth of writing
YNME3N-5245	Digital copies of the submitted images are being retained by the FDU. Definitions of Handwriting Opinions: The opinion "identification" meant that the evidence contained in the handwriting was in agreement in the individualizing characteristics and there were no significant, inexplicable differences between the questioned and known writings; therefore, the writings have common authorship. The opinion "highly probable not" meant that the evidence contained in the handwriting was very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality was missing so that an elimination was not in order. However, the examiner was virtually certain that the questioned and known writings were not written by the same individual.
Z68MGX-5245	Directly after identifying the questioned document, my reports include the following: Examination Requested: Attorney Xxxxxx Xxxxxxxx requested that I attempt to determine the authorship of the handwritten material/signature(s) on the above document or on the above documents. For the purpose of this examination, there are two mutually exclusive propositions that must be explored: 1. The signature Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx on the questioned document(s) was prepared by Xxxx XXXXXX. 2. The signature Xxxxxx Xxxxxxx on the questioned document(s) was prepared by someone other than Xxxxxx.
Z6PLQP-5245	My opinions are based on separate examinations of the handwritings from the two individuals; the opinion in relation to K1 is not related to the opinion in relation to K2. As part of standard casework I would examine the note using ESDA to reveal any indented impressions of writing that might provide useful information regarding its history.
ZFNAND-5245	Conclusion These consistent similarities lead to the conclusion that Cate Bane (K2) is the writer of all handwriting data contained in the memorandum referred to as (Q1) — the subject of this forensic examination.
ZM9A4Q-5245	The submission of ten to fifteen exact-text exemplars and/or comparable known normal course-of-business hand printing samples of Alana Hunter, containing similar words and letters as within the questioned entries, may provide the basis for an additional conclusion. Exhibits K1a, K1b, K2a, K2b, and Q1 were digitally preserved and processed. Exhibits K1a, K1b, K2a, K2b, and Q1 will be returned.

-End of Report-  
(Appendix may follow)

## Test No. 25-5241: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE SUBMITTED BY **Nov. 17, 2025, 11:59 p.m. EST** TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code: U1234A

WebCode: ANBFHP

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 potential school threat involving a handwritten note discovered at Metal Bridge High School. The note, which contains concerning language suggesting a possible act of violence, was found in a common area of the school. School administrators immediately notified law enforcement.

Two students, Alana Hunter and Cate Bane, have emerged as possible suspects in connection with the note. Known course of business writings and dictated exemplars for Alana and Cate have been collected. Please examine the submitted threatening note to determine, which, if either, of the individuals contributed to the hand printing on the questioned threatening note.

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

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

Item K1a: Dictated exemplars for Alana Hunter

Item K1b: Course of Business for Alana Hunter

Item K2a: Dictated exemplars for Cate Bane

Item K2b: Course of Business for Cate Bane

Item Q1: Threatening Note

**Examination Results**

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

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

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

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

K1 (Alana Hunter)	K2 (Cate Bane)
Q1 (Threatening Note) <input type="text"/>	Q1 (Threatening Note) <input type="text"/>

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

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

**Note:** Please use appropriate punctuation to indicate the end of sentences, sections, and statements in the free-form space below. Extra spacing and returns used for separation within your text will not transfer and may cause your information to be illegible in the Summary Report. The use of lists and tabular formats to deliver information is also cautioned against, as these do not transfer.

## 3.) Additional Comments

**Note:** Please use appropriate punctuation to indicate the end of sentences, sections, and statements in the free-form space below. Extra spacing and returns used for separation within your text will not transfer and may cause your information to be illegible in the Summary Report. The use of lists and tabular formats to deliver information is also cautioned against, as these do not transfer.

## 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)