



Handwriting Examination Test No. 14-523/524 Summary Report

This test was sent to 229 participants. Each sample set contained a photograph of two questioned receipts (Q1 and Q2) and photographs of known writings from two individuals. Participants were requested to examine these items and report their findings. Data were returned from 206 participants, 52 for the 14-523 DVD test and 154 for the 14-524 photo test (90% response rate) and are compiled into the following tables:

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Manufacturer's Information</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Summary Comments</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Table 1: Examination Results</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Table 2: Conclusions</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Table 3: Additional Comments</u>	<u>64</u>
<u>Appendix: Data Sheet</u>	<u>75</u>

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

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

Manufacturer's Information

Each sample set contained a photograph of two questioned receipts (Q1 and Q2) and six photographs of known writings, which included course of business writings and dictated exemplars provided by Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2). Participants were asked to determine which, if any, of the handprinted text and/or signatures on the receipts were produced by either of the two individuals.

SAMPLE PREPARATION-

The handprinted text and signature on the Q1 receipt were both produced by the K1 writer, Amy Michaels. The handprinted text and signature on the Q2 receipt were both produced by an unidentified third writer. During production of dictated writing, all three writers were instructed on capitalization, punctuation, and general formatting in order to maintain uniformity of appearance.

The questioned Q1 and Q2 documents were selected from several versions created by dictated writing.

The writer of K1 is female. The writer of K2 is male. The unidentified third writer is male.

SAMPLE ASSEMBLY: Once predistribution results were obtained, all sample packs were prepared. For each sample pack, the seven photographs were packaged into a pre-labeled manila envelope, sealed with evidence tape, and initialed with "CTS". All DVDs were produced and placed into cases. QC checks were performed on both media.

VERIFICATION-

Three of four predistribution participants confirmed the manufacturer's expected results. The Q1 handprinted text was produced by the K1 writer, and the Q1 signature was either produced by the K1 writer or could not be identified or eliminated. The Q2 handprinted text was not produced by either the K1 or K2 writer, and the Q2 signature was either not produced by these writers or could not be identified or eliminated. The signatures were purposely produced with minimal identifying characteristics, so a finding of "cannot be identified or eliminated" was anticipated.

The fourth predistribution participant stated that the K1 writer produced the Q1 handprinted text and signature, and that the K2 writer produced the Q2 handprinted text. They could not identify or eliminate the Q2 signature. Due to the Q2 text response, CTS consulted with an external QD/HW advisor for additional consideration. Based on the advisor's findings of multiple handprinting dissimilarities between the K2 samples and the Q2 receipt and the consistent, expected responses from the remaining predistribution participants, the test was approved for release with no changes

Release Date of Manufacturer's Information: 22-December-2014

Summary Comments

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text and signature identification challenge involving two questioned receipts. Each sample set contained a photograph of the two receipts (Q1 and Q2) and photographs of known writings provided by renter Amy Michaels (K1) and her subletter Carl Stevens (K2), including both course of business writings and dictated exemplars. Participants were requested to determine which, if any, of the handprinted text and/or signature in the two receipts was produced by either of the two individuals. The K1 writer produced the handprinted text and signature in Q1. An unidentified third writer produced the handprinted text and signature in Q2 (Refer to Manufacturer's Information for preparation details).

Several participants in this test commented that the signatures lacked adequate individualizing characteristics to make a determination of authorship. They stated that more exemplar signatures from the writers would be needed to make an identification or elimination. As the signatures were purposely prepared with minimal characteristics, CTS anticipated the response of "cannot be identified or eliminated" ("C") for the signatures in Q1 and Q2, even though the signature in Q1 was prepared by one of the writers for whom signature exemplars were provided.

For Question 1 relative to Item Q1 (Table 1a), "Which, if any, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signatures) on each of the questioned receipts?", all of the 206 participants (100%) identified the K1 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1. Of those that identified the K1 writer, a majority of participants (203) also eliminated the K2 writer (reported "D" or "E"); the remaining three participants gave no response for the K2 writer.

For Question 1 relative to Item Q2 (Table 1a), "Which, if any, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signatures) on each of the questioned receipts?", 170 of the 206 participants (83%) either eliminated both the K1 and K2 writers (reported "D" or "E"), could not identify or eliminate one or both writers (reported "C"), or a combination thereof. These results are grouped as follows: 140 participants eliminated both the K1 and K2 writers as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1; fifteen participants could not identify or eliminate either the K1 or K2 writer; thirteen participants eliminated the K1 writer but could not identify or eliminate the K2 writer; and two participants eliminated the K2 writer but could not identify or eliminate the K1 writer. Additionally, one participant eliminated the K2 writer but gave no response for the K1 writer. The remaining 35 participants identified either the K1 or K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q2, and the results are grouped as follows: 31 participants identified the K2 writer and eliminated the K1 writer; three participants identified the K1 writer and eliminated the K2 writer; and one participant identified the K1 writer and gave no response for the K2 writer.

For Question 2 relative to Item Q1 (Table 1b), "Which, if any, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts?" , 171 of the 206 participants (83%) identified the K1 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the signature in Q1. Of those that identified the K1 writer, the majority of participants (153) also eliminated the K2 writer (reported "D" or "E"). The other eighteen participants responded as follows: fifteen could not identify or eliminate the K2 writer (reported "C"), and three gave no response for the K2 writer. The participants that did not identify the K1 writer as the writer of the Q1 signature responded as follows: three participants eliminated the K2 writer as the writer of the Q1 signature and could not identify or eliminate the K1 writer; 32 participants could not identify or eliminate either the K1 or K2 writer as the writer of the signature in Q1.

For Question 2 relative to Item Q2 (Table 1b), "Which, if any, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts?" , 191 of the 206 participants (93%) either eliminated both the K1 and K2 writers (reported "D" or "E"), could not identify or eliminate one or both writers (reported "C"), or a combination thereof.

These results are grouped as follows: 82 participants eliminated both the K1 and K2 writers as the writer of the signature in Q2; 73 participants could not identify or eliminate either the K1 or K2 writer; 31 participants eliminated the K1 writer but could not identify or eliminate the K2 writer; five participants eliminated the K2 writer but could not identify or eliminate the K1 writer. Additionally, one participant eliminated the K2 writer but gave no response for the K1 writer. The remaining fifteen participants identified either the K1 or K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the Q2 signature, and the results are grouped as follows: twelve participants identified the K2 writer and eliminated the K1 writer; one participant identified the K1 writer and eliminated the K2 writer; and one participant identified the K1 writer and gave no response for the K2 writer.

Examination Results

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the questioned receipts?

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
246AAJ-524	A	E	6AXLXB-523	A	E
24NNQN-523	A	E	6HEPX7-524	A	E
28NRKV-523	A	E	6NHQXZ-524	A	E
2E74XW-523	B		6PDECN-524	A	E
2UECDQ-524	A		6QKP9R-523	A	E
2UGE9H-523	B	D	6QLLJN-524	A	E
2VV946-524	A	E	6U4LXH-524	A	E
33N3E9-524	A	E	6U8GR3-523	A	E
36Q2P2-524	A	E	6X7MZZ-524	A	E
38KRVF-523	A	E	72ZB37-524	A	E
39FAY3-524	A	E	73E6XT-524	A	E
3J9TCM-524	A	E	76MFQQ-523	A	E
3KBWC6-524	A	E	7FZFKY-524	A	E
3MYX9Z-524	A	E	7J4DRK-523	A	D
3NN4QC-524	A	E	7VWA3C-524	A	E
3V7374-524	A	E	7XKBWL-524	A	E
4D2MDV-523	A	E	8A96VD-523	A	E
4HXBU3-524	A	E	8E3NP4-523	A	E
4JTR8Y-524	A	E	8E6GLQ-523	A	E
4UQRJ4-524	A	E	8JVXRP-523	A	E
4V7UNQ-524	A	E	8MH6LK-524	A	E
4WGY2E-524	A	E	8T3Z82-524	A	E
689CNA-524	A	E	8UGV3N-523	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
92APDR-524	A	E	BEUQ6H-524	A	E
983YVX-524	A	E	BGYCWP-524	A	E
9JFU24-523	A	E	BKH9LF-524	A	E
9LJK9J-524	A	E	BQMALA-524	A	E
9N82JC-524	A	E	BRXKMZ-523	A	E
9NAQQV-524	A	E	C3YRXD-524	A	E
9XBBTM-523	A	E	C6XE4L-524	A	E
9XVUVA-524	A	E	C9222K-524	B	D
9YQEGM-523	A	E	CGB38X-523	A	E
A2RZNK-524	A	E	CHQ3P3-524	A	E
A2VH6-524	A	E	D8NQND-523	A	E
A4ZBKN-523	A	E	D8NW22-523	B	E
ADLL39-524	A	E	DAC6B3-524	A	E
AHWCDN-523	A	E	DBHU8J-523	A	E
AHYW8J-524	A	E	DK7Q9K-523	A	E
AM9DHT-523	A	D	DP3BGB-524	A	E
AN24N8-524	A	E	DV9YYH-524	A	E
APXJZ6-524	A	E	DYTM9-524	A	E
AV2K2Y-524	A	E	E2UCDB-524	A	E
B3JB3J-523	B	D	E42JUH-524	A	E
B6AHKV-524	B	D	E84DXE-524	A	E
B739QA-524	A	E	E8G7CU-524	A	E
BCNBRK-523	A	E	E9BUT4-523	A	E
BDEWD2-524	A	E	EBKA94-524	A	D
BEBDQY-524	A	E	EL6JXW-524	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
EWGHCK-524	A	E	KXVUZQ-524	A	E
EXFGVT-524	A	E	L9HWBR-524	A	E
FA366H-523	A	E	LA7L3Q-524	A	E
FCREEJ-524	A	E	LY3QKL-524	A	E
FJRYFU-524	A	E	M4F4AT-524	A	E
FLXU8Q-524	A	E	M7467M-524	A	-
FNMPMQ-524	A	E	MC6G2K-524	A	E
FUBBQ8-524	B	D	MFAJYU-524	A	E
FVM8ZH-524	A	E	MKJ6X8-524	A	E
G26ARX-524	A	E	MMPQPD-524	A	E
GJ9CGC-524	A	E	NGVHRH-524	A	E
GRECUK-524	A	E	NPMQ2U-524	A	E
H3WDPK-524	A	E	NWKZ2P-524	A	E
H6MJ8V-524	A	E	P4PGKE-524	A	E
H7FADB-524	A	E	P6FB4G-523	A	E
HDC3PB-523	A	E	P9HJLT-524	A	E
HVW97U-524	A	E	PP8QJQ-524	A	E
JDAXN8-524	A	E	PRRF44-524	A	D
JFEXTQ-524	A	E	PULTWV-524	A	E
JFXBBV-524	A	E	PV93FN-524	A	E
JH483R-524	A	E	PXXAXY-524	A	E
KCDD4X-523	B	D	Q3M9PZ-524	A	E
KCVRL3-524	A	E	Q4JP2W-524	B	E
KW23UC-523	A	E	Q83J6N-523	A	E
KXBBW6-523	A	E	QA6K3Z-524	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
QBXZ4G-524	A	E	VGA6WY-523	A	E
QK7FAP-524	B	D	VH7K9V-523	A	E
QV732L-523	A	D	VTNC4D-524	A	E
QVQAGY-524	A	E	W8M749-523	A	E
R9R83B-524	A	E	WELX9V-524	A	E
RA2CDD-524	A	E	WFCN6E-524	A	E
RBXTQB-524	A	E	WHK7GC-524	A	E
RCQJWP-524	A	E	WMDBAG-524	A	E
REUEFR-524	A	E	WP3HRR-524	A	E
RHX8DW-524	A	E	WR4KGT-524	A	E
RMTE2T-524	A	E	WVLF8K-523	A	E
RRMZM9-524	B	E	WWGVJG-524	A	E
RV7XCY-524	A	E	WXRZUK-524	A	E
RW2DNV-523	B	D	X2WEM-523	A	E
T26AWE-523	A	E	X6TCQG-524	A	E
TJ9BKU-524	A	E	XFZEC-524	A	E
TNJWHK-524	A	E	XJUG7N-524	A	E
TPFDUG-524	A	E	XU77KJ-524	A	E
TVY9LR-524	A	E	XUMUTJ-524	A	E
TWA8JL-524	A	E	Y6AD4Q-523	A	E
U7G7RN-524	A	E	YBAGLK-524	A	E
UP9DZE-524	A	E	YBAX4Z-524	A	E
V3UGRN-524	A	D	YCKATA-524	A	E
VE4K9Y-523	A	E	YDEXAK-524	A	E
VG9KEH-524	A	E	YNW6YF-523	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YWQAU3-524	A	E			
YVWUH7-524	A	E			
YXKZZG-524	A	E			
Z4TJYA-524	A	E			
Z7R2TV-523	A	E			
ZNWX6K-524	A	E			
ZPMP6C-524	B	D			
ZQGFBQ-523	A	E			
ZX3FMX-523	A	E			
ZZPHKB-524	A	D			

Response Summary Handwriting on Q1

Total Participants: 206

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the questioned receipts?

Response	Handwriting on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	193	0	<p>Note: The totals do not add up to the total number of participants because not all participants marked a response for all items or did not use provided key.</p> <p>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.</p>
B	13	0	
C	0	0	
D	0	16	
E	0	187	

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
246AAJ-524	D	D	6NHQXZ-524	E	E
24NNQN-523	E	E	6PDECN-524	D	D
28NRKV-523	C	C	6QKP9R-523	E	C
2E74XW-523		D	6QLLJN-524	E	E
2UECDQ-524	A		6U4LXH-524	C	E
2UGE9H-523	D	C	6U8GR3-523	E	E
2VW946-524	E	B	6X7MZZ-524	E	C
33N3E9-524	E	E	72ZB37-524	E	E
36Q2P2-524	E	E	73E6XT-524	E	A
38KRVF-523	D	D	76MFQQ-523	E	C
39FAY3-524	E	E	7FZFKY-524	E	B
3J9TCM-524	C	C	7J4DRK-523	D	D
3KBWC6-524	E	E	7VWA3C-524	D	D
3MYX9Z-524	E	E	7XKBWL-524	E	B
3NN4QC-524	E	B	8A96VD-523	E	E
3V7374-524	D	D	8E3NP4-523	E	E
4D2MDV-523	A	E	8E6GLQ-523	E	C
4HXBU3-524	E	E	8JVXR-523	D	B
4JTR8Y-524	E	E	8MH6LK-524	E	E
4UQRJ4-524	E	E	8T3Z82-524	E	E
4V7UNQ-524	D	D	8UGV3N-523	E	E
4WGY2E-524	D	D	92APDR-524	E	A
689CNA-524	E	E	983YVX-524	E	E
6AXLXB-523	C	D	9JFU24-523	E	E
6HEPX7-524	E	E	9LJK9J-524	A	E

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
9N82JC-524	D	D	BRXKMZ-523	E	E
9NAQQV-524	E	E	C3YRXD-524	E	E
9XBBTM-523	D	D	C6XE4L-524	E	A
9XVUVA-524	C	C	C9222K-524	C	C
9YQEGM-523	C	C	CGB38X-523	E	E
A2RZNK-524	E	E	CHQ3P3-524	D	D
A2VH6-524	E	B	D8NQND-523	E	E
A4ZBKN-523	E	C	D8NW22-523	D	D
ADLL39-524	D	D	DAC6B3-524	E	D
AHWCDN-523	E	E	DBHU8J-523	E	E
AHYW8J-524	D	D	DK7Q9K-523	D	D
AM9DHT-523	D	D	DP3BGB-524	E	E
AN24N8-524	E	E	DV9YYH-524	E	D
APXJZ6-524	E	A	DYVM9-524	E	E
AV2K2Y-524	E	A	E2UCDB-524	E	E
B3JB3J-523	C	C	E42JUH-524	E	E
B6AHKV-524	D	B	E84DXE-524	E	E
B739QA-524	D	D	E8G7CU-524	E	D
BCNBRK-523	E	A	E9BUT4-523	E	E
BDEWD2-524	E	E	EBKA94-524	D	C
BEBDQY-524	E	E	EL6JXW-524	D	D
BEUQ6H-524	D	D	EWGHCK-524	E	A
BGYCWP-524	E	A	EXFGVT-524	E	E
BKH9LF-524	E	E	FA366H-523	E	B
BQMALA-524	E	C	FCREEJ-524	E	A

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
FJRYFU-524	E	D	M4F4AT-524	E	E
FLXU8Q-524	D	D	M7467M-524	D	D
FNMPMQ-524	E	E	MC6G2K-524	E	E
FUBBQ8-524	D	D	MFAJYU-524	C	C
FVM8ZH-524	D	D	MKJ6X8-524	D	D
G26ARX-524	D	D	MMPQPD-524	E	A
GJ9CGC-524	D	D	NGVHRH-524	D	C
GRECUK-524	E	A	NPMQ2U-524	E	E
H3WDPK-524	E	A	NWKZ2P-524	E	E
H6MJ8V-524	E	E	P4PGKE-524	E	E
H7FADB-524	D	D	P6FB4G-523	D	D
HDC3PB-523	E	E	P9HJLT-524	D	D
HVW97U-524	D	D	PP8QJQ-524	E	E
JDAXN8-524	E	A	PRRF44-524	D	D
JFEXTQ-524	E	E	PULTWV-524	E	E
JFXBBV-524	D	D	PV93FN-524	D	D
JH483R-524	D	D	PXXAXY-524	D	C
KCDD4X-523	D	D	Q3M9PZ-524	E	E
KCVRL3-524	E	E	Q4JP2W-524	E	E
KW23UC-523	E	B	Q83J6N-523	E	E
KXBBW6-523	C	C	QA6K3Z-524	E	E
KXVUZQ-524	D	B	QBXZ4G-524	E	E
L9HWBR-524	D	D	QK7FAP-524	D	C
LA7L3Q-524	E	E	QV732L-523	D	D
LY3QKL-524	E	B	QVQAGY-524	D	D

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
R9R83B-524	E	A	WELX9V-524	D	D
RA2CDD-524	E	E	WFCN6E-524	D	D
RBXTQB-524	D	E	WHK7GC-524	E	E
RCQJWP-524	D	D	WMDBAG-524	C	C
REUEFR-524	E	E	WP3HRR-524	C	C
RHX8DW-524	C	C	WR4KGT-524	D	D
RMTE2T-524	D	D	WVLF8K-523	D	D
RRMZM9-524	E	B	WWGVJG-524	D	D
RV7XCY-524	D	E	WXRZUK-524	E	E
RW2DNV-523	D	D	X2WEM-523	E	E
T26AWE-523	E	E	X6TCQG-524	E	E
TJ9BKU-524	E	E	XEZEC-524	E	E
TNJWHK-524	D	D	XJUG7N-524	E	E
TPFDUG-524	E	E	XU77KJ-524	D	C
TVY9LR-524	E	C	XUMUTJ-524	C	C
TWA8JL-524	E	E	Y6AD4Q-523	E	E
U7G7RN-524	C	C	YBAGLK-524	D	D
UP9DZE-524	E	E	YBAX4Z-524	E	A
V3UGRN-524	D	D	YCKATA-524	E	E
VE4K9Y-523	E	B	YDEXAK-524	D	D
VG9KEH-524	E	E	YNW6YF-523	E	D
VGA6WY-523	E	E	YWQAU3-524	E	E
VH7K9V-523	E	E	YWVUH7-524	E	E
VTNC4D-524	E	E	YXKZZG-524	D	D
W8M749-523	E	A	Z4TJYA-524	C	C

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q2

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
Z7R2TV-523	E	A			
ZNWY6K-524	D	D			
ZPMP6C-524	B	D			
ZQGFBBQ-523	E	E			
ZX3FMX-523	E	A			
ZZPHKB-524	C	C			

Response Summary Handwriting on Q2

Total Participants: **206**

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the questioned receipts?

Response	Handwriting on Q2		
	K1	K2	
A	3	18	<p>Note: The totals do not add up to the total number of participants because not all participants marked a response for all items or did not use provided key.</p> <p>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.</p>
B	1	13	
C	17	28	
D	63	60	
E	121	86	

Examination Results

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts?

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
246AAJ-524	B	D	6AXLXB-523	B	D
24NNQN-523	A	E	6HEPX7-524	A	E
28NRKV-523	A	E	6NHQXZ-524	A	E
2E74XW-523	B		6PDECN-524	B	D
2UECDQ-524	A		6QKP9R-523	A	E
2UGE9H-523	C	C	6QLLJN-524	C	C
2VV946-524	A	E	6U4LXH-524	A	E
33N3E9-524	B	E	6U8GR3-523	B	D
36Q2P2-524	A	E	6X7MZZ-524	B	E
38KRVF-523	B	C	72ZB37-524	A	E
39FAY3-524	B	D	73E6XT-524	B	C
3J9TCM-524	A	E	76MFQQ-523	A	E
3KBWC6-524	A	E	7FZFKY-524	B	E
3MYX9Z-524	B	C	7J4DRK-523	B	D
3NN4QC-524	A	D	7VWA3C-524	A	E
3V7374-524	C	C	7XKBWL-524	A	E
4D2MDV-523	B	E	8A96VD-523	B	D
4HXBU3-524	A	E	8E3NP4-523	A	E
4JTR8Y-524	A	E	8E6GLQ-523	A	E
4UQRJ4-524	A	E	8JVXRP-523	A	E
4V7UNQ-524	B	D	8MH6LK-524	B	D
4WGY2E-524	C	C	8T3Z82-524	B	D
689CNA-524	A	E	8UGV3N-523	A	E

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
92APDR-524	B	C	BEUQ6H-524	C	C
983YVX-524	A	E	BGYCWP-524	B	C
9JFU24-523	B	D	BKH9LF-524	A	E
9LJK9J-524	A	E	BQMALA-524	C	C
9N82JC-524	C	C	BRXKMZ-523	A	E
9NAQQV-524	A	E	C3YRXD-524	A	E
9XBBTM-523	B	D	C6XE4L-524	B	D
9XVUVA-524	B	D	C9222K-524	B	D
9YQEGM-523	B	D	CGB38X-523	A	E
A2RZNK-524	B	D	CHQ3P3-524	C	C
A2VWH6-524	A	E	D8NQND-523	A	E
A4ZBKN-523	A	E	D8NW22-523	C	D
ADLL39-524	B	D	DAC6B3-524	C	C
AHWCDN-523	A	E	DBHU8J-523	A	E
AHYW8J-524	C	C	DK7Q9K-523	A	E
AM9DHT-523	C	C	DP3BGB-524	A	E
AN24N8-524	A	E	DV9YYH-524	A	E
APXJZ6-524	A	E	DYTM9-524	A	E
AV2K2Y-524	B	C	E2UCDB-524	A	E
B3JB3J-523	C	C	E42JUH-524	A	E
B6AHKV-524	B	D	E84DXE-524	A	E
B739QA-524	B	D	E8G7CU-524	A	E
BCNBRK-523	A	E	E9BUT4-523	A	E
BDEWD2-524	B	E	EBKA94-524	B	C
BEBDQY-524	A	E	EL6JXW-524	B	D

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
EWGHCK-524	A	E	KXVUZQ-524	A	E
EXFGVT-524	A	E	L9HWBR-524	B	D
FA366H-523	A	E	LA7L3Q-524	A	C
FCREEJ-524	B	C	LY3QKL-524	A	E
FJRYFU-524	B	D	M4F4AT-524	B	D
FLXU8Q-524	B	D	M7467M-524	B	-
FNMPMQ-524	B	E	MC6G2K-524	A	E
FUBBQ8-524	B	D	MFAJYU-524	B	D
FVM8ZH-524	B	D	MKJ6X8-524	C	C
G26ARX-524	A	E	MMPQPD-524	B	C
GJ9CGC-524	C	C	NGVHRH-524	B	D
GRECUK-524	B	C	NPMQ2U-524	C	E
H3WDPK-524	A	E	NWKZ2P-524	A	E
H6MJ8V-524	A	E	P4PGKE-524	A	E
H7FADB-524	C	C	P6FB4G-523	B	D
HDC3PB-523	A	E	P9HJLT-524	B	D
HWV97U-524	B	D	PP8QJQ-524	B	D
JDAXN8-524	A	E	PRRF44-524	C	C
JFEXTQ-524	A	E	PULTWV-524	A	E
JFXBBV-524	C	C	PV93FN-524	C	D
JH483R-524	B	D	PXXAXY-524	B	D
KCDD4X-523	C	C	Q3M9PZ-524	A	E
KCVRL3-524	A	E	Q4JP2W-524	B	D
KW23UC-523	A	E	Q83J6N-523	A	E
KXBBW6-523	A	E	QA6K3Z-524	A	E

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
QBXZ4G-524	A	E	VGA6WY-523	A	E
QK7FAP-524	B	D	VH7K9V-523	C	C
QV732L-523	B	C	VTNC4D-524	A	E
QVQAGY-524	B	D	W8M749-523	A	E
R9R83B-524	A	E	WELX9V-524	C	C
RA2CDD-524	B	D	WFCN6E-524	C	C
RBXTQB-524	B	E	WHK7GC-524	A	E
RCQJWP-524	B	C	WMDBAG-524	A	E
REUEFR-524	A	E	WP3HRR-524	B	D
RHX8DW-524	A	E	WR4KGT-524	C	C
RMTE2T-524	B	D	WWLF8K-523	C	C
RRMZM9-524	B	C	WWGVJG-524	C	C
RV7XCY-524	C	C	WXRZUK-524	A	E
RW2DNV-523	B	D	X2VEM-523	B	D
T26AWE-523	B	D	X6TCQG-524	B	D
TJ9BKU-524	A	E	XEFZEC-524	A	E
TNJWHK-524	C	C	XJUG7N-524	A	E
TPFDUG-524	B	D	XU77KJ-524	B	E
TVY9LR-524	C	C	XUMUTJ-524	C	C
TWA8JL-524	B	D	Y6AD4Q-523	B	D
U7G7RN-524	B	D	YBAGLK-524	B	D
UP9DZE-524	B	E	YBAX4Z-524	B	C
V3UGRN-524	B	D	YCKATA-524	A	E
VE4K9Y-523	B	D	YDEXAK-524	C	C
VG9KEH-524	C	C	YNW6YF-523	B	D

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YWQAU3-524	A	E			
YWUH7-524	B	D			
YXZZG-524	B	D			
Z4TJYA-524	C	C			
Z7R2TV-523	A	E			
ZNWY6K-524	B	D			
ZPMP6C-524	C	C			
ZQGFBQ-523	A	E			
ZX3FMX-523	A	E			
ZZPHKB-524	B	D			

Response Summary Signature on Q1			Total Participants: 206
<i>Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts?</i>			
Response	Signature on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	89	0	<p>Note: The totals do not add up to the total number of participants because not all participants marked a response for all items or did not use provided key.</p> <p>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.</p>
B	82	0	
C	35	47	
D	0	60	
E	0	96	

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
246AAJ-524	C	C	6NHQXZ-524	E	E
24NNQN-523	E	E	6PDECN-524	D	D
28NRKV-523	C	C	6QKP9R-523	E	C
2E74XW-523		D	6QLLJN-524	C	C
2UECDQ-524	A		6U4LXH-524	C	E
2UGE9H-523	C	C	6U8GR3-523	D	D
2VV946-524	E	B	6X7MZZ-524	E	C
33N3E9-524	D	D	72ZB37-524	E	E
36Q2P2-524	E	C	73E6XT-524	D	C
38KRVF-523	C	C	76MFQQ-523	E	C
39FAY3-524	D	D	7FZFKY-524	E	B
3J9TCM-524	C	C	7J4DRK-523	D	D
3KBWC6-524	C	C	7VWA3C-524	C	C
3MYX9Z-524	D	C	7XKBWL-524	D	C
3NN4QC-524	E	D	8A96VD-523	D	D
3V7374-524	C	C	8E3NP4-523	E	E
4D2MDV-523	C	C	8E6GLQ-523	E	C
4HXBU3-524	E	E	8JVXRP-523	D	B
4JTR8Y-524	E	E	8MH6LK-524	C	C
4UQRJ4-524	E	E	8T3Z82-524	D	C
4V7UNQ-524	D	D	8UGV3N-523	E	E
4WGY2E-524	C	C	92APDR-524	D	C
689CNA-524	E	E	983YVX-524	E	D
6AXLXB-523	C	C	9JFU24-523	D	D
6HEPX7-524	E	E	9LJK9J-524	A	E

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
9N82JC-524	C	C	BRXKMZ-523	D	D
9NAQQV-524	E	E	C3YRXD-524	E	E
9XBBTM-523	D	D	C6XE4L-524	C	C
9XVUVA-524	C	C	C9222K-524	C	C
9YQEGM-523	C	C	CGB38X-523	E	E
A2RZNK-524	D	D	CHQ3P3-524	C	C
A2VWH6-524	C	C	D8NQND-523	E	E
A4ZBKN-523	E	C	D8NW22-523	C	D
ADLL39-524	C	C	DAC6B3-524	C	C
AHWCDN-523	C	E	DBHU8J-523	E	E
AHYW8J-524	C	C	DK7Q9K-523	D	D
AM9DHT-523	C	C	DP3BGB-524	E	C
AN24N8-524	E	E	DV9YYH-524	E	C
APXJZ6-524	C	C	DYTMV9-524	E	E
AV2K2Y-524	D	C	E2UCDB-524	E	E
B3JB3J-523	C	C	E42JUH-524	D	D
B6AHKV-524	D	B	E84DXE-524	E	E
B739QA-524	D	D	E8G7CU-524	D	D
BCNBRK-523	E	A	E9BUT4-523	E	E
BDEWD2-524	E	E	EBKA94-524	C	C
BEBDQY-524	D	C	EL6JXW-524	C	C
BEUQ6H-524	C	C	EWGHCK-524	E	A
BGYCWP-524	D	C	EXFGVT-524	E	E
BKH9LF-524	D	D	FA366H-523	E	B
BQMALA-524	C	C	FCREEJ-524	D	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
FJRYFU-524	C	C	M4F4AT-524	D	D
FLXU8Q-524	D	D	M7467M-524	C	C
FNMPMQ-524	E	E	MC6G2K-524	E	E
FUBBQ8-524	C	C	MFAJYU-524	C	C
FVM8ZH-524	D	D	MKJ6X8-524	C	C
G26ARX-524	D	D	MMPQPD-524	D	C
GJ9CGC-524	C	C	NGVHRH-524	D	C
GRECUK-524	E	C	NPMQ2U-524	E	E
H3WDPK-524	E	C	NWKZ2P-524	E	E
H6MJ8V-524	C	C	P4PGKE-524	E	E
H7FADB-524	C	C	P6FB4G-523	D	D
HDC3PB-523	E	E	P9HJLT-524	C	C
HWV97U-524	C	C	PP8QJQ-524	D	D
JDAXN8-524	E	B	PRRF44-524	C	C
JFEXTQ-524	E	E	PULTWV-524	E	C
JFXBBV-524	C	C	PV93FN-524	D	D
JH483R-524	C	C	PXXAXY-524	C	C
KCDD4X-523	C	C	Q3M9PZ-524	E	E
KCVRL3-524	E	E	Q4JP2W-524	D	D
KW23UC-523	E	B	Q83J6N-523	E	E
KXBBW6-523	C	C	QA6K3Z-524	E	D
KXVUZQ-524	D	D	QBXZ4G-524	E	E
L9HWBR-524	D	D	QK7FAP-524	C	C
LA7L3Q-524	E	C	QV732L-523	C	C
LY3QKL-524	E	B	QVQAGY-524	D	D

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
R9R83B-524	D	C	WELX9V-524	C	C
RA2CDD-524	D	D	WFCN6E-524	C	C
RBXTQB-524	C	C	WHK7GC-524	E	E
RCQJWP-524	C	C	WMDBAG-524	C	C
REUEFR-524	D	D	WP3HRR-524	C	C
RHX8DW-524	C	C	WR4KGT-524	C	C
RMTE2T-524	C	C	WWLF8K-523	C	C
RRMZM9-524	E	C	WWGVJG-524	C	C
RV7XCY-524	C	C	WXRZUK-524	E	E
RW2DNV-523	D	C	X2VEM-523	D	D
T26AWE-523	D	D	X6TCQG-524	D	D
TJ9BKU-524	E	C	XEFZEC-524	E	E
TNJWHK-524	C	C	XJUG7N-524	E	C
TPFDUG-524	C	D	XU77KJ-524	D	C
TVY9LR-524	C	C	XUMUTJ-524	C	C
TWA8JL-524	D	D	Y6AD4Q-523	C	C
U7G7RN-524	C	C	YBAGLK-524	C	D
UP9DZE-524	D	D	YBAX4Z-524	E	C
V3UGRN-524	D	D	YCKATA-524	E	D
VE4K9Y-523	C	C	YDEXAK-524	C	C
VG9KEH-524	C	C	YNW6YF-523	D	D
VGA6WY-523	E	D	YWQAU3-524	E	E
VH7K9V-523	C	C	YWVUH7-524	D	D
VTNC4D-524	E	E	YXKZZG-524	C	C
W8M749-523	E	C	Z4TJYA-524	C	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q2

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q2	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
Z7R2TV-523	E	A			
ZNWY6K-524	D	D			
ZPMP6C-524	C	C			
ZQGFBQ-523	E	E			
ZX3FMX-523	E	A			
ZZPHKB-524	C	C			

Response Summary Signature on Q2			Total Participants: 206
<i>Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts?</i>			
Response	Signature on Q2		
	K1	K2	
A	2	4	<p>Note: The totals do not add up to the total number of participants because not all participants marked a response for all items or did not use provided key.</p> <p>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.</p>
B	0	8	
C	78	104	
D	54	47	
E	71	42	

Conclusions

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
246AAJ-524	Michaels wrote the questioned entries on Q1, with the exception of the questioned signature. Michaels probably wrote the questioned signature on Q1. Michaels probably did not write the questioned entries on Exhibit Q2, with the exception of the questioned signature. Michaels can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Q2. Stevens probably did not write the questioned entries on Q2, excluding the questioned signature. Stevens probably did not write the questioned signature on Q1. Stevens can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Q2. The questioned signature on Q2 bears features frequently associated with simulated signatures.
24NNQN-523	Amy Michaels wrote both handwriting and signature from Q1. Neither Amy Michaels nor Carl Stevens wrote both handwriting and signature from Q2.
28NRKV-523	The corresponding lease fee receipt to August 2014 questioned dated July 31, 2014, as filling out and signing is uniprocendente against relatives Porting reference to name Amy Michaels. The corresponding lease fee receipt to September 2014 questioned dated August 31, 2014, in his process and a signature can not be identified and eliminated some of you muestradantes given the particularities found with clerks. [sic]
2E74XW-523	The text of Q1 was probably written by Amy Michaels because several similar graphical features (similar) text with K1a Q1, and K1c K1b samples were found. The Q2 text was probably written by Carl Stevens because some similar graphic features (similar) text with K2a Q2, K2C K2b and samples were found. The signing of Q1 was probably written by Amy Michaels because several similar graphical features (similar) Signature Q1 with K1a, K1b and K1c samples were found. The signing of Q2 was probably written by Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens because K1a, K1b, K1c, K2a, K2C K2b and some samples show similar signature Q2 graphic features.
2UECDQ-524	The individual characteristics of Q1 and Q2 correspond completely in writing and signature to Mrs. Amy Michaels.
2UGE9H-523	The questioned receipt dated July 31, 2014, excluding the receipt signature, was probably written by the writer of the "Amy Michaels" exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there are sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of these exemplars wrote the questioned receipt. No determination could be made as to whether or not the excluded questioned signature and the questioned signature on the receipt dated August 31, 2014, were produced by the writer of the "Amy Michaels" exemplars. These two stylized signatures lack sufficient handwriting habits and patterns to conduct a comparison for the purposes of authorship or non-authorship. The questioned receipt dated August 31, 2014, may not have been written by the writer of the "Amy Michaels" exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive elimination, there are sufficient dissimilarities to establish some likelihood that the writer of these exemplars did not write the questioned receipt. No determination could be made as to whether or not the hand printing and the questioned signature on the receipt dated August 31, 2014, as well as the questioned signature on the receipt dated July 31, 2014, were produced by the writer of the "Carl Stevens" exemplars. These two stylized signatures lack sufficient handwriting habits and patterns to conduct a comparison for authorship or non-authorship. No determination was possible on the questioned hand printing because there were some areas of agreement as well as areas of disagreement. Additional extended non-request exemplars are requested, if further examination is required in this matter.
2WV946-524	3.1 Q1 was written by K1 and not written by K2. 3.2 Q2 was not written by K1 and probably written by K2. 3.3 Q1 was signed by K1 and not signed by K2. 3.4 Q2 was not signed by K1 and probably signed by K2.
33N3E9-524	Q1 Document: The questioned writing including the date of the body of this document was prepared by the K1 author. The signature Amy Michaels was very probably prepared the the[sic] K1 author. Q2 Document: The writing on the body of the Q2 Document contained features that were inconsistent with the K1 and K2 authors. The Signature Amy Michaels contained features not found in the known specimens and were very probably not prepared by either the K1 or K2 author.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
36Q2P2-524	the writings and the signature Q1 was written/signed by amy michaels. The writings on Q2 was not written by Amy michaels and Carl Stevens. The signature on Q2 was not signed by Amy Michaels , but the signature was formed by imitating the authentic signatures of Amy. It couldn't be identified whether Carl Stevens signed the signature on Q2 or not.
38KRVF-523	Based on the examination and comparison of the submitted questioned and known writing, the following conclusions were reached: The K1 writer (Amy Michaels) wrote the handprinted and numerical entries on Exhibit Q1. There are indications that the K1 writer (Amy Michaels) wrote the "Amy Michaels" signature on Exhibit Q1. However, the scrawled nature of the entry limits the examination possible and precludes a definite conclusion. There are indications that the questioned entries (excluding the signature) on Exhibit Q2 were not written by either the K1 writer (Amy Michaels) or the K2 writer (Carl Stevens), though the submission of additional course of business known writing and printing from the known writers may be of value in providing the basis for a more definite conclusion. There are indications that the signature entry on Exhibit Q2 may be an attempted simulation of a genuine "Amy Michaels" signature. The questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2 contained very limited identifying characteristics, which did not provide a sufficient basis for identifying or eliminating either writer. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the K2 writer (Carl Stevens) wrote the questioned signature on Exhibit Q1.
39FAY3-524	3.1 After examination and comparison I reached the following conclusions in terms of Questioned document marked "Q1" 3.1.1 There is sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the questioned writing marked "Q1" were written by the writer of the specimen writing marked "K1a-K1c". 3.1.2 There is a degree of similarity in respect of design and execution between the questioned signature on the document marked "Q1" and the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a-K1c", suggesting that it may have been written by the same author. 3.2 After examination and comparison I reached the following conclusions in terms of Questioned document marked "Q2": 3.2.1 There are significant differences between the writing on the Questioned document marked "Q2" and the specimen writing marked "K1a-K1c" and "K2a-K2c", which indicates that different writers are involved. 3.2.2 The signature on the questioned document marked "Q2" is neither intricate nor complex in nature and do not contain sufficient individualising characteristics to permit a definite finding to be made. However, the differences identified between the signature in question and specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a-K1c" and "K2a-K2c" are significant. I therefore found that the signature in question is probably a simulated (forged) signature.
3J9TCM-524	The signature style on the questioned receipt Q1 is of limited complexity and if examined in isolation an opinion regarding authorship would not be possible. However, it has been fluently completed and is similar in both gross features and subtle characteristics to the signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Amy Michaels. The examination noted a number of similarities were observed between the handwriting on the questioned receipt Q1 and the specimen handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels. These similarities were in gross and subtle features such as writing style, size and size relationships, slope, baseline and individual letter constructions. Considering the similarities in the handwriting and signature together, it is my opinion that the author of the specimens attributed to Amy Michaels has completed the handwriting and signature on the receipt Q1. A number of differences were observed between the handwriting on the questioned receipt Q2 and the specimen material attributed to Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens respectively. Accordingly, there is no evidence that either of them have been involved in completing the handwriting on this document. However, due to the possibility that the supplied specimens are not fully representative of these authors' range of writing styles, the examination to determine whether either of them has completed this questioned writing is inconclusive at this stage. If more course of business specimens for these authors, and/or specimens from any other potential authors of this document, can be obtained then the file could be resubmitted for further examination. The signature on the questioned receipt Q2 has some limited similarity to the specimen signatures attributed to Amy Michaels. However, it also has a number of differences in features such as baseline, size and size relationships and construction characteristics. Based on these differences it is my opinion that the signature on the receipt Q2 has resulted from an attempt to copy/simulate the natural signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Amy Michaels. As the act of copying/simulation tends to

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	mask natural handwriting habits it is unlikely any person could be identified as the author of this signature based on a handwriting comparison.
3KBWC6-524	On examination of Q1 I have found identification in handwriting characteristics between the questioned handwriting on the receipt Q1 and the exemplars in the name of Amy Michaels and in my opinion the questioned writing was written by her. It is highly probable that the signature on Q1 was also written by her. 2. On examination of Q2, I have not found a match in the handwriting characteristics between the handwriting on the receipt and the exemplars in the name of Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens that were received for examination. 3. On examination of the signature on Q2, I have found a number of dissimilarities in handwriting characteristics between the questioned signature and the exemplars in the name of Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens that were received for examination. However, I am not able to draw a significant conclusion from the above findings as there is only one questioned signature that is limited in its handwriting characteristics.
3MYX9Z-524	Generally we use this kind of wording (in 5 level scale) For level A: Findings strongly support the proposition that the questioned text (signature) was written by the same person as comparison handwriting (signatures). There are a lot of similarities and no significant dissimilarities. There were no limitations to the investigation (writing is characteristic, all material is original etc). Our opinion is that the questioned text (signature) was written by xx. And the same way for all other conclusions...
3NN4QC-524	After an analysis and comparison of the known (specimen) material and the unknown (disputed) writing (receipts) together with each signature on the respective documents I made the following observations where after the following conclusions was reached: 3.1 - Fifteen points of similarities (red color) which corresponds in respect of elements of style and execution was identified and marked out between the disputed writing and signature of the document marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting and signatures of the documents marked "K1a"- "K1c" ("Amy Michaels"). 3.2 - Fifteen points which illustrates differences (green color) reveals significant dissimilarities in respect of elements of style and execution between the disputed writing and signature of document marked "Q1" and the specimen writing and signature of the documents marked "K2a" to "K2c" ("Carl Stevens"), there fore taken in account the correspondence I found the evidence to support the proposition that the writer of the disputed writing "Q1" was written by the writer "A Michaels". 3.3 - Further comparison of the signature between "Q1" and "Q2" reveals a degree of resemblance as well as divergences which could be related to possible simulated forgery in all probability, however this "evidence" cannot be proof beyond any reasonable doubt to whom was responsible for creating the signature marked "Q2". 3.4 - Subjected to the available known (specimen) material obtained a completed an objected comparison was far fetch.[sic]
3V7374-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
4D2MDV-523	the texts of the receipts were written by Amy Michahels. The conclusion is based on scriptural elements coincide with their original writing samples, including existing cohesions in words like "received", "five", "hundred", "Stevens" and "rent". Also match the shapes of letters like "s", "f" and the lines start with the letters "A", as the location of the text in the graph space, mainly in what refers to the line. Regarding the firm certainly receipt dated July 31, 2014, is considered likely to be written by Amy Michaels (k1) in view of the similarities in form and footwork auction of "A", like, that the fall height of the right end of the "M". However the questioned signature is simple type so that anyone with minimal skills could make scriptural. Regarding the signing of doubt payment receipt dated August 31, 2014, it was not possible to identify the author, because the simplicity of the writing and the differences in shape of the signs, "A" and "M", not identify the structures of the original writings of Amy michaels and Carl Stevens. [sic]
4HXBU3-524	In the matter at hand, I formulated the following propositions in respect of the matter at hand which will be tested against the observations made during the examination: 3.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the Receipt of payment for August 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing and signatures marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". 3.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the Receipt of payment for August 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 marked "Q1" was written by the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	writer of the specimen writing and signatures marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". 3.3 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 marked "Q2" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing and signatures marked "K1a", "K1b", "K1c", "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c". 3.4 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question on the Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 marked "Q2" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing and signatures marked "K1a", "K1b", "K1c", "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c".
4JTR8Y-524	1) Amy Micheals[sic] (K1) wrote Q1, and didn't write Q2. Carl Stevens (K2) didn't write Q1 nor Q2. 2) Amy Micheals[sic] (K1) wrote the signature of Q1, and didn't write the signature of Q2. Carl Stevens (K2) didn't write the signature of Q1 nor Q2.
4UQRJ4-524	After an examination and comparison I reached the following conclusion: 3.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked "K1" wrote the disputed writing on the document marked "Q1". 3.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked "K2" did not write the disputed writing marked "Q1" and "Q2". 3.3 The evidence supports the proposition that the disputed signature on "Q1" is an authentic signature of the writer of the specimen signatures marked "K1". 3.4 The evidence supports the proposition that the disputed signature on "Q2" is a simulated forgery of the signature of the person who wrote the specimen signatures marked "K1".
4V7UNQ-524	Results of examination: It was determined that the questioned writing on Item Q1, excluding the signature, was prepared by Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer. A definite determination could not be reached whether the Item Q1 signature and Item Q2 questioned writing and signature were prepared by Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer due to the limited nature of the questioned signatures and unexplained characteristics. However, characteristics were observed that indicate Amy Michaels, K1a-c, may have prepared the questioned signature on Item Q1. Additionally, characteristics were observed that indicate the Item Q2 writing and signature may not have been prepared by Michaels or Stevens.
4WGY2E-524	We would report that "in our opinion" Amy Michaels was responsible for the handwritten entries in Q1. We would report that, based on the material submitted, there is no evidence that either Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens in responsible for Q2. Our findings with regards to the signatures would be inconclusive.
689CNA-524	The writer of Item 1(1.1-1.3) (K1a-c) (Amy Michaels) has been identified as the writer of the questioned writing (including the signature) appearing on Item 3 (Q1). The range of variation exhibited in the questioned entries and in the known writing contains substantial significant similarities with no significant dissimilarities. In addition, there were no limitations associated with absent characters or quantity of writing. The writer of Item 1(1.1-1.3) (K1a-c) (Amy Michaels) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned writing (including the signature) appearing on Item 4 (Q2). The range of variation exhibited in the questioned entries and in the known writing contains substantial significant dissimilarities. In addition, there were no limitations associated with absent characters or quantity of writing. The writer of Item 2(2.1-2.3) (K2a-c) (Carl Stevens) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned writing (including the signature) appearing on Item 3 (Q1) and Item 4 (Q2). The range of variation exhibited in the questioned entries and in the known writing contains substantial significant dissimilarities. In addition, there were no limitations associated with absent characters or quantity of writing.
6AXLB-523	H/W Q1-K1: The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. H/W Q1-K2: The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample was not written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. H/W Q2-K1: No opinion can be expressed as to whether or not the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. This is an inconclusive result. H/W Q2-K2: The evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample was not written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. This opinion level is used where there is an identifiable limitation associated with the examination process. Signature Q1-K1: The evidence

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	provides qualified support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. This opinion level is used when there is an identifiable limitation associated with the examination process. Signature Q1-K2: The evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample was not written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. This opinion level is used when there is an identifiable limitation associated with the examination process. Signature Q2-K1: No opinion can be expressed as to whether or not the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. This is an inconclusive result. Signature: Q2-K2: No opinion can be expressed as to whether or not the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting sample. This is an inconclusive result.
6HEPX7-524	1. The questioned writing (excluding the signature) of Q1 was written by K1. 2. The questioned writing (excluding the signature) of Q2 was neither written by K1, nor K2. 3. The questioned signature of Q1 was written by K1. 4. The questioned signature of Q2 was neither written by K1, nor K2.
6NHQXZ-524	After the analysis and comparison of the questioned writing and signatures on the two receipt payments dated "31 July 2014" and "31 August 2014" marked "Q1" and "Q2" respectively with the specimen writing and signatures of persons marked K1(a-c) and K2(a-c), I reached the following conclusions: 3.1. The writer of the specimen writing marked "K1(a-c)" of "Amy Michaels" also wrote and signed the questioned receipt payment dated "31 July 2014" marked "Q1". 3.2. The writer of the specimen writing marked "K2(a-c)" of "Carl Stevens" did not write and sign the questioned receipt payment dated "31 July 2014" marked "Q1". 3.3. The questioned writing and signatures on the receipt payment dated "31 August 2014" marked "Q2" was not written by either of the writers of the specimen documents marked "K1(a-c)" and "K2(a-c)".
6PDECN-524	It was determined that Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1a-c, prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1 (excluding the signature). It was determined that Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, did not prepare the questioned writing on Item Q1 (excluding the signature). A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned writing on Item Q2 (excluding the signature) was or was not written by Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, due to characteristics in the questioned writing which were not accounted for in the submitted known writing. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate Amy Michaels, Item K1a-c, and Carl Stevens, Item K2a-c, may not have prepared this writing. A definite determination could not be reached whether the limited questioned signatures on Item Q1 and Item Q2 were or were not written by Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c, writer, or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, due to characteristics in the questioned signatures which were not accounted for in the submitted known writing. However, the following conclusions regarding these signatures were made: Some characteristics were observed which indicate Amy Michaels, Item K1a-c, may have prepared the Item Q1 signature. Further, some inconsistencies were observed which indicate Amy Michaels, Item K1a-c, may not have prepared the Item Q2 signature. Some inconsistencies were observed which indicate Carl Stevens, Item K2a-c, may not have prepared the Item Q1 and Item Q2 signatures.
6QKP9R-523	According to the evidence collected in the results and in graphology identity characteristics observed in each case, provides as follows: 1. That the manuscripts of processing of the questioned receipt "Q1", identified with the graphic gesture embodied in the known handwriting samples provided by Ms. AMY MICHAELS therefore be said to exist between these manuscripts manuscritural uniprocedencia. The manuscripts and questioned signature receipt "Q2" is not identified with the graphic gesture AMY MICHAELS, but can not be discarded or removed with muestradante CARL STEVENS. 2.2. The signature of receipt questioned "Q1", identified with the graphic gesture embodied in the known handwriting samples provided by Ms. AMY MICHAELS therefore be said to exist between these manuscripts manuscritural uniprocedencia. That signing the bill into question "Q2" is not identified with the graphic gesture AMY MICHAELS, but can not be dismissed or removed with muestradante CARL STEVENS. [sic]
6QLLJN-524	Amy Michaels (K1) wrote the questioned material on Exhibit Q1; excluding the signature. It could not be determined whether or not Amy Michaels (K1) or Carl Stevens (K2) wrote the questioned signature appearing on Exhibit Q1. The Exhibit Q1 signature lacks a sufficient amount of

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	identifying characteristics needed for handwriting comparison purposes. The questioned material on Exhibit Q-2 was not written by Amy Michaels (K1) nor Carl Stevens (K2); excluding the Exhibit Q-2 signature. It could not be determined whether or not Amy Michaels (K1) or Carl Stevens (K2) wrote the exhibit Q2 signature. The Exhibit Q2 signature lacks a sufficient amount of identifying characteristics needed for handwriting comparison purposes.
6U4LXH-524	1. The writing in the receipt of payment Q1 is consistent with those in K1a-c. 2. The writing in the receipt of payment Q2 is not consistent with those in K1a-c. 3. The signature in the receipt of payment Q1 is consistent with the signatures of Amy Michales[sic] (K1a-c). 4. The signature in the receipt of payment Q2 can not be associated neither discarded with the signatures of Amy Michaels (K1a-c). 5. The writings and signatures of the receipts of payment Q1 and Q2 are not consistent with those of Carl Stevens (K2a-c).
6U8GR3-523	Based on the examination and comparison of the questioned entries depicted on Exhibits Q1 and Q2 with Exhibits K1a through K1c and K2a through K2c, the following was determined: Amy Michaels (K1a through K1c) wrote the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q1, excluding the signature. Amy Michaels (K1a through K1c) probably wrote the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit Q1. Amy Michaels (K1a through K1c) probably did not write the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit Q2. Neither Amy Michaels (K1a through K1c) nor Carl Stevens (K2a through K2c) wrote the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q2, excluding the signature. Carl Stevens (K2a through K2c) did not write the questioned entries depicted on Exhibit Q1, excluding the signature. Carl Stevens (K2a through K2c) probably did not write the questioned signatures depicted on Exhibits Q1 and Q2. The above qualified findings are necessitated by a lack of distinguishable letter forms in the signatures depicted on Exhibits Q1 and Q2.
6X7MZZ-524	The writer of Q1 is most probable the writer of k1a, k1b and k1c. The writer of Q1 is most probable not the writer of k2a, k2b and k2c. The writer of Q2 is most probable not the writer of k1a, k1b and k1c. The writer of Q2 cannot be identified to have been written by the writer of k2a, k2b and k2c. The signature on Q1 is most probable signed by the writer of signature k1a, k1b and k1c. The signature on Q1 is most probable not the writer of signature k2a, k2b and k2c. The signature on Q2 is most probable not the writer of signature k1a, k1b and k1c. The signature on Q2 cannot be identified to have been signed by writer of signature k2a, k2b and k2c.
72ZB37-524	It was determined the receipt payment for August 2014 rent (including the signature), Q-1, was written by Amy Michaels, K-1. It was determined the receipt payment for September 2014 rent (including the signature), Q-2, was not written by Amy Michaels, K-1 or Carl Stevens, K-2.
73E6XT-524	The evidence supports the following propositions: "Q1" was written by the author of known writings "K1". "Q2" was not written by the author of known writings "K2". "Q1" was probably signed by the author of known writings "K1". "Q2" was probably not signed by the author of "K1". No conclusion[sic] could be reached with regards to the author of K2.
76MFQQ-523	Analyzed and collated the writings in the Q1 document samples manuscriturales and extraproceso material allowed evidence matches grafonomicas of dynamic order and morphostructural which indicate that they were produced by the Lady Amy Michaels. Analyzed and collated the writings in the Q2 document samples manuscriturales and extraproceso material they allowed to establish discrepancies grafonomicas of dynamic order and morphostructural which indicate that they were not produced by the Lady Amy Michaels. Conducted a thorough evaluative analysis of the General and particular characteristics that identify observed writings in Q2 document and samples manuscriturales and extraproceso material, they allowed set that you can not be encartar or discard to Mr Carl Stevens, every time that the material analysed offer some similarities of morphological, structural and dimensional type in the general setup of some spelling However these are not sufficient evidence to establish a same authorship manuscritural. The signature noted in document Q1 presents aspects grafonomicos of similarity that allows to establish that it was drawn up by Mrs Amy Michaels. Observed in Q2 document not be encarta or discards the samples manuscriturales and material extraproceso of Mr Carl Stevens, since most likely the development of indubitadas signatures correspond to imitations of the original signature. [sic]

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
7FZFKY-524	3.1 The questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1" was written by "K1". 3.2 The questioned writing on the document marked as "Q2" was not written by "K1". 3.3 The questioned writing on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by "K2". 3.4 The questioned writing on the document marked as "Q2" was probably written by "K2". 3.5 The questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" was probably written by "K1". 3.6 The questioned signature on the document marked as "Q2" was not written by "K1". 3.7 The questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by "K2". 3.8 The questioned signature on the document marked as "Q2" was probably written by "K2".
7J4DRK-523	The writer of Exhibit K1 (Amy Michaels) is identified as the writer of the questioned handwritten entries in the body of the receipt in Exhibit Q1. She also probably wrote the questioned signature on Exhibit Q1, but due to the limited number of known normal-course-of-business Amy Michaels signatures, a conclusive opinion could not be rendered. The writer of Exhibit K1 (Amy Michaels) probably did not write the questioned handwritten entries and signature on Exhibit Q2, but due to an inability to examine the original documents, a conclusive opinion could not be rendered. The writer of Exhibit K2 (Carl Stevens) probably did not write the questioned handwritten entries and signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2, but due to an inability to examine the original documents, a conclusive opinion could not be rendered.
7VWA3C-524	The questioned handwriting and signature appearing on the document in Item Q1 display similarities in features such as, style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, character construction and connections, when compared with the specimen handwriting and signatures appearing on the documents in Items K1a-c. No significant differences were observed between the specimen and questioned handwriting and signatures. Based on the combination of similarities, and in the absence of differences, I have formed the opinion that the questioned handwriting and signature appearing on the document in Item Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting and signatures appearing on the documents in Items K1a-c. The questioned handwriting appearing on the document in Item Q2 displays some similarities and some significant differences in both overt pictorial and more inconspicuous (habitual) handwriting features such as, speed, manner of execution, slant, alignment, proportions, character construction and connections, when compared with the specimen handwriting appearing on the documents in Items K1a-c. Based on the differences observed, and considering the range of specimen handwriting available for comparison, I have formed the qualified opinion that the questioned handwriting appearing on the document in Item Q2 was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting appearing on the documents in Item K1a-c. The questioned handwriting appearing on the document in Item Q2 displays some similarities and some significant differences in both overt pictorial and more inconspicuous (habitual) handwriting features such as, speed, manner of execution, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, character construction and connections, when compared with the specimen handwriting appearing on the documents in Items K2a-c. Based on the differences observed, and considering the range of specimen handwriting available for comparison, I have formed the qualified opinion that the questioned handwriting appearing on the document in Item Q2 was not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting appearing on the documents in Item K2a-c. The questioned signature appearing on the document in Item Q2 displays some constructional differences to the specimen signatures appearing on the documents in Items K1 and K2. Similarities and dissimilarities were observed between the questioned signature and specimen signatures. Due to the simplistic nature of the signature, and differences in construction, these similarities and dissimilarities were unable to be fully evaluated. Further, the possibility of simulation or disguise could not be excluded. Therefore, the result of my examination of the questioned signature on Item Q2 is inconclusive. That is, neither of the specimen writers could be identified or eliminated.
7XKBWL-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
8A96VD-523	Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q1 and the handwriting (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A, K1B and K1C revealed numerous similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on the similarities noted, it is the opinion of the undersigned that it is highly probable that the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q1 and the handwriting (reportedly) authored and provided

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test

Conclusions

by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A, K1B and K1C share common authorship. The term "highly probable" is used in the sense that the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality (original documents not submitted) is missing so that an identification is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain the Questioned handwriting appearing on Q1 and the handwriting (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A, K1B and K1C share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwriting appearing on Q2 and the handwriting (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A, K1B and K1C and Carl Stevens appearing on K2A, K2B and K2C revealed numerous dissimilarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on dissimilarities noted, it is the opinion of the undersigned that it's highly probable that the Questioned handwriting appearing on Q2 and the handwriting (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A, K1B and K1C and Carl Stevens appearing on K2A, K2B and K2C do not share common authorship. The term "highly probable" is used in the sense that the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality (original documents not submitted) is missing so that an elimination is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q2 and the handwriting writing[sic] (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A, K1B and K1C and Carl Stevens appearing on K2A, K2B and K2C do not share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned signature appearing on Q1 and the signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A and K1B revealed a number of similarities in individual characteristics and signature habits. Based on these similarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned that it is highly probable that the Questioned signature appearing on Q1 and the signature exemplars (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A and K1B share common authorship. The term "highly probable" is used in the sense that the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality (original documents not submitted) is missing so that an identification is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain the Questioned signature appearing on Q1 and the signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels appearing on K1A and K1B share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned signature appearing on Q2 and the signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens appearing on Items K1A and K1B (Amy Michaels) and K2A and K2B (Carl Stevens) revealed some dissimilarities in individual characteristics and signature habits. Based on the dissimilarities noted, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that it is highly probable that the Questioned signature appearing on Q2 and the signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens appearing on Items K1A and K1B and K2A and K2B do not share common authorship. The term "highly probable" is used in the sense that the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality (original documents not submitted) is missing so that an elimination is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain that the Questioned signature appearing on Q2 and the signature exemplars (reportedly) authored and provided by Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens appearing on Items K1A and K1B and K2A and K2B do not share common authorship.

8E3NP4-523 Both the content handwriting and the signature on item Q1 were written by Amy Michaels, not by Carl Stevens. Neither the content handwriting nor the signature on item Q2 was written by Amy Michaels, or by Carl Stevens.

8E6GLQ-523 CONCLUSIONS Document Q1, compared to filling out we have (A) WAS WRITTEN BY K1 , showing the graphical regularity exposing the samples manuscrituales AMY MICHEL`S . Document Q1, compared to filling out we have (E) WAS NOT WRITTEN BY K2 , since the graph regularity of CARL STEVENS clerk was not there exposed. Q1 document , regarding the signature must be (A) WAS WRITTEN BY K1 , showing the graphical regularity exposing the samples manuscrituales AMY MICHEL`S . Q1 document , regarding the signing has to be (E) WAS NOT WRITTEN BY K2 , since the expression graph CARL STEVENS configuration of the firm and AMY MICHEL`S was not exposed there. Document Q2 , compared to filling out we have (E) WAS NOT WRITTEN BY K1 , since the graph regularity of AMY MICHEL`S amanuensis was not there exposed. Document Q2 , compared to filling out we have (C) CAN NOT BE IDENTIFIED AND REMOVED K2. Q2 document , regarding the signing has to be (E) WAS NOT WRITTEN BY K1 , showing the graphical

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	regularity since the clerk was not there MICHEL`S AMY exposed. Q2 document , regarding the signing has to be (C) CAN NOT BE IDENTIFIED AND REMOVED K2. [sic]
8JVXRP-523	Q1 BELONG TO AMY AND Q2 BELONG TO CARL. FROM K1B, A FEW NOTICEABLE HANDWRITING HABITS WHICH ARE NATURAL TO AMY CAN SEEN IN Q1 RATHER Q2. THE NOTICEABLE HABIT ARE: THE LETTER 'a' TENDS TO MISSING A TAIL. THE LETTER 'f' TO HAVE A LONGER TAIL WHICH FORMS A LOOP. THE LETTER 'r' TENDS TO CONNECT TO THE LETTER 'e'. THE LETTER 'g' AND 'd' TENDS TO HAVE LOOPS. THE NUMBER 2 TENDS TO HAVE A LOOP. Q2 BELONG TO CARL ALTHOUGH HE MAY TRY TO IMITATE AMY'S HANDWRITING. THE LETTER :m' IN CARL'S TEND TO BE A CURVE WHILE AMY;S IS A SHARP BEGINNING AND ENDING. HIS 'l' IS DIFFERENT FROM AMY'S. [sic]
8MH6LK-524	K1a-c was identified as the author of Q1. No one was identified as the author of Q2. Signatures: There is a strong evidence that the signature on Q1 was written by the author of K1a-c. K2a-c probably did not write the questioned signature on Q1. Signature on Q2 cannot be identified or eliminated.
8T3Z82-524	3.1a) Amy Michaels (K1) wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q1. 3.1b) Amy Michaels (K1) did not write the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q2. 3.1c) Carl Stevens (K2) did not write the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q1 and Q2. 3.2a) While Amy Michaels (K1) probably signed her name on Q1, the lack of sufficient individualizing handwriting characteristics in both the Known writing of Michaels (K1) and the questioned signature (Q1) precludes an identification. 3.2b) Amy Michaels (K1) probably did not sign her name on Q2. Due to subtle, yet significant differences in significant handwriting characteristics between the known writing of Amy Michaels (K1) and the signature in her name, the Q2 signature entry appears to be a simulation of a genuine signature. When a signature is simulated, it is copied or drawn from a model (genuine) signature. 3.2c) Carl Stevens (K2) probably did not write the "Amy Michaels" signature on Q1. The lack of sufficient individualizing handwriting characteristics in the Q1 signature precludes an elimination. 3.2d) Carl Stevens (K2) can neither be identified nor eliminated as writing the "Amy Michaels" entry on Q2. The "Amy Michaels" entry on Q2 appears to be a simulation of a genuine signature. When a signature is simulated, it is copied or drawn from a model (genuine) signature and the true handwriting habit patterns of the writer (simulator) are not present. Remarks: The above findings are demonstrable through the use of enlarged illustrations charts. If testimony is anticipated, please return all items and allow at least two weeks for the necessary preparation.
8UGV3N-523	1. It has been concluded that the questioned text and signature appearing on the face of the questioned receipt Q1 were written by the writer of the comparison Amy Michaels(K1) samples. 2. It is my opinion that Amy Michaels(K1) and Carl Stevens(K2) did not write the questioned receipt Q2.
92APDR-524	1. Writing on "Q1" was written by K1, not K2. 2. Writing on "Q2" was written by K2, not K1. 3. K1 probably wrote signature on "Q1" not "Q2". 4. K2 cannot be identified or eliminated whether he wrote signature on "Q2".
983YVX-524	Amy Michaels wrote Q1. Amy Michaels did not write Q2. Carl Stevens did not write Q1 or the hand printed entry of Q2. It is highly probable that Carl Stevens did not write the Q2 signature.
9JFU24-523	1. Q1 text was written by Amy Michaels. A complete set of matching characteristics in questioned and known writings of Amy Michaels has been established. 2. Q2 text was not written by Amy Michaels nor written by Carl Stevens, which is justified by writing dissimilarities, as marked in respective texts. 3. Amy Michaels alleged signature (Q1) was probably written by Amy Michaels. The signature is of low identification value due to its simple construction (occurrence of only two initial letters which initiate two words and occurrence of only two wavy lines which follow). In the signature, a limited scope of graphic features has been designated. Characteristics of questioned signatures are reflected in known material. 4. Amy Michaels alleged signature (Q1) was probably not written by Carl Stevens as the characteristics designated in signatures written by him are not reflected in a questioned signature. 5. Amy Michaels alleged signature (Q2) was probably not written by Amy Michaels as the characteristics designated in signatures written by her are not reflected in a questioned signature. 6. Amy Michaels alleged signature (Q2) was probably not

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	written by Carl Stevens as the characteristics designated in signatures written by Carl Stevens are not reflected in a questioned signature.
9LJK9J-524	In the [Laboratory], we did this test adapting the conclusions to the following aspects: A. Was WRITTEN by. E. Was NOT WRITTEN by. In this Laboratory not used the odds.
9N82JC-524	It was determined that Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1 a-c, prepared all of the questioned handwriting (excluding the signature) on Item Q1. A definite determination could not be reached whether the signature on Item Q1 or the handwriting and signature on Item Q2 were prepared by Michaels, due to the limited nature of the signatures and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However from the examinations that could be conducted, Michaels may not have prepared the handwriting (excluding the signature) on Item Q2. A definite determination could not be reached whether the handwriting on Q2 and the signatures on Item Q1 and Item Q2 were prepared by Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, due to the limited nature of the signatures and the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, from the examinations that could be conducted, Stevens may not have prepared the handwriting (excluding the signature) on Item Q2.
9NAQQV-524	1- Receipt of payment for august (Q1) was written and signed by Amy Michaels. 2- Receipt of payment for September (Q2) was not written by Amy Michaels neither by Carl Stevens. 3- The signature on the (Q2) is not written by Amy Michaels neither by Carl Stevens.
9XBBTM-523	[No Conclusions Reported.]
9XVUVA-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
9YQEGM-523	No significant handwriting dissimilarities were observed between Q1 and the K1 samples. There were sufficient distinctive and individualizing handwriting characteristics to support an opinion of identification that the writer of the K1 samples wrote the handwritten text on Q1. No significant dissimilarities were observed between the Q1 signature and the K1 signature samples. However, the Q1 signature and K1 signature samples exhibited limited complexity requiring a qualified opinion. No signs of simulation were observed in Q1. No conclusion can be rendered as to the authorship of Q2. Because the observed handwriting differences between Q2 and the K1 and K2 samples could be a product of disguise or simulation, neither the K1 or K2 writer could be identified or eliminated as the writer of Q1 [sic].
A2RZNK-524	It was determined that Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1 a-c, prepared the questioned writing on Item Q1, Receipt of payment for August 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 (excluding the signature). It was determined that Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1 a-c, did not prepare the questioned writing on Item Q2, Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 (excluding the signature). It was determined that Carl Stevens, writer of K2a-c, did not prepare the questioned writing on Item Q2, Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 (excluding the signature). A definite determination could not be reached whether Amy Michaels, writer of K1 a-c, or Carl Stevens, writer of K2a-c, did or did not prepare the questioned "Amy Michaels" signatures on Item Q1 or Item Q2 due to the limited nature of the questioned signatures. However, limited handwriting characteristics observed indicate that Amy Michaels, writer of K1 a-c, may have prepared the questioned "Amy Michaels" signature on Item Q1 and may not have prepared the "Amy Michaels" signature on Item Q2. In addition, limited handwriting characteristics observed indicate that Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, may not have prepared the questioned "Amy Michaels" signature on Item Q1 and Item Q2.
A2WH6-524	14-524 Prof Test. The Q1 receipt and signature was written by the writer of the K1 samples. The Q2 receipt was probably written by the writer of the K2 samples. The Q2 receipt signature cannot be identified or eliminated when compared with the K1 or K2 samples. Additional handwriting samples from the Michaels and Stevens may be of value for further comparison purposes. The evidence is ready for pickup.
A4ZBKN-523	According to the manuscripts and signatures observed in questioned document (Q1 and Q2) indicates that : The manuscript and signature captured in the receipt of payment of July 2014 August rental rate (Q1), 31 were written by Ms. AMY MICHAELS . Because there grafonómicos

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	gestures and graphic aspects that individualize and identify. The manuscript and signature captured in the receipt of payment of August 2014 in lease September (Q2), 31 were not written by Ms. AMY MICHAELS . Because there are no grafonómicos gestures and graphic aspects and identify them individually. The manuscript and signature captured in the receipt of payment of August 2014 in lease September (Q2) 31 cannot be identified or eliminated relative to the standard samples provided Calr name of Mr. Stevens. For variables and constants are presented in samples not possible to identify and clearly identify the authorship of the writings. [sic]
ADLL39-524	In my opinion, the evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the handwriting appearing on Q1 was written by the writer of the comparison Amy Michaels handwriting sample, K1. In my opinion, the evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the handwriting appearing on Q2 was not written by either of the comparison writers Amy Michaels (K1) or Carl Stevens (K2). In my opinion, the evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the signature appearing on Q1 was written by the writer of the comparison Amy Michaels signature sample, K1. No opinion can be expressed as to authorship of the questioned signature appearing on Q2.
AHWCDN-523	We express our conclusions almost with the same way because we follow the ASTM E1658-04.
AHYW8J-524	It was determined that the questioned writing on Item Q1, excluding the questioned signature, was prepared by Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer. A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned writing, excluding the questioned signature, on Item Q2 was or was not prepared by Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, due to the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, dissimilarities were observed to indicate that Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens may not have prepared the questioned writing, excluding the questioned signature, on Item Q2. No conclusion could be reached whether or not Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, prepared the questioned signatures on Item Q1 or Item Q2 due to the limited complexity and limited unique identifying characteristics of the questioned signatures.
AM9DHT-523	1. Amy MICHAELS (a) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample (excluding the signature) contained in Item Q1 was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting samples in the name of Amy MICHAELS (Items K1a to K1c). (b) The evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample (excluding the signature) contained in Item Q2 was not written by the writer of the comparison handwriting samples in the name of Amy MICHAELS (Items K1a to K1c). (c) No opinion can be expressed as to whether or not the questioned signature contained in Items Q1 and Q2 was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting samples in the name of Amy MICHAELS (Items K1a to K1c) due to the lack of complexity of the questioned signature. This is an inconclusive result. 2. Carl STEVENS (a) The evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample (excluding the signature) contained in Items Q1 and Q2 was not written by the writer of the comparison handwriting samples in the name of Carl STEVENS (Items K2a to K2c) (b) No opinion can be expressed as to whether or not the questioned signature contained in Items Q1 and Q2 was written by the writer of the comparison handwriting samples in the name of Carl STEVENS (Items K2a to K2c) due to the lack of complexity of the questioned signature. This is an inconclusive result.
AN24N8-524	In my opinion I conclude that Amy Michaels has written the "Questioned" Item "1" - A "Receipt of payment for August 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014". I find Amy Michaels is also responsible for the handwritten "Questioned" signature allegedly "Amy Michaels" on this document. It is also of my opinion that the "Questioned" Item "2" has not been written by either Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens - comparison reveals major differences in the writings of the "Receipt of payment for September 2014, rent dated August 31, 2014."
APXJZ6-524	The questioned signature and writing on Q1 were writing by Amy Michael[sic] (K1). The questioned writing on Q2 was writing by Carl Stevens(K2). The questioned writing on Q2 can not be identified or eliminated of either of the two known writers

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
AV2K2Y-524	The evidence at hand supports the following hypotheses. 1. The handwriting on the questioned document "Q1" was written by the author "K1", Amy Michaels. 2. The handwriting on the questioned document "Q1" was not written by the author "K2", Carl Stevens. 3. The signature on the questioned document "Q1" was probably written by the author "K1", Amy Michaels. 4. The handwriting on the questioned document "Q2" was written by the author of "K2", Carl Stevens. 5. The handwriting on the questioned document "Q2" was not written by the author of "K1", Amy Michaels. 6. The signature on the questioned document "Q2" was properly[sic] not written by the author "K1", Amy Michaels. 7. Common authorship cannot be identified or eliminated between the author "K2" and the signatures on the questioned document "Q1" and "Q2".
B3JB3J-523	Based on examination of the submitted writings, the following conclusions were reached: Amy Michaels (K-1) wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Exhibit Q-1. No determination could be made as to whether or not Amy Michaels (K-1) and/or Carl Stevens (K-2) wrote the remaining questioned entries on Exhibits Q-1 and Q-2.
B6AHKV-524	There is very strong probability that "K1" is the writer and signatory to "Q1" and "Q2", due to strong resemblances as the result of element of such as letter design, construction, consistency[sic], spacing between intraword[sic] and connecting stroke between some characters. Execution of the signature line quality is good, the alignment of ending strokes are above imaginary base line. There is attempt by "K1" to disguise both hand writing and signature on "Q2" but there is also differences. There is significant differences in signature and hand writing of "K2" with questioned document "Q1" and "Q2".
B739QA-524	See attached [Participant did not include additional conclusions with the report]
BCNBRK-523	Although one may try to imitate the original writer's handwriting but he or she will not be able to imitate the writer's style and habits which are only unique to him or her. If the person is imitating a writer's handwriting, he or she will tend to show a degree of uncertainty in his or her handwriting. This can be seen in the signature section between Amy and Carl.
BDEWD2-524	Amy Michaels wrote the questioned hand printing on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of significant similarities and no differences between the questioned and known writings. Amy Michaels probably wrote the questioned signature on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of similarities and no differences between the questioned and known writings, but also upon the signature's simplistic nature. Amy Michaels did not write the questioned hand printing and signature on Item Q2. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and few similarities between the questioned and known writings submitted. Carl Stevens did not write the questioned hand printing and signature on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and few similarities between the questioned and known writings submitted. Carl Stevens did not write the questioned hand printing and signature on Item Q2. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and few similarities between the questioned and known writings submitted. The submission of additional collected and requested known signatures of Amy Michaels may provide for a more definitive conclusion.
BEBDQY-524	The questioned writing and the Questioned signature on Q1 were written by Amy Michaels. The questioned writing on Q2 was not written by Amy Michaels nor by Carl Stevens. The questioned signature on Q2 was not written by Amy Michaels and constitute[sic] a forgery of Amy Michael's signature. The author of this forgery cannot, in this instance, be identified. Therefore, M. Steven's cannot be identified or eliminated as writer of this signature.
BEUQ6H-524	It was determined that the writer of Item K1a-c, Amy Michaels, prepared the questioned writing on the Q1 item (excluding signature). A definite determination could not be reached whether Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1a-c, or Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, did or did not prepare the questioned writing on the Q2 item due to unexplained characteristics and limited quantity of known writing. However, handwriting characteristics were observed which indicate that Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1a-c, and Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item Q2 (excluding signature and overwriting). No conclusion could be reached whether Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1a-c, or Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, did or did not prepare

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	the questioned signatures on the Q1 and Q2 items due to a lack of unique identifying characteristics in the questioned signatures. It should be noted that due to this limitation it is unlikely that the questioned signatures on Items Q1 and Q2 will ever be identified to a specific writer(s) through handwriting comparisons. If additional handwriting examinations are desired, additional dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1a-c, Carl Stevens, writer of Item K2a-c, and anyone else suspected of having prepared...(continued request for known writing). (Methodology would also be included)
BGYCWP-524	Evidence at hand support the following hypotheses: Pertaining to the writing in question: "Q1" was written by the author of "K1" and not "K2". "Q2" was written by the author of "K2" and not "K1". Following conclusions[sic] were reached (Pertaining to the signatures in question) "Q1" was probably signed by "K1". "Q2" was probably not signed by "K1". No conclusions[sic] could be reached with regards to "K2".
BKH9LF-524	Handwriting - On examination, I noted significant similarities in stroke quality, slant and relative positioning of handwriting with respect to the reference line between the specimen handwriting of Amy Michaels in "K1a" to "K1c" and the questioned handwriting in "Q1". I also found the formation, relative positioning and spacing of alphabet letters and numerals of the questioned handwriting in "Q1" to fall within the range of natural variations noted in the specimen handwriting of Amy Michaels in "K1a" to "K1c". The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c" wrote the questioned handwriting in "Q1". I noted significant differences in stroke quality, slant and relative positioning of handwriting with respect to the reference line between the specimen handwriting of Amy Michaels in "K1a" to "K1c" and the questioned handwriting in "Q2". I also noted differences in respect of the formation and relative positioning of alphabet letters and numerals between them. The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c" did not write the questioned handwriting in "Q2". I noted significant differences in stroke quality, formation and relative positioning of alphabet letters and numerals between the specimen handwriting of Carl Stevens in "K2a" to "K2c" and the two questioned handwriting respectively in "Q1" and "Q2". The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2c" did not write the two questioned handwriting respectively in "Q1" and "Q2". Signatures - I noted significant similarities in stroke fluency, slant and relative positioning of the signatures with respect to the reference line between the specimen signatures of Amy Michaels in "K1a" to "K1c" and the questioned signature in "Q1". I also found the formation and the relative positioning of strokes of the questioned signature in "Q1" to fall within the range of natural variations noted in the specimen signatures of Amy Michaels in "K1a" to "K1c". The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen signatures in "K1a" to "K1c" wrote the questioned signature in "Q1". I noted differences in stroke fluency and relative positioning of the signatures with respect to the reference line between the specimen signatures of Amy Michaels in "K1a" to "K1c" and the questioned signature in "Q2". I also noted differences in the formation and relative positioning of strokes between them. In view of the differences, there is no evidence to indicate that the writer of the specimen signatures available in "K1a" to "K1c" wrote the questioned signature in "Q2". I noted significant differences in stroke fluency, formation and relative positioning and spacing of strokes between the specimen signatures of Carl Stevens in "K2a" and "K2b" and the questioned signature in "Q1". The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen signatures in "K2a" and "K2b" did not write the questioned signature in "Q1". I noted differences in stroke fluency, formation and relative positioning and spacing of strokes between the specimen signatures of Carl Stevens in "K2a" and "K2b" and the questioned signature in "Q2". In view of the differences, there is no evidence to indicate that the writer of the specimen signatures available in "K2a" and "K2b" wrote the questioned signature in "Q2".
BQMALA-524	It was determined that the body of the rental receipt for August 2014, Q1, was written by Amy Michaels, K1. It was determined that the body of the rental receipt for September 2014, Q2, was not written by Amy Michaels, K1. It could not be determined whether Carl Stevens, K2, wrote the body of the rental receipt, Q2. Due to the lack of sufficient identifying characteristics in the signatures in Q1 and Q2, it cannot be determined whether Amy Michaels, K1, or Carl Stevens, K2 signed the rental receipts, Q1 or Q2.
BRXKMZ-523	Amy Michaels (K1) wrote the questioned writing on receipt Q1 and signed it. The questioned

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	writing on receipt Q2 has not been written by Amy Michaels (K1) nor by Carl Stevens (K2). The questioned signature on receipt Q2 has very probably not been written by Amy Michaels (K1) nor by Carl Stevens (K2).
C3YRXD-524	Questioned writing and signature on receipt Q1 (Aug. receipt) WERE WRITTEN by Amy Michaels (K1) and WERE NOT WRITTEN by Carl Stevens (K2). Questioned writing and signature on receipt Q2 (Sep. receipt) WERE NOT WRITTEN by Amy Michaels (K1) nor Carl Stevens (K2).
C6XE4L-524	Q1 - After careful examination and comparison of Q1 with K1(a-c) and K2(a-c), it is concluded that questioned handwriting on Q1 is written by Amy Michaels. Hence Amy Michaels is the author of questioned handwriting on Q1. Q1 - After careful examination and comparison of Q1 with K1(a-c) and K2(a-c), it is concluded that the questioned signature on Q1 is probably done by Amy Michaels. Q2 - After careful examination and comparison of Q2 with K1(a-c) and K2(a-c), it is concluded that questioned handwriting on Q2 is written by Carl Stevens. Hence Carl Stevens is the author of questioned handwriting on Q2. Q2 - After careful examination and comparison of Q2 with K1(a-c) and K2(a-c), no conclusion can be drawn for questioned signature on Q2.
C9222K-524	The characteristics within the questioned handwriting and the signature on the Item Q1, a rent receipt for August, 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 and the characteristics within the known handwriting of Amy Michaels on the documents identified as K1a, K1b, and K1c was probably written by the same person. The similarities between the questioned handwriting on Q1 and the known handwriting of Amy Michaels on K1a, K1b, and K1c include the alignment of the left margins, alignment of right margins, baseline usage, punctuation, letter combinations, spacing between letters, spacing between words, idiosyncrasies such as hooks and occasional micrographia, lead-in strokes, connecting strokes, method of construction of letters, speed, rhythm, line quality, letter designs, and letter height proportions. The characteristics within the questioned handwriting and the signature on the Item Q2, a rent receipt for September, 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 and the characteristics in the handwriting and signatures from Amy Michaels on the items identified as K1a, K1b, and K1c are not consistent with and was probably not written by the same hand (Amy Michaels). Additionally, the characteristics within the questioned handwriting and the signature on the Item Q2, a rent receipt for September, 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 and the characteristics in the handwriting and signatures from Carl Stevens on the items identified as K2a, K2b, and K2c are not consistent with and was probably not written by the same hand (Carl Stevens).
CGB38X-523	It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q1 receipt and signature were written by the writer of Item K1, which was submitted as the known writing of Amy Michaels. It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q2 receipt and signature were not written by either the writer of Item K1, or the writer of Item K2, which was submitted as the known writing of Carl Stevens.
CHQ3P3-524	Upon completion of a comparison and examination of the exhibits submitted in this case the following opinions were reached: The Q1 text was written by the K1 writer. The Q2 text was probably not written by the K1 or K2 writer. This is a less than conclusive opinion due to the level of reconciliation between the questioned items and the standards submitted. It could not be determined if K1 or K2 wrote the Q1 and Q2 signatures. This also is a less than conclusive opinion as this signature would be relatively easy for a skilled individual to simulate. In comparison to the standards it is unknown if discrepancies are differences or variation. It may not even be possible to determine with additional standards.
D8NQND-523	In my opinion, 1. The questioned writing (excluding the signature): Q1 (Aug. receipt) was written by Amy Michaels (K1). Q1 (Aug. receipt) was not written by Carl Stevens (K2). Q2 (Sep. receipt) was not written by Amy Michaels (K1). Q2 (Sep. receipt) was not written by Carl Stevens (K2). 2. The questioned signature: Q1 (Aug. receipt) was written by Amy Michaels (K1). Q1 (Aug. receipt) was not written by Carl Stevens (K2). Q2 (Sep. receipt) was not written by Amy Michaels (K1). Q2 (Sep. receipt) was not written by Carl Stevens (K2).
D8NW22-523	HANDWRITING: This is a preliminary report based on very limited 'normal course of business' known writing. Some writing comparisons from Q-1 were matched with the K-1 request writing material, but not sufficient to reach a definite conclusion. In addition comparison with Q-2 writing,

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>K-1 was found to probably not be the author. With the collection of available known writing authored by K-2, the writing of Q-1 and Q-2 was determined to probably not have been written by K-2. SIGNATURES: Why is K-2's execution of signatures in request writing a series of Capital letters and waves? Were the questioned materials presented to K-2 author and instructions given to "copy" the material? Without knowledge of the request writing instructions, this questions is unanswered. With very limited 'possibly directed' request writing of signatures by author K-2, comparison items are limited but sufficient to determine K-2 probably was not author of the signatures. The questioned signatures both lack complexity but K-1's known request writing signatures also lack complexity. The result is: comparison is limited to two Capitals, a series of waves, and initial and final strokes. K-1 author cannot be identified or eliminated with the limited number of known signatures -- missing are 'normal course of business' signatures for comparison.</p>
DAC6B3-524	<p>The writer of the known writing appearing upon Exhibits K1 a-c and the writer of the questioned writing appearing upon Exhibit Q1 is the same person (excluding the signatures). Forensic comparative handwriting comparison found agreement in a combination of significant individualizing characteristics and an absence of any significant differences. Due to the simplistic nature of the signatures, it was not possible to perform a proper forensic handwriting comparison of the "Amy Michaels" signatures. The writer of the known writing appearing upon Exhibits K1 a-c did not write the questioned writing appearing upon Exhibit Q2 (excluding the signatures). Forensic comparative handwriting comparison found significant differences in handwriting characteristics. Due to the simplistic nature of the signatures, it was not possible to perform a proper forensic handwriting comparison of the "Amy Michaels" signatures. Forensic comparative handwriting comparison found that the writer of the known writing appearing upon Exhibits K2 a-c probably did not write the questioned writing appearing upon Exhibit Q2 (excluding the signatures). Although a finding of "probable" falls short of the conclusive opinion of "elimination," the term is used to express the presence of strong disagreement in the questioned and known writing. Due to the simplistic nature of the signatures, it was not possible to perform a proper forensic handwriting comparison of the "Amy Michaels" signatures.</p>
DBHU8J-523	<p>Based on the documents submitted for examination, and subsequent analysis, comparison, and evaluation of exemplar documents, labeled Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2), the evidence supports my non-qualified opinion, to a reasonable degree of scientific and professional certainty that the author of K1 penned Q1 (Aug. receipt and signature) and did not pen Q2 (Sep. receipt or signature). Further the author of K2 did not pen the Q2 Sep. receipt or signature.</p>
DK7Q9K-523	<p>Based on documents submitted, the evidence supports my opinion that the Amy Michaels of the known material did write the signature and is the source of the hand printing on the document labeled Q1. There were signification[sic] similarities that included letter and number formation, slant, connecting strokes, beginning strokes, ending strokes, and spacing. Based on documents submitted, the evidence supports my opinion that the Carl Stevens of the known material did not write the signature and did[sic] not the source of the hand printing on the document labeled Q1. The differences that were noted were letter formation, slant, connecting strokes, beginning strokes, ending strokes and spacing. Based on the documents submitted, the evidence supports my opinion that the Amy Michaels of the known material probably did not write the signature and is not the source of the hand printing on the document labeled Q2. The differences that were noted were letter formation, slant, connecting strokes, beginning strokes, ending strokes and spacing. Based on documents submitted, the evidence supports my opinion that the Carl Stevens of the known material probably did not write the signature and is not the source of the hand printing on the document labeled Q2. The differences that were noted were letter formation, slant, connecting strokes, beginning strokes, ending strokes and spacing.</p>
DP3BGB-524	<p>According to the analyses performed, the questioned material pattern held for the present study and the foregoing reason technical order is determined that: Q1 = K1 identity exists in the manuscript. Q1 is not consistent to K2. Q2 is not consistent to K1. Q2 is not consistent to K2. Q1 = K1 identity exists in the signature. Q1 is not consistent to K2. Q2 is not consistent to K1. Q2 can not be associated neither discarded to K2</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
DV9YYH-524	Graphic characteristic's study of questioned checks Q1 and Q2 allows to conclude that Q1 and Q2 were not written and not signed by the same person. The comparative observation of major graphic elements, allows to conclude that Q1 was written and signed by Amy Michaels. The comparative observation of major graphic elements, allows to conclude that Q2 was not written and not signed by Amy Michaels. Q2 was probably not written by Carls Stevens, indeed we don't have enough spontaneous handprinted text to definitely conclude. The Q2 signature was not written by Amy Michaels, but it's impossible to determinate if Carls Stevens signed it or not. An imitated signature cannot be allocated to someone when they are not enough major graphic elements to compare. [sic]
DYTVM9-524	The writing and the signature of the questioned receipt of payment of August 2014 (Q1) present graphical identity with Amy Michael's original writings. The writing and the signature of the questioned receipt of payment of September 2014 (Q2) do not present graphical identity with the original writings of Amy Michael[sic] and Carl Stevens.
E2UCDB-524	Q1 questioned writing and signature on the questioned receipts was written by Amy Michaels (K1). Q2 questioned writing and signature on the questioned receipts was not written by Amy Michaels (K1) or Carl Stevens (K2).
E42JUH-524	Handwriting Q1 In view of the significant similarities observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting in "Q1" (Aug. receipt) was written by Amy Michaels, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c". In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting in "Q1" (Aug. receipt) was not written by Carl Stevens, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2c". Q2 In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting in "Q2" (Sep. receipt) was not written by Amy Michaels, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c". In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen handwriting, the questioned handwriting in "Q2" (Sep. receipt) was not written by Carl Stevens, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2c". Signature Q1 In view of the significant similarities observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, it is highly likely that the questioned signature in "Q1" (Aug. receipt) was written by Amy Michaels, the writer of the known specimen signatures in "K1a" to "K1c". In view of the significant differences observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, it is highly unlikely that the questioned signature in "Q1" (Aug. receipt) was written by Carl Stevens, the writer of the known specimen signatures in "K2a" to "K2c". Q2 In view of the differences in some of the strokes observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, there are indications that the questioned signature in "Q2" (Sep. receipt) was not written by Amy Michaels, the writer of the known specimen signatures in "K1a" to "K1c". In view of the differences observed between the questioned and specimen signatures, it is unlikely that the questioned signature in "Q2" (Sep. receipt) was written by Carl Stevens, the writer of the known specimen signatures in "K2a" to "K2c".
E84DXE-524	Based on the expertise results I conclude that handwriting and signature on the document of item Q1 is written/signed from the same person that wrote/signed know sample of item K1a-c and it is not written/signed from the person on the known samples of item k2a-c. Based on the expertise results I conclude that handwriting and signature on the document of Q2 is not written/signed from the same person that wrote/signed know sample of item K1a-c and k2a-c.
E8G7CU-524	In conclusion, the evidence at hand support the hypothesis that the document marked Q1 was written by the author of K1a-c not by K2a-c. The questioned document marked Q2 was probably not written by both the author of K1a-c and K2a-c.
E9BUT4-523	1. The signature and the content on questioned receipt (Q1) were written by Amy Michaels (K1). 2. Neither Amy Michaels (K1) nor Carl Stevens (K2) wrote the signature and the content on questioned receipt (Q2).
EBKA94-524	Conclusions with respect to the writer of the Amy Michaels specimens on K1: The writer of the specimen handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels wrote the original of the questioned handwriting reproduced on Q1. That is to say, it is assessed that the likelihood of another person writing the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>questioned entries on Q1 in such a similar style to Amy Michaels handwriting style (by coincidence or as the result of a simulation process, the only feasible other hypotheses in this situation) is negligibly small. It is probable that the writer of the specimen signatures and handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels wrote the original of the questioned signature reproduced on Q1. That is to say, it is unlikely that the questioned signature was written by a person other than the writer of the specimens attributed to Amy Michaels. It is unlikely that the writer of the specimen handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels wrote the original of the questioned handwriting reproduced on Q2. That is to say, it is probable that this questioned handwriting was written by a person other than the writer of the specimen handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels. However, the possibility of this writing being the product of the writer of the specimen handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels writing in an alternative style in order to disguise her natural handwriting cannot be absolutely discounted. The result of the comparison between the specimen signatures and handwriting attributed to Amy Michaels and the questioned signature reproduced on Q2 was inconclusive. Although significant differences were found, the possibility of the writer of these specimens having written the original of this signature in a changed style from that exhibited in the specimen signatures cannot be discounted. Conclusions with respect to the writer of the Carl Stevens specimens on K2: (The conclusions with respect to the Carl Stevens specimens are independent of the conclusions expressed above with respect to the Amy Michaels specimens.) It is highly unlikely that the writer of the specimen handwriting attributed to Carl Stevens wrote the original of the questioned handwriting reproduced on Q1. That is to say, it is highly probable that this questioned handwriting was written by a person other than the writer of the specimen handwriting attributed to Carl Stevens. The result of the comparison between the specimen handwriting attributed to Carl Stevens and the questioned writing on Q2 was inconclusive. Similarities and differences were found and the possibility of distorted handwriting on one or more of the Q2, K2a and K2b writings could not be dismissed. The results of the comparisons between the specimen handwriting and specimen signatures (in the name Amy Michaels) attributed to Carl Stevens and the questioned signatures reproduced on Q1 and Q2 were inconclusive. Although differences were found, the significance of these is diminished by the nature of the comparison. If either of the signatures is not genuine then it is a simulation of the style of the genuine signature of Amy Michaels and may not contain features of the actual writer. Furthermore the circumstances are not known how Mr Stevens was asked to write specimen signatures in the name Amy Michaels.</p>
EL6JXW-524	<p>1. MICHAELS wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 3. 2. MICHAELS probably wrote the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit 3. 3. MICHAELS and STEVENS probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 4. 4. STEVENS probably did not write the questioned signature on Exhibit 3. 5. MICHAELS and STEVENS can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit 4. 6. These findings are limited due to the limited quantity of comparable known writing and the abbreviated nature of the questioned signatures.</p>
EWGHCK-524	<p>ON THE QUESTIONED WRITING EXAMINATION; -Q1(AUG.RECEIPT) IS MOST PROBABLY WRITTEN BY AMY MICHAELS(K1) -Q2(SEPT.RECEIPT)IS MOST PROBABLY WRITTEN BY CARL STEVENS(K2). -ON Q2, THERE IS A BIG SIMILARITY OF THE LETTER "p" BETWEEN CARL STEVENS' HANDWRITINGS. ON THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE EXAMINATION; -Q1(AUG.RECEIPT) IS MOST PROBABLY SIGNED BY AMY MICHAELS(K1) -Q2(SEPT.RECEIPT)IS MOST PROBABLY SIGNED BY CARL STEVENS(K2). -WE CAME TO THAT CONCLUSION THAT; IF THE Q2 IS WRITTEN BY CARL STEVENS HE SHOULD SIGN IT. -AND THE LETTERS "M" OF CARL STEVENS ARE ALSO SIMILAR.</p>
EXFGVT-524	<p>After an analysis and comparison of the writing and signatures on the respective material I made the following observations and conclusions: 1. Significant correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the writing and signature in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting and signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" (purported to be of one "Amy Michaels"), however significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the writing and signature in question ("Q1") and the specimen writing and signature on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c" (purported to be of one "Carl Stevens"). In light of the above observations, I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the writing and signature in question marked as</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	"Q1" was, in all probability, written by the writer of "K1a" to "K1c", and thus the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2c" is eliminated as a possible writer of the writing and signature in question marked "Q1". 2. Significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the writing and signature in question marked as "Q2" and the specimen writing and signatures of both of the writers of the current specimen material ("K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2c"). I therefore found the evidence to support the proposition that the writing and signature in question marked as "Q2" was, in all probability, not written by either of the writers of the current specimen material ("K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2c") and are thus both eliminated as a possible writer of the writing and signature in question marked as "Q2".
FA366H-523	Seen on the receipt August 2014 (Q1), manuscripts will find correspondence graphic against the writings of Lady AMY MICHELS. Seen on the receipt August 2014 (Q1), manuscripts not be correspondence with calligraphic signs of CARL STEVENS. The firm view on the receipt August 2014 (Q1) is find correspondence with the signatures of the Lady AMY MICHELS. The firm view on the receipt August 2014 (Q1) not be correspondence compared the signatures of Mr CARL STEVENS. Seen in the receipt September 2014 manuscripts (Q2) probably was written by CARL STEVENS. Seen on the receipt September 2014 (Q2), manuscripts not be correspondence with calligraphic signs of AMY MICHELS. View on the receipt signature September 2014 (Q2) was probably written by CARL STEVENS. The firm view on the receipt September 2014 (Q2) not be HALLO correspondence with calligraphic signs of AMY MICHELS [sic]
FCREEJ-524	The evidence at hand support the following hypotheses pertaining to the handwriting in question: Q1 was written by the author of K1 and not K2. Q2 was written by the author of K2 and not K1. Pertaininmg[sic] th[sic] the signatures in question: Q1 was probably signed by K1. Q2 was probably not signed by K1. No conclusion could be reached with regards to K2.
FJRYFU-524	The writer of K1 wrote the questioned handwriting on Q1 and there is some evidence that this same writer wrote the questioned signature on Q1. There is some evidence that the writer of K2 did not write the questioned signature on Q1. The writer of K1 did not write the questioned handwriting on Q2. There is some evidence that the writer of K2 did not write the questioned[sic] handwriting on Q2. It was not possible to determine whether or not the writers of either K1 or K2 wrote the questioned signature on Q2.
FLXU8Q-524	It has been determined that the writer of K1, submitted as the known writing of Amy Michaels, prepared the printed writing on the receipt in Q1. This writer probably prepared the signature on Q1. There is a strong probability that this writer did not prepare the printed writing on the receipt in Q2. This writer probably did not prepare the signature on the receipt in Q2. It has been determined that the writer of K2, submitted as the known writing of Carl Stevens, did not prepare the printed writing on the receipt in Q1. This writer probably did not prepare the signature on Q1 or any of the writing on Q2.
FNMPMQ-524	A - Amy Michaels (K1) of the known material wrote the questioned material marked Q1. E - Amy Michaels (K1) of the known material did not write the questioned material marked Q2. E - Carl Stevens (K2) of the known material did not write Q1 and Q2 of the questioned material. B - There is a strong probability that Amy Michaels (K1) of the known material wrote the questioned signature on Q1. E - Carl Stevens (K2) of the known material did not write the questioned signature on Q1 and Q2. E - Amy Michaels (K1) did not write the questioned signature on Q2.
FUBBQ8-524	The questioned and the sample writings are reproductions. It is not possible to detect traces of manipulation and forgery with the procedures of forensic document examination. Features/details of line quality and writing movement are only partially in view. This is not a sufficient basis to draw definite conclusions concerning the genuineness and/or authorship of handwritings. Laboratory examinations of reproductions normally lead to an inconclusive result like "C" (cannot be identified or eliminated). In some cases there is a supplement possible. This can be a statement like a tendency (e.g. "a common authorship of the questioned handwriting and the known specimen can be taken into consideration" or "there are no hints of a common authorship..."). Assuming that we deal with originals in this examination the wording in our report would be: A common authorship between Q1 (excluding the signature) and the samples K1 is probable. Q2 was probably not

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	written by K1 or K2. A common authorship between the signature Q1 and the samples K1 is probable. The signature Q2 cannot be identified or eliminated. All identifications imply that an authorship of the other writer (K2) is excluded to (at least) the same degree. The reduction of the probabilities in the conclusions are caused by limitations of the graphic complexity in the questioned writings, shortcomings in the sample writings and the limited familiarity with the American kind of handwriting.
FVM8ZH-524	<p>Observations and Conclusions. Item Q1, Receipt for August dated July 31. 3. I compared the writing of the August receipt, Item Q1, with the writing of Amy Michaels in Items K1a, K1b, and K1c. I found many similarities; no single similarity is conclusive but the combination of similarities leads me to conclude that Item Q1 was written by Amy Michaels. I consider the possibility that it was written by any other person to be negligible. 4. I separately compared the signature in Item Q1 with the signatures and the other writing of Amy Michaels and with the signatures and other writing of Carl Stevens. The signature in Item Q1 provides a much smaller amount of writing for comparison than does the other writing in the receipt and that has limited my examination. Nonetheless, the signature in Item Q1 shows significant similarity to the signatures of Amy Michaels and I conclude that there is strong evidence that it was written by her. Also, the signature in Item Q1 differs significantly from the signatures and other writing made by Carl Stevens and I consider that there is strong evidence that it was not written by him. Item Q2, Receipt for September dated August 31. 5. I compared the writing of the September receipt, Item Q2, with the writing of Amy Michaels and with the writing of Carl Stevens. In each comparison I found significant differences which lead me to conclude that there is strong evidence that Item Q2 was not written by Amy Michaels and strong evidence that it was not written by Carl Stevens. 6. I compared also the signature in Item Q2 with the signatures and writing of Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens. Again, each comparison revealed significant differences which lead me to conclude that there is strong evidence that the signature in Item Q2 was not written by either Amy Michaels or by Carl Stevens. 7. The conclusions given in paragraphs three to six are ranked with others in a scale as follows: Definite (was/was not written by), Very Strong Evidence (was/was not written by), Strong Evidence (was/was not written by), Moderate Evidence (was/was not written by), Inconclusive (was/was not written by). 8. This statement is a summary of my findings; a full record of the work done in this case is contained in my case-notes.</p>
G26ARX-524	It has been concluded that Amy Michaels (K1) wrote the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 Item. It has been concluded that Carl Stevens (K2) did not write the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 Item. It has been determined that Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2) probably did not write the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q2 Item.
GJ9CGC-524	Results of Examination: The Item Q1 questioned writing, excluding the questioned signature, was prepared by Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1 (a-c). Due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing not accounted for in the available known writing, no definite determination could be reached whether the Item Q2 questioned writing, excluding the questioned signature, was or was not prepared by Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1 (a-c) or Carl Stevens, the writer of Item K2 (a-c). However, characteristics were observed which indicate that the Item Q2 questioned writing, excluding the questioned signature, may not have been prepared by Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1 (a-c) or Carl Stevens, the writer of Item K2 (a-c). Due to the limited nature of the Items Q1 and Q2 questioned signatures, it could not be determined whether these signatures were or were not prepared by Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1 (a-c) or Carl Stevens, the writer of Item K2 (a-c).
GRECUK-524	The evidence at hand supports the following hypotheses: 1. The writing on "Q1" was written by the author of "K1" and not written by the author of "K2"; 2. The writing on "Q2" was written by the author of "K2" and not written by the author of "K1"; 3. The signature on "Q1" was probably written by the author of "K1"; 6. The signature on "Q2" was not written by the author of "K1"; 7. Common authorship cannot be identified or eliminated with regards to "K2" and the questioned signatures on "Q1" and "Q2".
H3WDPK-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
H6MJ8V-524	In my opinion there is conclusive evidence that Amy Michaels wrote out and signed Q1. In my opinion there is conclusive evidence that neither Amy Michaels nor Carl Stevens wrote out the body of Q2. The questioned signature on item Q2 corresponds sufficiently closely to the specimens of Amy Stevens such that it must either be a genuine signature written by her or a close simulation of her signature written by some other person. There are some features of this signature which cannot be matched in her specimens. These specimens are, however, limited and are unlikely to be fully representative of her signature. On the basis of these specimens no opinion can be expressed as to whether Amy Michaels signed item Q2 or some other person (including Carl Stevens) has made a deliberate attempt to copy her signature.
H7FADB-524	Results of Examination: it was determined that the questioned writing, excluding the signature, on Item Q1 was prepared by Amy Michaels, writer of Item K1a-c. A definite determination could not be reached concerning the questioned writing, excluding the signature, on Item Q2 due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited quantity of comparable undictated writing submitted for comparisons. However, numerous inconsistencies were observed which indicate Amy Michaels, Item K1a-c, and Carl Stevens, Item K2a-c, may not have prepared the questioned writing (excluding the signature). Due to the presence of illegible portions and the limited quality of the Item Q1 and Item Q2 signatures, no conclusion could be reached whether Amy Michaels, Item K1a-c, or Carl Stevens, Item K2a-c, did or did not prepared the questioned signatures. Handwriting Methodology.
HDC3PB-523	Based on the expertise results I conclude that handwriting and signature on the document of item Q1 is written/signed from the same person that wrote/signed know sample of item K1a-c and it is not written/signed from the person on the known samples of item k2a-c. Based on the expertise results I conclude that handwriting and signature on the document of Q2 is not written/signed from the same person that wrote/signed know sample of item K1a-c and k2a-c.
HVW97U-524	1. MICHAELS wrote the original questioned hand printed entries reproduced on Exhibit 3(Q1). 2. STEVENS did not write the original questioned hand printed entries reproduced on Exhibit 3(Q1). 3. MICHAELS probably wrote the original questioned signature reproduced on Exhibit 3(Q1). 4. STEVENS probably did not write the original questioned signature reproduced on Exhibit 3(Q1). 5. The findings in paragraphs 3 and 4 are limited primarily due to the abbreviated nature of the questioned signature on Exhibit 3(Q1). 6. MICHAELS and STEVENS probably did not write the original questioned hand printed entries reproduced on Exhibit 4(Q2). This finding is limited due to the minimal amount of known handwriting exemplars and standards from MICHAELS and STEVENS submitted for comparison. 7. MICHAELS and STEVENS can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the original questioned signature depicted on Exhibit 4(Q2). This finding is limited due to the abbreviated nature of the original questioned signature depicted on Exhibit 4(Q2).
JDAXN8-524	Examinations on the questioned receipts showed significant differences in handwriting and signatures. Therefore they were written by different writers. Comparisons with the known specimens of writers K1 & K2 showed that the handwriting and signature in Q1 showed significant similarities to those of K1 (Amy Michaels). Similarly, those in Q2 showed similarities to those of K2 (Carl Stevens). However, as the questioned signatures' design was quite simple and was quite easy to simulate, the level of confidence that K2 having written Q2 was lowered.
JFEXTQ-524	The questioned writing on the august receipt was written by the autor of the comparaisn writing samples quoted K1. Signature of questioned august receipt was written by the autor of the comparaisn writing samples quoted K1. The questioned writing on the september receipt was not written by the autor of the comparaisn writing samples quoted K1 and K2. Signature of questioned september receipt was not written by the autor of the comparaisn writing samples quoted K1 and K2. [sic]
JFXBBV-524	Visual and microscopic examination of the submitted documents revealed the following: The receipt in item Q1 (excluding the signature) was written by the writer of the samples in item K1. This is based on substantial significant similarities with no significant differences between the questioned and known writing. Pictorial similarities were noted between the questioned signature on item Q1 and the Amy Michaels samples in item K1 indicating a familiarity with the signature style of

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>Michaels. However, due to the abbreviated nature of the signature on item Q1 no opinion can be offered as to the writer. There are indications that the writers of items K1 and K2 may not have written item Q2 (excluding the signature) based on differences between the questioned and known writing. However, the evidence is far from conclusive. Due to the abbreviated nature of the questioned signature on item Q2 no opinion can be offered as to the writer. Additional requested and non-requested print and cursive samples from both submitted writers would be of value for comparison. If additional examinations are requested, please resubmit items K1, K2, Q1, and Q2 in their original packaging.</p>
JH483R-524	<p>1.Contributor one, Amy Michaels is identified as the author of the questioned writings excluding the signature appearing on Q1. 2.The questioned writing excluding the signature appearing on Q2 was probably not authored by contributor number one, Amy Michaels or contributor two, Carl Stevens. 3.Evidence was found to indicate that contributor one, Amy Michaels, may have authored the questioned signature appearing on Q1. However, due to the abbreviated nature of the questioned signature, a more conclusive opinion could not be reached. 4.Indications were found that suggest the signature appearing on Q2 may be a simulation. Because writings of this nature do not normally exhibit sufficient identifying features to permit an identification of the writer, the contributors could neither be identified nor eliminated as the author of the questioned signature appearing on Q2.</p>
KCDD4X-523	<p>The K1 writer (Michaels) probably wrote the questioned handprinting and numerals on Q1. An opinion of "probably wrote" means that there is strong evidence to support that common authorship is more likely than not. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The K2 writer (Stevens) probably did not write the questioned handprinting and numerals on Q1. An opinion of "probably did not write" means that there is strong evidence to support that common authorship is unlikely. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The K1 writer (Michaels) probably did not write the questioned handprinting and numerals on Q2. An opinion of "probably did not write" means that there is strong evidence to support that common authorship is unlikely. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The K2 writer (Stevens) probably did not write the questioned handprinting and numerals on Q2. An opinion of "probably did not write" means that there is strong evidence to support that common authorship is unlikely. This opinion falls short of the "virtually certain" degree of confidence. The K1 writer (Michaels) has neither been identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signatures on Q1 and Q2. This is an inconclusive result because the signatures depicted on Q1 and Q2 are highly stylized and bear only two (2) legible letters. A total of six (6) signature specimens were submitted and this is an insufficient quantity with which to make an assessment of the writer's range of variation, especially due to the stylized nature of the signature. The K2 writer (Stevens) has neither been identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signatures on Q1 and Q2. This is an Inconclusive result because the signatures depicted on Q1 and Q2 are highly stylized and bear only two (2) legible letters. A total of six (6) signature specimens were submitted and this is an insufficient quantity with which to make an assessment of the writer's range of variation, especially due to the stylized nature of the signature.</p>
KCVRL3-524	<p>Content and signature of the receipt of payment Q1 are consistent with the contents and signatures of documents K2a-c. Content and signature of the receipt of payment Q2 are not consistent with the contents and signatures of documents K2a-c.</p>
KW23UC-523	<p>after performing the analysis of form and dynamics of handwriting and to make comparisons of the material in question, the expert concludes as follows: The questioned writing on the item Q1, receipt of payment for august 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 was WRITTEN by Amy Michaels. The questioned writing on the item Q1, receipt of payment for august 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 was NOT WRITTEN by Carl Stevens. The questioned writing on the item Q2, receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 was NOT WRITTEN by Amy Michaels. The questioned writing on the item Q2, receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 was PROBABLY WRITTEN by Carl Stevens. The questioned signature on the item Q1, receipt of payment for august 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 was WRITTEN by Amy Michaels. The questioned signature on the item Q1, receipt of payment for august 2014 rent, dated July 31,</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	2014 was NOT WRITTEN by Carl Stevens. The questioned signature on the item Q2, receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 was NOT WRITTEN by Amy Michaels. The questioned signature on the item Q2, receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 was PROBABLY WRITTEN by Carl Stevens.
KXBBW6-523	The handwriting on item Q1 was written by the same person who wrote the handwriting on item(s) K1 a-c, i.e., Amy Michaels. It is highly probable (virtually certain) that the "Amy Michaels" signature appearing on item Q1 was written by the same person who wrote the "Amy Michaels" signatures appearing on item(s) K1a and K1b. Neither the writer of item(s) K1a-c nor the writer of item(s) K2a-c can be identified or eliminated as the author of the handwriting appearing on item Q2. Neither the writer of item(s) K1a-c nor the writer of item(s) K2a-c can be identified or eliminated as the author of the "Amy Michaels" signature appearing on item Q2.
KXVUZQ-524	1. It has been concluded that the questioned writing and the questioned signature "Amy Michaels" on Exhibit Q1 were executed by the K1 (a-c) specimen writer (Amy Michaels). 2. It has been concluded that the questioned writing and the questioned signature "Amy Michaels" on Exhibit Q1 were not executed by the K2 (a-c) specimen writer. 3. It has been concluded that it is probable that the questioned writing and the questioned signature "Amy Michaels" on Exhibit Q2 were not executed by the K1 (a-c) specimen writer. 4. It has been concluded that it is probable that the questioned writing on Exhibit Q2 was executed by the K2 (a-c) specimen writer. 5. It has been concluded that it is probable that the questioned signature "Amy Michaels" on Exhibit Q2 was not executed by the K2 (a-c) specimen writer.
L9HWBR-524	a) Sufficient similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits were observed in both the Questioned handwriting appearing on Q1 and the (reported) Known handwriting of Amy Michaels, appearing on K1a, K1b and K1c, to opine that Amy Michaels is the author of the handwriting appearing on Q1. b) Some similarities in handwriting characteristics and habits were observed in both the Questioned handwriting appearing on Q2 and the (reported) Known handwritings of Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens; however, several dissimilarities in handwriting characteristics and habits were also observed. Based upon the presence of the dissimilarities it is the opinion of this examiner that it is probable that neither Amy Michaels nor Carl Stevens author the handwriting appearing on Q2. c) Some similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits were observed in the Questioned signature appearing on Q1 and the (reported) Known signatures of Amy Michael submitted for examination. Based upon the presence of these similarities it is the opinion of this examiner that this Questioned signature was probably authored by Amy Michaels. Due to the limited number of legible letter formation characteristics present in the signatures submitted for examination, a more definite opinion cannot be rendered. d) Several dissimilarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits were observed in the Questioned signature appearing on Q2 when compared to the (reported) Known signatures of Amy Michael and the "Amy Michael" signature exemplars provided by Carl Stevens submitted for examination. Based upon the presence of these dissimilarities it is the opinion of this examiner that the Questioned signature appearing on Q2 was probably not authored by either Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens. The limited number of legible letter formation characteristics present in the signatures submitted for examination precludes rendering a more definite opinion. [sic]
LA7L3Q-524	1. The questioned signature in "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen signatures in "K1a" and "K1b". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature was written by the writer of the specimens (Amy Michaels). 2. The questioned signature in "Q2" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures in "K1a" and "K1b". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens (Amy Michaels). 3. The questioned signatures in "Q1" and "Q2" showed differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures in "K2a" and "K2b". However, as these were simulated specimen signatures, it was not possible to form an opinion to ascertain the authorship of these questioned signatures. 4. The questioned handwriting in "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting in "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens (Amy Michaels). 5. The questioned handwriting in "Q2"

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting in "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens (Amy Michaels). 6. The questioned handwriting in "Q1" and "Q2" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting in "K2a", "K2b" and "K2c". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens (Carl Stevens).
LY3QKL-524	3.1 Q1 was written by K1 and not written by K2. 3.2 Q2 was not written by K1 and probably written by K2. 3.3 Q1 was signed by K1 and not signed by K2. 3.4 Q2 was not signed by K1 and probably signed by K2.
M4F4AT-524	Amy Michaels (Item K1 a-c) wrote (i.e. a full identification) the body of the Item Q1 receipt (excluding the signature). Further, there are indications she wrote (i.e. it is very likely) the "Amy Michaels" signature on Item Q1. There are indications Carl Stevens (Item K2a-c) did not write (i.e. it is very unlikely) the "Amy Michaels" signature on the Item Q1 receipt. Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens did not write (i.e. a full elimination) the body of the Item Q2 receipt (excluding the signature). The "Amy Michaels" signature on the Item Q2 receipt may be a simulation (imitation) of Amy Michaels' natural signature. There are indications Amy Michaels did not write the "Amy Michaels" signature on the Item Q2 receipt; and there are limited indications Carl Stevens did not write (i.e. it is unlikely) the "Amy Michaels" signature on the Item Q2 receipt. Findings were limited by the abbreviated nature of the "Amy Michaels" signatures on the Items Q1 & Q2 receipts. The evidence is being retained for personal pickup.
M7467M-524	Q1 Handwriting: Similarities were noted between the questioned and specimen handwriting in terms of pictorial similarity, size and size relationships, construction characteristics, fluency and speed, together with no significant differences. Notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the non-original nature of the specimen and questioned material, I concluded the author of the specimen handwriting attributed to Amy MICHAELS (K1 author) wrote the questioned handwriting. Q1 Signature: The questioned signature's attributes fit well within the range of variation exhibited by the 6 specimen signatures attributed to Amy MICHAELS (K1 author). Both the low-moderate complexity of the questioned signature and the non- original nature of the specimen and questioned material served to limit the strength of conclusion in this case. Accordingly, I concluded there is a strong probability the author of the specimen signatures attributed to Amy MICHAELS (K1 author) wrote the questioned signature. Q2 Handwriting: There are a number of maintained habitual differences in handwriting habit between the Q2 handwriting and that of both the K1 and K2 authors. Accordingly, I concluded there are indications the authors of the specimen handwriting attributed to both Amy MICHAELS (K1) and Carl STEVENS (K2) did not write the handwriting on the Q2 document. Q2 Signatures: The questioned signature bears gross pictorial similarities to all the specimen signatures. However, there were a number of unresolved differences between the Q2 signature and the specimen K1 (Amy Michaels) and K2 (Carl Stevens) signatures. These differences could not be resolved based on the specimens provided. Accordingly, the examination to determine authorship of the Q2 signature was inconclusive with respect to the authors of the specimen signatures attributed to Amy MICHAELS (K1) and Carl STEVENS (K2).
MC6G2K-524	After an analysis and comparison of the questioned writing and signatures and the specimen handwriting and signatures on the respective documents I made the following observations and conclusions: 1) A number of strong correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the writing and signature in question contained on the document marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting and signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" (purported to be of one "Amy Michaels"), however significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the writing and signature in question ("Q1") and the specimen writing and signature on the documents marked as "K2a" to "K2c" (purported to be of one "Carl Stevens"). In light of the above observations, I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the writing and signature in question marked as "Q1" was, in all probability, written by the writer of "K1a" to "K1c", and the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2c" is thus, eliminated as a possible writer of the writing and signature in question marked "Q1". 2) Significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	writing and signature in question marked as "Q2" and the specimen writing and signatures of both of the writers of the current specimen material ("K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2c"), therefore I found the evidence to support the proposition that the writing and signature in question marked as "Q2" was, in all probability, not written by either of the writers of the current specimen material ("K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2c") and thus, I eliminated both as a possible writer of the writing and signature in question marked as "Q2".
MFAJYU-524	It is my opinion that: 1: There is very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwritten entries appearing on the document, item Q1, were written by the writer of the Amy Michaels handwriting specimens, item K1. 2: There is strong support for the proposition that the questioned signature appearing on the document, item Q1, was written by the writer of the Amy Michaels signature specimens, item K1. The examination was limited by the simplistic nature of the questioned signature. 3: No opinion could be expressed on the questioned handwritten entries appearing on the document, item Q2, and as a result the examination was inconclusive. 4: The questioned signature appearing on the document, item Q2, is not naturally written. However due to the simplistic nature of the signature an authorship opinion could not be expressed and as a result the examination was inconclusive.
MKJ6X8-524	It was determined that Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1a-c, prepared the questioned hand printing on Item Q1. Due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned hand printing that are not present on the available known writing, it could not be determined whether Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1a-c, or Carl Stevens, the writer of Item K2a-c, prepared the questioned hand printing on Item Q2. However, significant characteristics were observed which indicate that Michaels, K1a-c, and Stevens, K2a-c, may not have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item Q2. No conclusion could be reached whether Amy Michaels, K1a-c, or Carl Stevens K2a-c, prepared the questioned signatures on Items Q1 and Q2, due to the limited quality of the questioned signatures and the presence of characteristics in the questioned signatures that are not present in the available known writing.
MMPQPD-524	I found the evidence to suggest that or the following 1. Q1 was written by the author of K1 not K2; 2. Q2 was not written by the author of K2 not K1; I found the evidence to suggest that or the following: 1. K1 probably wrote signature or Q1 not on Q2 2. No conclusion can be reached regarding the specimen signature of K2. [sic]
NGVHRH-524	1. The questioned handwriting (excluding signatures) on Exhibit Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K1 (a to c) (Amy Michaels). 2. The questioned handwriting (excluding signatures) on Exhibit Q2 was probably not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K1 (a to c) (Amy Michaels). 3. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the questioned handwriting (excluding signatures) on Exhibit Q2 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2 (a to c) (Carl Stevens). 4. The questioned handwritten "Amy Michaels" signature on Exhibit Q1 was probably written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K1 (a to c) (Amy Michaels). 5. The questioned handwritten "Amy Michaels" signature on Exhibit Q1 was probably not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2 (a to c) (Carl Stevens). 6. The questioned handwritten "Amy Michaels" signature on Exhibit Q2 was probably not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K1 (a to c) (Amy Michaels). 7. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the questioned handwritten "Amy Michaels" signature on Exhibit Q2 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2 (a to c).
NPMQ2U-524	i. The questioned handwriting in "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens.(Amy Michaels) ii. The questioned handwriting in "Q1" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2c". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens. (Carl Stevens) iii. The questioned handwriting in "Q2" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens. (Amy Michaels) iv. The questioned handwriting in "Q2"

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2c". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens. (Carl Stevens) v. The questioned signature in "Q1" showed both similarities and differences in handwriting characteristics with/from the specimen signatures in "K1a" to "K1c". As such, I was unable to form an opinion regarding the authorship of this questioned signature. vi. The questioned signature in 'Q1' showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristic from the specimen signature in 'K2a' to 'K2c'. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens. (Carl Stevens) vii. The questioned signature in 'Q2' showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures in 'K1a' to 'K1c'. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens.(Amy Michaels) viii. The questioned signature in 'Q2' showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristic from the specimen signatures in 'K2a' to 'K2c'. Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens.(Carl Stevens)</p>
NWKZ2P-524	1. Ms. Michaels wrote Item Q1. 2. Neither Ms. Michaels nor Mr. Stevens wrote Item Q2.
P4PGKE-524	1) Amy Micheals[sic] (K1) wrote Q1, and didn't write Q2. Carl Stevens (K2) didn't write Q1 nor Q2. 2) Amy Micheals[sic] (K1) wrote the signature of Q1, and didn't write the signature of Q2. Carl Stevens (K2) didn't write the signature of Q1 nor Q2.
P6FB4G-523	In as much as it is possible to examine digital images in lieu of the original documents, it is my opinion that Amy Michaels wrote the Q1 receipt with the exception of the signature. There are indications that Amy Michaels wrote the questioned signature on the Q1 receipt. There are indications that Carl Stevens did not write the questioned signature on the Q1 receipt. It is probable that neither Amy Michaels nor Carl Stevens wrote the Q2 receipt with the exception of the signature. There are indications that neither Amy Michaels nor Carl Stevens wrote the questioned signature on Q2. The limited amount of submitted known writing and the simplistic nature of the questioned signatures hindered my examinations and precludes a more conclusive opinion.
P9HJLT-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
PP8QJQ-524	a. The reproduced questioned handwriting appearing on Q1 was written by the author of the reproduced known handwriting samples (Amy Michaels/AM1-3). b. The reproduced questioned handwriting appearing on Q1,Q2 was not written by the author of the reproduced known handwriting samples (Carl Stevens/CS1-3). C. The reproduced questioned handwriting appearing on Q2 was not written by the author of the reproduced known handwriting samples (Amy Michaels/AM1-3). D. The reproduced questioned signature appearing on Q1 probably may have been written by the author of the reproduced known signatures (Amy Michaels/AM1-3). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: lack of highly identifiable features and lack of a high degree of individuality in the questioned signature and the known signatures. E. The reproduced questioned signature appearing on Q2 probably may not have been written by the author of the reproduced known signatures (Amy Michaels/AM1-3). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: lack of highly identifiable features and lack of a high degree of individuality in the questioned signature and the known signatures. F. The reproduced questioned signatures appearing on Q1,Q2 probably may not have been written by the author of the reproduced known signatures (Carl Stevens/CS1-3). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: lack of highly identifiable features and lack of a high degree of individuality in the questioned signature and the known signatures.
PRRF44-524	It was determined that Amy Michaels, the writer of Item K1a-c, prepared the questioned writing, excluding the signature, on Item Q1. A definite determination could not be made as to whether or not Michaels prepared the questioned writing on Item Q2 and the questioned signature on Item Q1, due to the limited amount of comparable known writing, the limited nature of the questioned signatures, and characteristics in the questioned writing which could not be accounted for on the basis of the available known writing. However, dissimilarities between the known writing of Michaels and the questioned writing on Item Q2 indicate that Michaels may not have prepared the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	questioned writing, excluding the signature, on Item Q2. Although some pictorial similarities were observed between the known writing of Michaels and the questioned signature on Item Q1, no conclusion could be reached due to the limited nature of the questioned signature. Although some dissimilarities were observed, no conclusion could be made as to whether or not Michaels prepared the questioned signature on Item Q2, due to the limited nature of the questioned signature. A definite determination could not be made as to whether or not Carl Stevens, the writer of Item K2a-c, prepared the questioned writing on Items Q1 and Q2, due to the limited amount of comparable known writing, the limited nature of the questioned signatures, and characteristics in the questioned writing which could not be accounted for on the basis of the available known writing. However, dissimilarities between the known writing of Stevens and the questioned writing on Items Q1 and Q2 indicate that Stevens may not have prepared the questioned writing, excluding the signatures, on Items Q1 and Q2. Although some dissimilarities were observed, no conclusion could be made as to whether or not Stevens prepared the questioned signatures on Items Q1 and Q2, due to the limited nature of the questioned signatures.
PULTWV-524	CONCLUSIONS Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the questioned receipts? The same person who wrote K-1 a-c also wrote the body of Q-1, the August receipt. The same person who wrote K-1 a-c did not write Q-2. The person who wrote K-2 a-c did not write Q-1 The person who wrote K-2 a-c did not write Q-2 2. Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts? The same person who signed the Amy Michaels signatures on K-1 a-c signed the Amy Michaels signature on Q-1. K-1 a-c did not sign Q-2. Q-2 was neither written nor signed by K-2 a-c nor by K-1 a-c 3.) WHAT WOULD BE THE WORDING OF THE CONCLUSIONS IN YOUR REPORT? In my opinion, the same person who wrote the standards K-1 a-c also authored the text and signature of Q-1. Further, it is my opinion the text in Q-2 was not written by K-1 a-c nor K-2 a-c. Significant differences are observed between Q-1 and Q-2 in the placement of the left margin, and particularly in the formation of the letter "x" in the word "expenses" in Q-1 and Q-2. As for the signature on Q-2, it is my opinion that it cannot be identified or eliminated as that of K-2 for these reasons: Not only are the capital letters "A" and "M" different from all K-2's known writing but, also, because of the limited strokes in the name, the Q-2 signature cannot be identified or eliminated.
PV93FN-524	In my opinion my findings provide: Conclusive support for the proposition that the questioned non-signature writing on cheque Q1 was written by Amy Michaels. Moderate support for the proposition that the signature on cheque Q1 was written by Amy Michaels. Strong support for the proposition that the questioned non-signature details and accompanying signature on cheque Q2 were written by a person(s) other than Amy Michaels. Strong support for the proposition that the questioned non-signature details and accompanying signature on cheque Q2 were written by a person(s) other than Carl Stevens
PXXAXY-524	Based on the side by side comparisons of the questioned writings found on the face of Q1 and Q2 to the known requested and non-requested standards of Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2), the following conclusions are offered: In reference to Q1, I conclude that Amy Michaels wrote (Positively authored) the questioned writings found in the body of Q1. Carl Stevens did not write the questioned writings found in the body of Q1. Regarding the signature attached to Q1, Amy Michaels probably wrote the signature. Carl Stevens probably did not write the signature found at the bottom of Q1. Regarding Q2, Amy Michaels probably did not write the writings found in the body of Q2. There is no basis to conclude (cannot be identified or eliminated) that Carl Stevens authored the writings found in the body of Q2. There is no basis to conclude (cannot be identified or eliminated) that Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens were responsible for the signature attached to the body of writing identified as Q2.
Q3M9PZ-524	(a) Amy Michaels wrote/printed Q-1 July 31, 2014 receipt. (b) Amy Michaels wrote/printed the questioned signature on Q-1 July 31, 2014 receipt. (c) Based on the items submitted, Carl Stevens did not write/print Q-1 July 31, 2014 receipt. (d) Based on the items submitted, Carl Stevens did not write/print the questioned signature on Q-1 July 31, 2014 receipt. (e) Based on the items submitted, Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens did not write/print Q-2 the August 31, 2014 receipt. (f) Based on the items submitted, Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens did not write/print the questioned

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	signature on Q-2 the August 31, 2014 receipt.
Q4JP2W-524	<p>Q1 Handwritings: Amy - B: Although the detected characteristics were similar between the questioned and the sample handwritings, the handwritings were available in copies. Carl - E: There were so many differences what could be detected in the examination that has allowed answer E.</p> <p>Q2 Handwritings: Amy, Carl - E: We could detected a lot of differences from the specimens both of the sample writers, that's why we excluded them among of potential authors. Q1 Signature: Amy - B: The detected characteristics were similar between the questioned signature and the samples of the name bearer, but the signatures were available in copies. Carl - D: The questioned signatures are simplified, therefore they can be imitated easily. So in spite of the detected differences were justified answer D. Q2 Signature: Amy, Carl - D: The questioned signatures are simplified, therefore they can be imitated easily. So in spite of the detected differences were justified answer D. [sic]</p>
Q83J6N-523	I have concluded that Amy Michael's habitual written traits were found in the document identified as Q1, both in the written portion as well as in the signature. I have concluded that Carl Steven's habitual written traits were not found in the document identified as Q1 and Q2.
QA6K3Z-524	In my opinion, Amy Michaels wrote out and signed the receipt Q1 and I am satisfied that Carl Stevens was not responsible for writing or signing Q1. In my opinion, neither Amy Michaels nor Carl Stevens wrote out the receipt Q2 and in my opinion Amy Michaels did not sign Q2. Whilst I am unable to completely rule out the possibility that Carl Stevens forged the Amy Michaels signature on Q2 by copying, as this questioned signature differs from his specimen handwriting, I consider it unlikely he is the writer.
QBXZ4G-524	1. Amy Michaels wrote the questioned "Renter's Receipt" dated July 31, 2014, document Q-1. 2. Amy Michaels wrote the questioned "Amy Michaels" signature, document Q-1. 3. Amy Michaels did not write the questioned "Renter's Receipt" dated August 31, 2014, document Q-2. 4. Amy Michaels did not write the questioned "Amy Michaels" signature, dated August 31, 2014, document Q-2. 5. Carl Stevens did not write the questioned "Renters Receipt", dated August 31, 2014, document Q-2. 6. Carl Stevens did not write the questioned "Amy Michaels" signate[sic], dated August 31, 2014, document Q-2.
QK7FAP-524	Based on the evidence received, there are indications Amy Michaels may have written Q1 and signed the signature in the name of Amy Michaels on Q1. There are indications Amy Michaels may not have written Q2. There is no basis for an identification or elimination of Amy Michaels as having signed the signature in the name of Amy Michaels on Q2. Based on the evidence received, there are indications Carl Stevens may not have written Q1 or signed the signature in the name of Amy Michaels on Q1. There is no basis for an identification or elimination of Carl Stevens as having written or signed the signature in the name of Amy Michaels on Q2.
QV732L-523	Amy Michaels (K1) was the writer of the hand printing and numbers on the receipt dated "July 31, 2014" (Q1). There are indications that Amy Michaels (K1) was the writer of the stylized signature on the receipt dated "July 31, 2014" (Q1), but the evidence is far from conclusive. It is probable that Amy Michaels (K1) was not the writer of the hand printing and numbers on the receipt dated "August 31, 2014" (Q2). Amy Michaels (K1) cannot be identified to nor eliminated as the writer of the stylized signature on the receipt dated "August 31, 2014" (Q2). The stylized signature has a limited amount of features available for comparison. It is probable that Carl Stevens (K2) was not the writer of the hand printing and numbers on the receipts dated "July 31, 2014" (Q1) and "August 31, 2014" (Q2). Carl Stevens (K2) cannot be identified to nor eliminated as the writer the stylized signatures on the receipts dated "July 31, 2014" (Q1) and "August 31, 2014" (Q2). The stylized signatures have a limited amount of features available for comparison.
QVQAGY-524	It is my expert opinion that the body of writing on Q1 was authored by the K1 writer. The signature representing "Amy Michaels" was also probably written by the K1 writer designated as Amy Michaels. In my expert opinion the K1 and K2 writers were probably not the author of the Q2 document and signature.
R9R83B-524	1. The evidence at hand supports the following prepositions[sic]: a) Q1 was written by K1 and not

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	K2 b) Q2 was written by K2 and not K1 2.(a) The evidence at hand supports the preposition[sic] that Q1 was executed by K1 and not K2 (b) Q2 was probably not written by K1 and no conclusion can be reached with regards to K2
RA2CDD-524	3.1 After analysis and comparison, I came to the following conclusions regarding questioned document marked "Q1": 3.1.1 There is sufficient evidence supporting the hypothesis that the questioned writing marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the comparison material marked "K1a-K1c"; 3.1.2 The signature is neither intricate nor complex in nature and do not contain sufficient individualising characteristics to permit a definite finding to be made. There is, nonetheless, some evidence suggesting that the signature in question was probably written by the writer of the specimen signatures marked "K1a-K1c". 3.2 After analysis and comparison, I came to the following conclusions regarding questioned document marked "Q2"; 3.2.1 Significant differences are identified between the questioned writing marked "Q2" and the specimen writing marked "K1a-K1c" and "K2a-K2c", and I therefore found the evidence to support the hypothesis that the writing in question is not written by either of the writers of the specimen. 3.2.2 The signature is neither intricate nor complex in nature and do not contain sufficient individualising characteristics to permit a definite finding to be made. However, some differences identified between the signature in question and specimen signatures marked "K1a-K1c" and "K2a-K2c" support evidence that the signature in question is, in all probability, a simulated (forged) signature.
RBXTQB-524	Contributor Amy Michaels (K1) is identified as the author of the questioned written text appearing in the body of Q1. Evidence was found that suggests that contributor Amy Michaels (K1) probably authored the questioned signature appearing on Q1. Neither contributor, Amy Michaels (K1) nor Carl Stevens (K2), authored the questioned written text appearing in the body of Q2. Contributors Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2) could neither be identified or eliminated as the author of the questioned signature appearing on Q2.
RCQJWP-524	The writer who prepared the known hand printing on K1 also prepared the questioned hand printing on Q1. This finding is based upon the presence of corresponding significant similarities in the absence of significant differences. The similarities between the K1 and Q1 hand printing include speed, relative height proportions, relationship to baseline, spatial relationships, and letter formations. There are indications that the K1 writer may have prepared the questioned signature appearing on Q1. Although a finding of "indications" is far from conclusive, it is reflective of similarities that exist between the K1 and Q1 signatures. A more definitive finding was not reached due to the simplistic and abbreviated nature of the Q1 signature. The writers who prepared the known hand printing on K1 and K2 probably did not prepare the questioned hand printing on Q2. This finding is based upon the presence of numerous significant dissimilarities between the questioned and known hand printing. It should be noted that "probably did not prepare" is a qualified opinion in which the evidence points rather strongly towards the writing having been prepared by a different person; however, this opinion falls short of the virtually certain degree of confidence. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the K2 writer prepared the Q1 signature or whether the K1 or the K2 writers prepared the Q2 signature. This finding is due to the absence of similarities and abbreviated nature of the signatures; furthermore, both writers demonstrate an adequate skill level to have prepared these signatures.
REUEFR-524	It was determined that handwriting and signature on Q1 were written by K1/Amy Michaels/. Neither K1/Amy Michaels/ nor K2/Carl Stevens/ wrote the handwriting on Q2. On[sic] our opinion the signature on Q2 was probably not written by Amy Michaels/K1/ and probably was not written by Carl Stevens /K2/. There are some similarities and more differences between the Q2 signature and the known writings of K1. There are few similarities and some differences between the Q2 signature and the specimen of Carl Stevens. The structure, complexity of the signature is simple, which makes the forgery easier, therefore we couldn't eliminate K2. It would have been useful for the examination to have more information about the procedure for obtaining signature specimens of Carl Stevens /for example which instructions was given to him, was it allowed the writer to see the questioned signature, to copy it/.
RHX8DW-524	It has been concluded that Amy Michaels wrote the August receipt and signature (Exhibit Q1). No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens wrote or signed

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	the September receipt (Exhibit Q2). Due to the potential of disguise, additional known standards are required from both writers before further consideration.
RMTE2T-524	1. MICHAELS wrote the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit 3. 2. MICHAELS probably wrote the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit 3. 3. MICHAELS and STEVENS probably did not write the questioned hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit 4. 4. STEVENS probably did not write the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit 3. 5. MICHAELS and STEVENS could neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature depicted on Exhibit 4. 6. These findings are limited due to the exhibits not being originals, the insufficient amount of comparable known writing and the abbreviated nature of the questioned signatures.
RRMZM9-524	A degree of similarity is identified amongs[sic] the writing of K1 to the questioned writing marked as Q1, suggesting that K1 was written by Q1. A degree of similarity is identified amongs[sic] the writing of K2 to the questioned writing marked as Q2, suggesting that K2 was written by Q2. A degree of similarity is identified amongst the signatures of K1 and that of Q1 suggesting possible common authorship.
RV7XCY-524	As a result of examination and comparison based solely on the material submitted the flowing[sic] conclusions and observations are opinions based upon my experience, education and training and are as follows: The questioned writing submitted in exhibit Q1 was written by the author of K1a-K1c (Amy Michaels). The questioned writing was not written by the author of K2a-K2c (Carl Stevens). The questioned writing submitted in exhibit Q2 was probably not written by the author of K1a-K1c (Amy Michaels) and was not written by the author of K2a-K2c (Carl Stevens). The author of the signatures on Q1 and Q2 can not be identified as there is not enough identification potential in either signature.
RW2DNV-523	It is highly probable that the questioned writing Q1 was written by writer K1. It is highly probable that the questioned writing Q1 was NOT written by writer K2. It is probable that the questioned signature Q1 was written by writer K1. It is highly probable that the questioned signature Q1 was NOT written by writer K2. It is highly probable that the questioned writing Q2 was NOT written by writers K1 or K2. It is highly probable that the questioned signature Q2 was NOT written by writer K1. It is not possible to decide if the falsified signature Q2 was written by writer K2.
T26AWE-523	We would draw up pairs of mutually exclusive hypotheses for each comparison to be made in advance. In our conclusions we then don't give an opinion on the probability of these hypotheses, but on the probability of our findings (results of each comparison) in the light of the (typically two) hypotheses. For the comparison of the questioned writing on Q1 with the known samples of K1 these hypotheses would be: (H1) The questioned writing Q1 was written by K1 vs. (H2) The questioned writing was written by any other person than K1. We use the following "scale" of conclusions if we can give an opinion at all: The results of the comparative handwriting examination between Qi and Kj are: about equally probable, slightly more probable, more probable, much more probable, very much more probable and extremely much more probable. When hypothesis H1 is correct as/than when hypothesis H2 is correct (or the other way around). The limited space here does not allow us to work out all conclusions in the wording we use, but these are consistent with the responses given at 1 and 2.
TJ9BKU-524	1. Graphic identity exists between the writings and signature of Q1 and the known signatures of Mrs. Amy Michaels (K1a-c). 2. The calligraphic samples of Amy Michaels Mrs. (K1a-c) are not consistent to those of Mr. Carl Stevens (K2a-c).
TNJWHK-524	Amy Michaels, K1, has been identified as the writer of the questioned writing appearing in Item Q1, with the exception of the questioned signature. Michaels cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing in Item Q1. Carl Stevens, K2, has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned writing appearing in Item Q1, with the exception of the questioned signature. Stevens cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing in Item Q1. The questioned writing appearing in Item Q2, with the exception of the questioned signature, was probably not written by Amy Michaels, K1, or Carl Stevens, K2. Neither Michaels nor Stevens can be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing in Item Q2.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
TPFDUG-524	The writing on Q1 was written by the writer of K1. The writing on Q2 was not written by either of the writers of K1 nor K2. The signature on Q1 was probably written by the writer of K1. The signature in Q2 was probably not written by the writer of K2. The writer of K1 cannot be identified or eliminated regarding the signature[sic] on Q2.
TVY9LR-524	It was determined that the body of the receipt, Q-1, was written by Amy Michaels, K-1. It was determined that the body of the receipt, Q-2, was not written by Amy Michaels, K-1. It could not be determined if the body of the receipt, Q-2, was written by Carl Stevens, K-2. Due to the lack of identifying detail in the signatures on Q-1 and Q-2, the writer of these signatures could not be determined.
TWA8JL-524	1.Examination, comparison and evaluation of the handwriting on the questioned and known writing samples resulted in the following opinions: a.)The questioned handwriting appearing on Q1 was written* by the author of the known writing samples (Amy Michaels/K1a-c). b.)The questioned handwriting appearing on Q1 was not written* by the author of the known writing samples (Carl Stevens/K2a-c). c.)The questioned signature appearing on Q1 probably may have been written* by the author of he[sic] known writing samples (Amy Michaels/K1a-c). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion:dissimilarities, lack of a high degree of individuality and identifiable features in the questioned signature and the known signatures. D.)The questioned signature appearing on Q1 probably may not have been written* by the author of the known writing samples (Carl Stevens/K2a-c). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: similarities, lack of a high degree of individuality and identifiable features in the questioned signature and known signatures. E.)The questioned handwriting appearing on Q2 was not written* by the author of the known writing samples (Amy Michaels/K1a-c) and (Carl Stevens/K2a-c). F.)The questioned signature appearing on Q2 probably may not have been written* by the author of the known writing samples (Amy Michaels/K1a-c) and (Carl Stevens/K2a-c). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion:similarities, lack of a high degree of individuality and identifiable features in the questioned signature and known signatures.
U7G7RN-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
UP9DZE-524	3.1 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K1a to K1c wrote the writing on the document marked Q1. 3.2 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K2a to K2c did not write the writing on the document marked Q1. 3.3 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K1a to K1c did not write the writing on the document marked Q2. 3.4 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K2a to K2c did not write the writing on the document marked Q2. 3.5 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K1a to K1c probably wrote the signature on the document marked Q1. 3.6 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K2a to K2c probably did not write the signature on the document marked Q1. 3.7 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K1a to K1c probably did not write the signature on the document marked Q2. 3.8 The evidence support the proposition that the writer of the specimen writing marked K2a to K2c probably did not write the signature on the document marked Q2.
V3UGRN-524	The results of the examination strongly support that the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q1 was written by Amy Michaels (Level +3). The results of the examination support to some extent that the questioned signature on Q1 was written by Amy Michaels (Level +1). The results of the examination support that the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q2 was not written by Amy Michaels (Level -2). The results of the examination support to some extent that the questioned signature on Q2 was not written by Amy Michaels (Level -1). The results of the examination support that the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q1 was not written by Carl Stevens (Level -2). The results of the examination support to some extent that the questioned signature on Q1 was not written by Carl Stevens (Level -1). The results of the examination support that the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Q2 was not written by Carl Stevens (Level -2). The results of the examination support to some extent that the questioned signature on Q2 was

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
VE4K9Y-523	<p>not written by Carl Stevens (Level -1).</p> <p>For the printing on document Q1: Summary of findings. The printing on document Q1 shows patterns of writing rhythms and character designs consistent with the complex patterns of printing habits defined by the exemplars for Amy Michaels. Opinions. I have considered three possible explanations for this evidence. 1) That any similarities are the result of coincidence. a. This explanation can never be completely dismissed. However, it is my opinion that coincidence has a very low likelihood of being the correct explanation for this printing. 2) That someone other than Amy Michaels imitated her printing and produced Q1. a. Even with a high level of specialized knowledge, skill and attention to detail, successful imitation of this amount of printing would be an extremely difficult task. It is my opinion that imitation or simulation has a very low likelihood of being the correct explanation for the printing on Q1. 3) That the person who produced the exemplars for Amy Michaels also printed the body of Q1. a. This explanation fully supports the evidence seen in the examination of Q1. It is my opinion that this explanation has a high potential for being the correct explanation for this printing. For the signature on Q1. Summary of findings. The signature habits defined by the exemplars for Amy Michaels have a very low level of complexity. Ms. Michaels uses a signature that many writers would be able to produce with only a moderate amount to practice. The signature on Q1 shows no hesitation and replicates the speed and flow defined by the exemplars. Opinions. For the question of validity of the Q1 signature I have given consideration to three possible explanations. 1) Coincidence. a. (same explanation as above) 2) Imitation or simulation. a. Because Q1 lacks complexity this possibility must be considered as having at least a moderate potential for being correct. 3) The writer of the Amy Michaels exemplar signatures produced the signature on Q1. a. This explanation fully supports the evidence seen in this examination. However, because of the lack of complexity this explanation must be regarded only as "probably" correct. For the printing on document Q2: Summary of findings. The printing on Q2 shows writing rhythms and character designs significantly different from the habits defined by the exemplars for Amy Michaels. Opinions on the question of Q2 having been printed by the writer of K1. I have given consideration to two possible explanations for the printing on Q2. 1) That the writer of the Amy Michaels exemplars printed Q2 and for reasons unknown did so in a printing style not represented by the exemplars she provided. a. The printing on Q2 shows indications of having been produced at a fast, natural writing speed. It includes a number to noticeable differences and also more subtle differences of writing rhythms and character designs. Based on my training and experience I do not believe this explanation has more than a very low possibility of being correct. 2) That someone other than the writer of the Amy Michaels signatures printed the body of Q2. a. This explanation fully supports the evidence seen in this examination. It is my opinion that this explanation has a high potential for correct. Opinions for the question of Q2 having been printed by the writer of K2. Summary of findings. The printing on document Q2 shows patterns of writing rhythms and character designs consistent with the printing habits defined by the exemplars for Carl Stevens (set K2). Opinions. I have considered three possible explanations for this evidence. 1) That any similarities are the result of coincidence. a. This explanation can never be completely dismissed. However, it is my opinion that coincidence has a very low likelihood of being the correct explanation for this printing. 2) That someone other than Carl Stevens imitated his printing and produced Q2. a. Even with a high level of specialized knowledge, skill and attention to detail successful imitation of the amount of printing would be an extremely difficult task. It is my opinion that imitation or simulation has a very low likelihood of being the correct explanation for the printing on Q2. 3) That the person who produced the exemplars for Carl Stevens also printed the body of Q2. a. This explanation fully supports the evidence seen in the examination of Q2. It is my opinion that this explanation has a high potential for being the correct explanation for this printing. For the signature on Q1. Summary of findings. The signature habits defined by the exemplars for Amy Michaels have a very low level of complexity. Ms. Michaels uses a signature that many writers would be able to produce with only a moderate amount to practice. The signature on Q2 shows only a slightly different stroke pattern in the name Amy. Opinions. For the question of validity of the Q2 signature I have given consideration to two possible explanations. 1) The writer of the Amy Michaels exemplar signatures produced the signature on Q2 and for some unknown reason the rhythm of the pen movements was disturbed. a. Because of the lack complexity in Ms. Michaels' signature this possibility must be considered as having at least a moderate potential for being</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	correct. 2) Imitation or simulation - meaning that someone attempted to imitate Amy Michaels' signature. A. Again, because of the lack of complexity in Ms. Michaels' signature this possibility must be considered as having at least a moderate potential for being correct. As to the possibility that Carl Stevens imitated Amy Michaels' signature - this question cannot be answered with a meaningful level of certainty. [sic]
VG9KEH-524	It is my conclusion Amy Michaels completed the body of text on the receipt listed as item 1. Carl Stevens is eliminated as a possible writer of the body of text in item 1. This elimination is based on the differences in the combination of characteristics in item 1 and the known Carl Stevens writings. Based on the submitted known writings, Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens are eliminated as possible writers of the body of text on the receipt listed as item 2. These eliminations are based on differences in the combination of characteristics between the known writings and item 2. I am unable to identify or eliminate Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens as the possible authors of the "Amy Michaels" signatures on items 1 and 2. The inconclusive results are due to the disputed "Amy Michaels" signatures being simplistic symbolic style signatures and not text-based signatures. Item 1 signature consists of a hand printed "A" followed by a squiggly line and a hand printed "M" followed by a shorter squiggly line. Item 2 consists of a cursive "A" followed by a squiggly line and a cursive "M" followed by a squiggly line. The two stylized signatures do not contain a sufficient number of individual characteristics to allow for an identification or elimination of a writer. Since the "A" and "M" in items 1 and 2 are in different formats, it is unknown if one writer prepared both signatures.
VGA6WY-523	[No Conclusions Reported.]
VH7K9V-523	1. Amy Michaels (K1a-c) wrote the non-signature entries on Q1. 2. Carl Stevens (K2a-c) did not write the non-signature entries on Q1. 3. Amy Michaels (K1a-c) and Carl Stevens (K2a-c) did not write the non-signature entries on Q2. 4. Amy Michaels (K1a-c) and Carl Stevens (K2a-c) can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer(s) of the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2. The questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 contain insufficient features for identification of their source(s) by a handwriting comparison examination.
VTNC4D-524	1. According to the individual characteristics, the written portion of "Q1" (July 31, 2014...Month of August 2014) excluding the signature, were "written" by Amy Michaels ("K1a-c"). 2. According to the individual characteristics, the written portion of "Q2" (August 31, 2014...Month of September 2014) excluding the signature, were "not written" by Amy Michaels ("K1a-c") or by Carl Stevens ("K2a-c"). 3. According to the individual characteristics, the signature portion of "Q1" (on the face) excluding the writings[sic], were "written" by Amy Michaels ("K1a-c"). 4. According to the individual characteristics, the signature portion of "Q2" (on the face) excluding the writings[sic], were "not written" by Amy Michaels ("K1a-c") or by Carl Stevens ("K2a-c").
W8M749-523	Amy Michaels has made the text and the signature on your receipt referred to as Q1, for the payment of August. Carl Stevens has made the text that appears on the receipt referred to as Q2, for the month of September. The signature on the receipt, referred to as Q2, is an imitation of the signing of Amy Michaels and it is not possible to determine whether or Carl Stevens does not participate in its implementation.[sic]
WELX9V-524	It was determined that the hand printed portion appearing on Item Q1 was prepared by Amy Michaels, the known writer of Item K1a-c. A definite conclusion could not be reached whether either of the known writers, Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, did or did not prepare the hand printing on Item Q2 due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing which could not be accounted for on the basis of the available known writing. However, inconsistencies were observed to indicate Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, and Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item Q2. No conclusion could be reached whether either of the known writers, Amy Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, or Carl Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, did or did not prepare the questioned signatures on Items Q1 and Q2 due to the limited quantity and complexity of the questioned signatures on Items Q1 and Q2 and the presence of characteristics in the questioned signatures which could not be accounted for on the basis of the available known writing. Furthermore, due to the aforementioned

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>limitations, it is doubtful that the questioned signatures appearing on Items Q1 and Q2 will ever be identified to a particular individual through handwriting comparisons.</p>
WFCN6E-524	<p>Results of Laboratory Hand Writing Comparisons: Amy Michaels produced the questioned writing on Item 3 (Q1), excluding the questioned signature on the Signature Line at the bottom of Item 3 (Q1). (Identification) There is no conclusion if Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens did or did not produce the questioned signature on the Signature Line at the bottom of Item 3 (Q1) or the questioned signature on the Signature Line at the bottom of Item 4 (Q2). (No Conclusion) There [sic] indications Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens may not have produce any of the questioned writing on Item 4 (Q2), excluding the questioned signature on the Signature Line at the bottom of Item 4 (Q2). (Indications May Not) Interpretation: The following descriptions are meant to provide context to the opinions reached in this report. Every type of conclusion may not be applicable in every case or for every exam type. Identification (definite conclusion of identity) — this is the highest degree of confidence expressed by Forensic Document Examiners. The examiner has no reservations whatsoever, and although prohibited from using the word "fact," the examiner is certain, based on evidence revealed during the examination. Highly probable did (strong probability, very probable) — the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an identification is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain based on evidence revealed during the examination. Probable did — the evidence is persuasive, yet critical features or quality is missing. The examiner is certain based on evidence revealed during the examination. During examinations, features were examined of significance and are in agreement between the questioned and known evidence; however, it falls short of the highly probable degree of confidence. Indications may have (evidence to suggest) — the evidence is persuasive, however many critical features or quality are missing. During examinations, features were examined which are of significance and are in agreement between the questioned and known evidence, however, it falls very short of the highly probable degree of confidence. No conclusion (inconclusive, indeterminable) — this is the zero point of the confidence scale. It is used when there are significantly limiting factors, such as disguise in the questioned and/or known evidence or a lack of comparable features and therefore no conclusion can be reached. Indications may not have — the evidence is persuasive, however many critical features or quality are missing. During examinations, features were examined which are of significance that are not in agreement between the questioned and known evidence; however, it falls very short of the highly probable degree of elimination. Probable did not — the evidence is persuasive, yet critical features or quality is missing. The examiner is certain based on evidence revealed during the examination. During examinations, features were examined of significance that are not in agreement between the questioned and known evidence; however, it falls short of the highly probable degree of elimination. Highly probable did not (strong probability did not) — the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing so that an elimination is not in order; however, the examiner is virtually certain based on evidence revealed during the examination. Elimination - this is the highest degree of confidence expressed by Forensic Document Examiners. The examiner has no reservations whatsoever, and although prohibited from using the word "fact," the examiner is certain, based on evidence revealed during the examination.</p>
WHK7GC-524	<p>3.1 I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the known writing marked "K1". Thus, the writer of the known writing marked "K2" is excluded is a potential writer. 3.2 I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition taht the writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q2" was not written by the writers of the known writing marked "K1" and "K2". , thus, found the evidence to strongly[sic] support the proposition that said writing and signature was written by another writer. However, the identity of this writer cannot be determined at this stage of the examination. [sic]</p>
WMDBAG-524	<p>Amy Michaels (K1) wrote the hand printing and signature on Q1. Carl Stevens (K2) did not write the hand printing or signature on Q1. Based on the present available evidence, no opinion was reached as to whether Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens wrote the hand printing or signature on Q2.</p>
WP3HRR-524	<p>Based on the examination and comparison of the question writing listed as Q1 & Q2 with the</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	known standards of Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2), I offer the following. I find that Amy Michaels positively authored the main body of K1. I find that I cannot identify or eliminate either party as the author of K2. This is based on some similarities of both parties' writing that is found on this document. However I find that there are not sufficient similarities that point to either party as the author. In addition question #2 of a separate finding of the question signatures of Q1 & Q2, I find that Amy Michaels probably did author the question signature on K1. This is opposite that I find Carl Stevens probably did not author this signature. On the signature on Q2 I find that due to the lack of individual characteristics I find that I cannot ID or eliminate either party as the author. [sic]
WR4KGT-524	Amy Michaels wrote the body of the receipt dated July 31, 2014. Carl Stevens did not write the body of the receipt dated July 31, 2014. There are pictorial similarities between the known signatures of Amy Michaels and the signature on the receipt dated July 31, 2014; however, no conclusion could be reached whether or not Amy Michaels wrote the signature on the receipt. There are pictorial dissimilarities between the known writing of Carl Stevens and the signature on the receipt dated July 31, 2014; however, no conclusion could be reached whether or not Carl Stevens wrote the signature on the receipt. Amy Michaels probably did not write the body of the receipt dated August 31, 2014. Carl Stevens probably did not write the body of the receipt dated August 31, 2014. There are pictorial dissimilarities between the known signatures of Amy Michaels and the signature on the receipt dated August 31, 2014; however, no conclusion could be reached whether or not Amy Michaels wrote the signature on the receipt. There are pictorial dissimilarities between the known writing of Carl Stevens and the signature on the receipt dated August 31, 2014; however, no conclusion could be reached whether or not Carl Stevens wrote the signature on the receipt. The examination of the signature on the receipts was limited by the stylist and simplistic manner in which they were produced.
WVLF8K-523	Similarities and no differences were observed between the K1 specimen writer and the handwritten entries on Q1. Differences were observed between the K2 specimen writer and the handwritten entries on Q1. Based on these observations, in my opinion the K1 specimen writer produced the entries on Q1. In my opinion, the K2 specimen writer did not produce the entries on Q1. Differences were observed between the K1 and the K2 specimen writers and the handwritten entries on Q2. Based on these observations and the specimen material provided, in my opinion there is qualified support for the proposition that neither the K1 or the K2 writer produced the entries on Q2. The genuine K1 signature and the signatures on Q1 and Q2 have very limited complexity. This means that it would be relatively easy for another writer to successfully simulate the signature without leaving any signs of the simulation. The K2 specimen signatures do not appear to have been fluently produced. Given the limited complexity of the questioned signatures however, my opinion with respect to the authorship of Q1 and Q2 is inconclusive.
WWGVJG-524	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the exhibits and standards submitted in this case, this examiner has reached the following opinions: Excluding the signature, the K-1 writer did write the Q-1 text. Excluding the signature, the K-1 writer probably did not write the Q-2 text. This is not a conclusive opinion due to features that cannot be reconciled with the available specimens. Additional K-1 request and nonrequest standards would be needed for further examination. Excluding the signature, there were no significant similarities to indicate that the K-2 writer wrote the Q-2 text. This is not a conclusive opinion due to the aforementioned limitation. Additional K-2 request and nonrequest standards, or any other suspect(s), would be needed for further examination. The Q-1 and Q-2 signatures are not complex, but rather simplistic and exhibit low skill. Due to this, execution of a simulation and/or disguise of these signatures could be completed rather easily by a writer. Thus, no determination of authorship can be made at this time.
WXRZUK-524	The questioned writing and signature on the payment receipt dated July 31, 2014 in Q1 have been examined and compared with the control writings and signatures written by Amy Michaels in K1a-c and those by Carl Stevens in K2a-c. Comparison between the questioned and control writing and signatures in Q1 and K1a-c respectively revealed similarities in line quality, design of letters and numerals, connection of letters and overall size of the writings as well as design, construction details and size of the signatures. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the questioned writing and signature in Q1 were written by Amy Michaels. Comparison between the questioned and control writing and

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test

Conclusions

signatures in Q1 and K2a-c respectively revealed differences in line quality, design of letters and numerals, connection of letters and overall size of the writings as well as design, construction details and size of the signatures. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the questioned writing and signature in Q1 were not written by Carl Stevens. The questioned writing and signature on the payment receipt dated August 31, 2014 rent in Q2 have been examined and compared with the control writings and signatures written by Amy Michaels in K1a-c and those by Carl Stevens in K2a-c. Comparison between the questioned writing and signature in Q2 and the two sets of control writings and signatures in items K1a-c and K2a-c revealed differences in marginal habit, design of letters and numerals, connection of letters and overall size of the writings as well as design, construction details and size of the signatures. Therefore, I am of the opinion that the questioned writing and signature in Q2 were not written by Amy Michaels or Carl Stevens.

X2WEM-523

Note: These results are based on the instructions received from Collaborative Testing Services stating that "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." In actuality, the documents examined are not originals and treating them as originals is not entirely scientific. Therefore, the results below may not accurately reflect the results we would obtain in live casework with original documents. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q1 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the writing (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif, 14-523_K1B.tif and 14-523_K1C.tif revealed numerous similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on these similarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q1 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the writing (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif, 14-523_K1B.tif and 14-523_K1C.tif share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the writing (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif, 14-523_K1B.tif and 14-523_K1C.tif revealed numerous dissimilarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on these dissimilarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the writing (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif, 14-523_K1B.tif and 14-523_K1C.tif do not share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the writing (reportedly) authored by Carl Stevens appearing in 14-523_K2A.tif, 14-523_K2B.tif and 14-523_K2C.tif revealed numerous dissimilarities in individual handwriting characteristics. Based on these dissimilarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that the Questioned handwriting appearing in Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the writing (reportedly) authored by Carl Stevens appearing in 14-523_K2A.tif, 14-523_K2B.tif and 14-523_K2C.tif do not share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned "Amy Michaels" signature appearing in Q1 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the "Amy Michaels" signatures (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif and 14-523_K1B.tif revealed some similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on these similarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that it is highly probable that the Questioned "Amy Michaels" signature appearing in Q1 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the "Amy Michaels" signatures (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif and 14-523_K1B.tif share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned "Amy Michaels" signature appearing in Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the "Amy Michaels" signatures (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif and 14-523_K1B.tif revealed some dissimilarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on these dissimilarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that it is highly probable that the Questioned "Amy Michaels" signature appearing in Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the "Amy Michaels" signatures (reportedly) authored by Amy Michaels appearing in 14-523_K1A.tif and 14-523_K1B.tif do not share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned "Amy Michaels" signatures appearing in Q1 and Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the "Amy Michaels" signatures (reportedly) authored by Carl Stevens appearing in 14-523_K2A.tif and 14-523_K2B.tif revealed some dissimilarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on these dissimilarities, it is the opinion of the

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	undersigned examiners that it is highly probable that the Questioned "Amy Michaels" signature appearing in Q1 and Q2 in 14-523_Q1_Q2.tif and the "Amy Michaels" signatures (reportedly) authored by Carl Stevens appearing in 14-523_K2A.tif and 14-523_K2B.tif do not share common authorship.
X6TCQG-524	Amy Michaels (K1) wrote the non-signature portion of Q1. There are strong indications (meaning virtual certainty) she (Michaels) also wrote the signature on Q1. There are strong indications Carl Stevens (K2) did not write the "Amy Michaels" signature on Q1. The non-signature portion of Q2 was not written by Michaels or Stevens. There are indications (meaning a high degree of likelihood) Michaels did not write the "Amy Michaels" signature on Q2. There are limited indications (meaning a likelihood) Stevens also did not write this signature. This "Amy Michaels" signature on Q2 displays features and characteristics suggesting that it may have been the result of an attempt on the part of the writer to imitate the signature style of Michaels.
XEFZEC-524	3.1 In respect of the writing in question: 3.1.1 I found the evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the known writing marked "K1". The writer of the known writing marked "K2" is, thus, eliminated as a potential writer. 3.1.2 In respect of the writing on the document marked "Q2", I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the writing in question was not written by either writer of the known writings marked "K1" and "K2". 3.2 In respect of the signatures in question: 3.2.1 I found the evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the known writing marked "K1". The writer of the known writing marked "K2" is, thus, eliminated as a potential writer. 3.2.2 I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the signature in question on the document marked "Q2" was not written by either writer of the known writings marked "K1" and "K2".
XJUG7N-524	1. The receipt of payment Q1 was written and signed by Amy Michaels. 2. The receipt of payment Q2 was not written nor signed by Amy Michaels. It was neither written by Carl Stevens. 3. It is not possible to include or exclude Carl Stevens as the source of the signature in the receipt of payment Q2.
XU77KJ-524	1. K1 (Amy Michaels) wrote the questioned writings above the signature on the Q1 document. 2. K1 (Amy Michaels) is probably responsible for the signature on the Q1 document. 3. K1 (Amy Michaels) is probably not responsible for the questioned writings above the signature on the Q2 document. 4. Because simulation or disguise can not be eliminated on the Q2 writings, K1 (Amy Michaels) is probably not the writer and K2 (Carl Stevens) can not be identified or eliminated as being the writer.
XUMUTJ-524	The writer of K1 can be identified within the limits of practical certainty* as having written the questioned body particulars on Item Q1. I am unable to identify or eliminate this writer as having written the questioned body particulars and signature on Item Q2 and the questioned signature on Item Q1. The writer of K2 did not write the questioned body particulars on Item Q1. I am unable to identify or eliminate this writer as having written the questioned body particulars and signature on Item Q2 and the questioned signature on Item Q1. LIMITATIONS: * Practical Certainty: Since it is not possible to collect and examine samples of everyone's handwriting, it is not possible to make an identification with absolute certainty. However, all scientific research to date and the continuous inability to disprove the principle that no two people share the same combination of handwriting habits have demonstrated that even without a numerical threshold, handwriting examiners can reliably make identifications. Document examination is an empirical science that relies on objective observation of individual features and a subjective assessment of those features.
Y6AD4Q-523	Amy Michaels (K-1) wrote the questioned entries on Exhibit Q-1, excluding the 'Amy Michaels' signature. Amy Michaels (K-1) probably wrote the 'Amy Michaels' questioned signature on Exhibit Q-1 Amy Michaels (K-1) and Carl Stevens (K-2) did not write the questioned entries on Exhibit Q-2, excluding the 'Amy Michaels' signature. Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens could neither be identified nor eliminated as having written the questioned 'Amy Michaels' signature on Exhibit Q-2. The limited nature of the 'Amy Michaels' signature and unreconciled differences were limiting factors.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
YBAGLK-524	I have determined that the K1 writer prepared the text portion of the Q1 specimen. It is also probable that the K1 writer prepared the signature on the Q1 specimen. I have determined that the K2 writer did not prepare the text portion of the Q1 specimen. There is no evidence within the K2 known samples which suggest that the K2 writer prepared the signature on the Q1 specimen. There is no evidence within the known writing which suggests that either the K1 or K2 writers prepared the text portion of specimen Q2. There is no evidence within the known writings which suggest that the K2 writer prepared the signature on specimen Q2. Due to the lack of a sufficient number of known signatures from the K1 writer, no conclusion can be reached as to whether or not the K1 writer prepared the Q2 signature.
YBAX4Z-524	The evidence at hand supports the following hypotheses: 1. The writing on "Q1" was written by the author of "K1"; 2. The writing on "Q1" was not written by the author of "K2"; 3. The writing on "Q2" was written by the author of "K2"; 4. The writing on "Q2" was not written by the author of "K1"; 5. The signature on "Q1" was probably written by the author of "K1"; 6. The signature on "Q2" was not written by the author of "K1"; 7. Common authorship cannot be identified or eliminated between "K2" and neither of the questioned signatures on "Q1" and "Q2".
YCKATA-524	Amy Michaels wrote the questioned writing of Q1. Amy Michaels wrote the questioned signature of Q1. Amy Michaels didn't write the questioned writing of Q2. Amy Michaels didn't write the questioned signature of Q2. Carl Stevens didn't write the questioned writing of Q2. The questioned signature of Q2 was probably not written by Carl Stevens.
YDEXAK-524	The non-signature portions of item #Q1 were executed by the writer of items #K1a-c, Amy Michaels. The non-signature portions of item #Q2 were probably NOT executed by either of the known writers. An examination of additional course-of-business writing of both Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens may provide the basis for a more definite conclusion. The simplistic nature of the signatures appearing on items #Q1 and #Q2 prevents a determination of authorship.
YNW6YF-523	Q-1. The writer of K1a-K1c was identified to have written the writing appearing on Q-1, except signature. It is probable the writer of K1a-K1c signed the signature appearing on Q-1. The writer of K2a-K2c was eliminated as the writer of Q-1. It is probable the writer of K2a-K2c did not sign Q-1. Q-2. The writer of K1a-K1c was eliminated as the writer of Q-2. It is probable the writer of K1a-K1c did not sign Q-2. It is probable the writer of K2a-K2c did not write or sign Q-2.
YWQAU3-524	1 - The questioned writing including the signature on the questioned receipt (Q1) was written by the original renter, Amy Michaels. 2 - The questioned writing including the signature on the questioned receipt (Q2) neither was written by the original renter, Amy Michaels, nor by the subletter, Carl Stevens.
YVWUH7-524	3.1 After comparison and examination, I reached the following conclusions in terms of Questioned document marked "Q1": 3.1.1 Similarities occur between the writing on the questioned document and the specimen writing marked "K1a-K1c", which support evidence to conclude that the same writer is involved. 3.1.2 Due to a lack of sufficient individualising characteristics and the fact that the questioned signature is neither complex nor intricate in nature, a definite finding could not be reached. There is, nonetheless, a degree of similarity which occurs between the questioned signature and the specimen signatures marked "K1a-K1c", suggesting that the same writer was probably involved. 3.2 After comparison and examination, I reached the following conclusions in terms of Questioned document marked "Q2": 3.2.1 Differences occur between the questioned writing and the specimen writing marked "K1a-K1c" and "K2a-K2c", which support the conclusion that different writers are involved. 3.2.2 Due to a lack of sufficient individualising characteristics and the fact that the questioned signature is neither complex nor intricate in nature, a definite finding could not be reached. There is, nonetheless, some differences between the questioned signature and the specimen signatures marked "K1a-K1c" and "K2a-K2c", suggesting that the questioned signature is probably a simulated (forged) signature.
YXKZZG-524	It was concluded the author of Item K1a-c, Amy Michaels, prepared the Item Q1 receipt. Strong indications were also found she prepared the signature on Item Q1, however, due to the abbreviated structure of the signature, a positive conclusion could not be rendered. Strong indications were found the authors of Item K1a-c and Item K2a-c, did not prepare the receipt on

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	Item Q2. Also, no conclusion could be reached whether or not they prepared the signature on Item Q2 due to the simple structure of the questioned signature. The similarities or differences observed were not sufficient to either identify or eliminate them as the author.
Z4TJYA-524	The writer of the specimen writing on documents K1 (a-c), purportedly Amy Michaels, wrote the questioned handwriting, excluding the signature on document Q1. It was not possible to determine whether or not the writers of the specimen writing on: K1 (a-c) purportedly Amy Michaels and K2(a-c) purportedly Carl Stevens wrote the questioned handwriting on document Q2. Due to the low complexity of the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 it was not possible to determine whether or not the writers of K1 (a-c) and K2(a-c) wrote the questioned signatures.
Z7R2TV-523	Q1 belonged to Amy while Q2 belonged to Carl. From K1b, a few noticeable handwriting habits which are natural to Amy can be seen in Q1 rather than in Q2. The noticeable habits are : i) The writing of 'a'. It tends to missing a tail. ii)The letter 'f' tends to have a longer tail which form a loop. iii) The 'r' tends to connect to the letter 'e'. iv) The letter 'g' and 'd' tends to have loops. v) The 'i' dot tends to have a loop. vi) The number '2' tends to have a loop. Q2 belonged to Carl. Although he may try to imitate Amy's handwriting but he will not be able to imitate her habitual style which is only unique to her. i) The 'm' in Carl's tend to be a curve while Amy's is a sharp. ii) The 'f' does not have a loop feature. iii) His 'l' is different from Amy's. iv) His '2' does not have a loop. v)His 'i' dot tends to be on the right side.
ZNWY6K-524	Results and Conclusions: The writer of the standards submitted as Items K-1a-c, reportedly Amy Michaels, is identified as the writer of the text portion of Item Q-1. There are indications this writer may have written the signature on this receipt, but the signature is very simple and lacking in identifying features. This writer probably did not write the text on Item Q-2 and there are indications she may not have written the signature. The writer of the standards submitted as Items K-2a-c, reportedly Carl Stevens, is eliminated as the writer of the text portion of Item Q-1. There are indications this writer may not have written the signature on Item Q-1. This writer probably did not write the text portion of Item Q-2 and there are indications he may not have written the signature. Again, the signatures are very simple and lacking in identifying features.
ZPMP6C-524	The questioned handwritings (Q1 and Q2) show many similarities and no significant differences when compared with the handwritings of Amy Michaels (K1a – K1c). These factors amount to very strong positive evidence to support the view that the two Receipts (Q1 and Q2) were written by her. The evidence is not entirely conclusive, largely because of the limited amount of material for comparison. However, it is most unlikely that either Receipt (Q1 or Q2) was written by anyone other than Ms Michaels. There are similarities in style between the questioned handwritings (Q1 and Q2) and the handwritings of Carl Stevens (K2a – K2c). However, there are differences present. The number and nature of the differences observed amount to strong positive evidence to support the view that he did not write either Receipt (Q1 or Q2). The evidence is not entirely conclusive but it is unlikely that he made these handwritings. The signatures of Ms Michaels are simple in structure and only six specimen signatures (K1a and K1b) have been provided for examination. These specimens (K1a and K1b) are unlikely to demonstrate the full range of natural variation occurring in Ms Michaels's signature. I am, therefore, unable to reach any conclusions regarding the signatures on the questioned Receipts (Q1 and Q2).
ZQGFBBQ-523	Handwriting examination showed that the questioned writing and signature on the Receipt of payment for August 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014 (Item Q1) were written by Amy Michaels, whose known writings (K1a-c) were examined, and she did not write any of questioned writing nor questioned signature on the questioned Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 (Item Q2). Carl Stevens, whose known writing samples (K2a-c) were examined, did not write any of questioned writing nor questioned signature on the Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014 (Item Q2).
ZX3FMX-523	Q 1 BELONG TO AMY, HER HANDWRITING IS CURSIVE, MOST NOTABLE IS LETTER "G". HER LETTER "Y" DOES NOT CURVE UP, SO IT LOOKS LIKE A "U" WITH A LONG TAIL. HER "M" STARTS SHORT SO IT LOOKED LIKE IT'S WRITTEN IN ONE STROKE e.g. LETTER "M" ,LETTER "X" STARTS FROM LEFT Q 2 BELONGS TO CARL . HIS HANDWRITINGIS[sic] OPPOSITE[sic] OF AMY'S.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
ZZPHKB-524	<p>HIS 'G' DOES NOT CURVE UP. HIS 'Y' IS FORMED BY TWO STROKES. HIS 'M' STARTS LONG SO THE TIP IS VISIBLE . HIS 'X' STARTS FROM THE RIGHT.</p> <p>There are limited indications MICHAELS may have written the questioned signature reproduced on Exhibit 3 (Q1). This finding is limited due to the abbreviated nature of the questioned signature and the absence of sufficient individual indentifying characteristics. There are limited indications that STEVENS may not have written the questioned signature reproduced on Exhibit 3 (Q1). This finding is limited due to the abbreviated nature of the questioned signature and the absence of sufficient individual indentifying characteristics. MICHAELS wrote the remaining handwritten entries reproduced on Exhibit 3 (Q1). MICHAELS and STEVENS could neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer (s) of any of the questioned entries on Exhibit 4 (Q2). Similarities and dissimilarities were observed for both MICHAELS and STEVENS in comparison to the questioned entries on Exhibit 4 (Q2). A determination could not be made as to whether or not the questioned writing is the result of un- natural writing (e.g., disguise, off-hand, internal/external factors, etc.) from either known writer or possibly another writer; the result of an attempt at simulating the genuine writing and/or signature of MICHAELS; or writing from an unknown writer(s). The examination and comparison of the questioned signature on Exhibit 4 (Q2) was also limited due to the abbreviated nature of the questioned signature and the absence of sufficient individual indentifying characteristics. An adequate basis for a stronger opinion statement may be provided through an examination of Exhibits 1(1-3), 2(1-3) and 4 in conjunction with additional exact text exemplars and course of business writings completed by MICHAELS and STEVENS. If possible, the original document used to produce Exhibit 4 should also be submitted for examination. [sic]</p>

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
28NRKV-523	by extending the above samples in content and signatures are required , if possible, extra- material contribution. [sic]
2E74XW-523	In the case of Carl Stevens, the answers are D , which calls for the extension of the standard samples which were few and similar graphical features found later to find a definitive answer. The answer B and D probability is given by the fact that our protocol [Country] graphology studies contemplated confidently assert the existence of handwritten uniprocedencia occurs when the expert reviewed the original documents for when examining the digital copies answer is for guidance only . In this case , evidence of CTS regardless mentioning us to assume the digital copies as if they were the originals, my concept must adhere to our current protocol and therefore need to supplement my answers if I look at the original. I therefore respectfully suggest that for future tests that I consider very important and necessary to review and adjust our protocols if necessary studies propose that CTS original documents . Given that the objective of the CTS test is to obtain the respective one of our handwriting analysis , if I called as an expert witness in trial hearing and I wonder if I participated in interlaboratory tests , I must respond to other and with CTS , and if you ask me if the analyzes performed on the original document , I must answer no, that did about digital copies should assume as if they were original . This would imply a contradiction against our current protocol graphology Studies and cause my discredit an expert witness . Furthermore, our studies to prove handwriting as a laboratory must first be subject to an external audit that I most certainly do the same question . Therefore , I must be consistent with the Protocol . [sic]
33N3E9-524	The signature Amy Michaels contained limited writing and an awkward execution in the first name Amy. Additional known specimens are requested from both authors for additional review of their handwriting habit. It is also requested any information concerning either authors ability to write with their non accustomed hand. The Q2 signature Amy Michaels contains areas of awkward writing that may not be the natural writing of the author.
36Q2P2-524	As the result of comparison between the signature on Q2 and know signatures of Carl Stevens, It has been seen there are differences in terms of forming of the "A" and "M" letters and similarities in terms of forming of the lineal hand movement at the end of the signature . And also because of being this signature an imitation , generally it is not passible to see characteristics of the signature of the one who forms this signature so the person who forms this imilated signature can not be identified or eliminated. [sic]
38KRVF-523	Regarding the test format: The CTS conclusion "B-Was PROBABLY WRITTEN BY (some degree of identification)" is confusing. The published standard for QD report wording includes "Probable" as one of its accepted conclusions, along with "Highly probable" and "Indications" to indicate some degree of identification. With the conclusion choice worded as it is, the test taker may have been hesitant to choose "B" when they had, in fact, reached an "indications" conclusion. The result that was submitted for this test was "B", however, the intention was that choice B was meant to include an "indications did write" conclusion. With the evidence being digital images, examiners were unable to examine the direction of lines and other fine details. Regarding the known writing: It seems unlikely in a real case that the K2 writer (Carl Stevens), would write his repetitions of the "Amy Stevens[sic]" signature in such a similar manner to the questioned signatures (one legible letter for the first and last name, each followed by a wavy line) unless he was told to do so; I would probably call the submitting agent/officer to discuss this. Additional known writing from the K2 writer (Carl Stevens) would have been requested to determine the full range of his handwriting characteristics. The collected K2 exemplars (K2c) were more neatly written than the dictated K2 exemplars (K2a/K2b). Regarding "no conclusion" results": The questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 and Q2 contained very limited identifying characteristics, which did not provide a sufficient basis for identifying or eliminating either writer. Regarding additional examinations: The questioned exhibits would be examined using the ESDA and the VSC.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
39FAY3-524	The current specimen signatures is quantitatively unsatisfactory for a complete examination to be conducted. Therefore, the procurement of sufficient amount (15-20) of course-of-business (collected) signatures of the complainant on any (undisputed) document, such as bank documents, invoices, receipts, claim forms, letters etc, relative to the date of the documents in question, are requested for re-examination purposes.
3KBWC6-524	I am not able to draw a significant conclusion from the findings as there is only one questioned signature that is limited in its handwriting characteristics. If more course of business signatures in the name of Amy Michaels were available for examination there is a possibility that I could reach a more definite conclusion.
3MYX9Z-524	In real cases we don't work with copies or photographs if possible. If we can't get originals, we never conclude with higher degree than probability. Since one can't see all details in copies or photographs it can lead to the wrong conclusion. Especially with the simple signatures like in this test. In such cases photographs can lead to the wrong conclusion. While taking comparison handwriting (signatures) from the person K2 he was obviously shown questioned signatures. In our opinion a person whose handwriting is taken should never see questioned material. That sort of handwriting is not spontaneous and it is possible that it shows other than the writers handwriting characteristics. Therefore we excluded K2 signatures from the examination. Comparing questioned signatures with the text we could use only two letters which led to the inconclusive result.
3V7374-524	All the conclusions concerning the signatures are inconclusive because of the simplicity of the signatures. The signature of Q1 fits in the variation of the samples of Amy Michaels but we can't exclude the possibility that it could be a skillful imitation according to the model.
4WGY2E-524	The signatures are extremely simplistic in design. As such we cannot comment on the authorship of the signatures.
6QKP9R-523	It requires extending the material known writings and the like Mr. CARL STEVENS, with previous receipts of rent, which may clarify the divergence between writing samples taken and documents "K2C" above to enlarge the radius of study to take a clear and reasoned conclusion. [sic]
6QLLN-524	The Exhibit Q1 has a July 31, 2014 date. The Exhibit Q2 has an August 31, 2014 date. Your answer sheet is labeled incorrectly. Our laboratory uses the 9 point opinion scale; not the five point scale utilized in this test. If I was allowed to use the 9 point scale my opinions would be different than what I provided for this test. The questioned signatures on Exhibits Q1 & Q2 lack sufficient detail for handwriting comparison purposes.
6U4LXH-524	The writings and signature in the receipt of payment Q2 show some similarities with those from Amy Michaels (K1a-c). The analysis is limited by the quality and quantity of samples to be compared.
73E6XT-524	The known signatures provided by "K2" are not natural signatures and do not display individuality on which to base a finding.
76MFQQ-523	With respect to the conclusions that not be encarta or discarded to Mr Carl Stevens in the development of writing and signature, is required to receive a new test sample manuscrituales and the achievement of a greater material extraproceto [sic]

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
7FZFKY-524	Current known signatures are quantitatively unsatisfactory. As a result, a definite conclusion could not be reached. Similarities between a disputed signature on a document marked as "Q1" and the known signatures of "K1" were observed, however, the current known signatures failed to address a difference in connection between the 1st two letters. Analysis, comparison and evaluation of the disputed and known material revealed that a document marked as "Q2" was forged through simulation. Minor similarities due to habits were observed between "Q2" and "K2" which indicates that "K2" probably forged a disputed document marked as "Q2". Differences observed could be due to deliberate disguise of the author's identifying characteristics and simulating the writing habits of "K1" so that it can appear as if "K1" is the author. Identifying authorship of writing which is disguised and simulated is extremely challenging. Was "K2" dictated or shown the signature of "K1" to sign or copy? The current signatures are not complex in nature and are easy to duplicate.
7J4DRK-523	The submission of the original documents in Exhibits Q1, Q2, K1 and K2 along with additional known normal-course-of-business signatures of Amy Michaels, may provide the basis for additional conclusions.
7VWA3C-524	Q2 signature inconclusive result: The questioned signature appearing on the document in Item Q2 displays some constructional differences to the specimen signatures appearing on the documents in Items K1 and K2. Similarities and differences were observed between the questioned signature and specimen signatures. Due to the simplistic nature of the signature, and the constructional differences, these similarities and dissimilarities were unable to be fully evaluated. Further, the possibility of simulation or disguise could not be excluded. Therefore, the result of my examination of the questioned signature on Item Q2 is inconclusive. That is, neither of the specimen writers could be identified or eliminated.
7XKBWL-524	Answer C: Because of the brevity and simplicity of Amy Michael's known signature, we can't identify[sic] or eliminate any writer when it comes to Q2's signature
8A96VD-523	Note: The opinions are based on the fact that the documents submitted from Collaborative Testing Services are not original and therefore cannot be positively identified or eliminated.
8E6GLQ-523	CARL STEVENS CAN NOT BE IDENTIFIED AND DELETED in the manufacture of filling out and signing the document Q2 , because the value the graphic elements of undoubted material of Mr. Carl Stevens expose ambivalences . While the document Q2 both in the processing and signature are constants particular to the clerk , so is there the presence of variables, which limit the possibility of encartar the clerk albeit with some degree of probability , as it is uncertain whether these variables depend on the spontaneous expression of amanuensis or is it a flaw in this sampling . According to the above I request that samples be extended and manuscriturales greater number of -court material is attached , to assess the characteristics and variables that are constant over amanuensis . [sic]
8MH6LK-524	Due to the nature of the signature being simple and scribbled a conclusive evidence[sic] could not be reached as to the author of the signature because another person can make a similar signature.
8T3Z82-524	For Response "C" 1) Q2 signature entry pictorally similar to K1. 2) K2 upper case letters different than Q2 upper case letters. 3) K2 lower case letters somewhat similar to Q2 lowercase letters in that they are an illegable scrawl/and only grossly pictorally similar. 4) The act of simulating a signature requires the copying/drawing/tracing of the writing habits of the victim (in this case Michaels (K1) and the simulator does not write with his/her own handwriting habit patterns that may be individual to him/her. Thus, no significant handwriting habit patterns are in the "Amy Michaels" signature entry on Q2. [sic]
92APDR-524	1. K2 cannot be identified or eliminated whether he wrote signature on "Q2", due to the limited amount of specimen signatures of "K2" and lack of corresponding features and specimen signatures of K2 that cannot be exhibited on the signature in question of Q2.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
9NAQQV-524	The signature on the (Q2)is forged.
9YQEGM-523	It is recommended that additional handwriting samples be obtained from the K1 and K2 writers for further examination and comparison to Q2.
A4ZBKN-523	Use the "c " option , because in the grafonomico analysis was evident that the pattern variability and presents material provided convergence between samples and manuscriturales -court documents and this does not allow certainty about the authorship of texts and document signing Q2. More material is required pattern . [sic]
ADLL39-524	The signature examination was limited by the simplistic nature of the signature. The Q2 signature displays both similarities and differences with the comparison K1 and K2 signatures. The observed features may be attributed to a disguise or simulation behaviour.
AHWCDN-523	The justification of 'C': The evaluation of the findings is almost equal (at zero point) to both 'directions' and this doesn't give us the confidence to express any positive or negative conclusion (K1 cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the Q2 signature).
AHYW8J-524	Limitations for the following conclusion (C): limited complexity and limited unique identifying characteristics of the questioned signatures.
AM9DHT-523	Request the original questioned documents so they can be examined for latent indentations.
AV2K2Y-524	The requested signatures on documents "K2a" and "K2b" provided by "K2" are not his natural signatures and therefore lack his individuality, therefore inhibiting natural variation. Significant features can therefore not be compared to the signatures in question. The lack of sufficient discernable characteristics of the questioned signatures also limits individuality and comparison.
BEBDQY-524	In the hypothesis of the questioned[sic] signature being a forgery of an already relatively simple signature, only the mistakes in the forgery can be of use to identify a scriptor. In this instance, there remains too few of these characteristics to use for comparison to identify or eliminate a suspect.
BEUQ6H-524	C was selected for the results on the signatures on Items Q1 and Q2 due to the lack of unique identifying characteristics (the signatures were too basic and enough significant characteristics could not be examined).
BGYCWP-524	Reasons for no conclusions for "K2": The evidence at hand proves these are unnatural signatures and lack individuality. Since signature examination is based on comparison of discriminating elements (which one is not present in this case) no conclusion can be reached.
BKH9LF-524	The photographs that [sic] sent for the examination are assumed to be true and accurate reproductions of the original documents.
BQMALA-524	Item 1: Both similar and dissimilar identifying characteristics were found in the body of the rental receipt in Q2 and K2, and therefore, no conclusion could be reached regarding authorship of the questioned writing. Item 2: The signatures in Q1, Q2, K1, and K2 were illegible, and therefore, it was not possible to locate sufficient identifying characteristics pointing to or away from the writers.
C6XE4L-524	For questioned signature on Q1, the term probably has been used as routine signature of Amy Michaels have not been provided and provided dictated signatures are less in number. For questioned signature on Q2, the term "No Conclusion" has been used as there is very less[sic] letter details present in questioned signature, no routine signatures of suspect is provided and the dictated signatures of both suspect are less in number.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
C9222K-524	The author of the questioned handwriting and signature on the rent receipt, Q2, cannot be identified. The exemplars from Amy Michaels and the exemplars from Carl Stevens did not contain handwriting characteristics that were consistent with the questioned handwriting and signature on Q2. Some of the inconsistencies in handwriting characteristics include the method of construction of letters, left alignment, punctuation, letter combinations, letter height proportions, lead-in strokes, ending strokes, right alignments, speed, rhythm, pressure patterns, letter, and number designs.
CHQ3P3-524	Q1 and Q2 signatures could not be determined. The questioned signatures and the request standard signatures are so stylized and contain enough variation to make it prudent to not make a determination on these signatures with the standards provided. The questioned signatures are simply printed initials and wavy lines. This signature would be relatively easy for a skilled individual to simulate. Compared to the standards it is unknown if discrepancies are differences or variation. It may not even be possible to determine with additional standards.
D8NW22-523	Suggest investigators consider obtaining 'normal course of business' writing and request writing from a THIRD writer, if one is identified.
DAC6B3-524	Due to the simplistic nature of the Amy Michaels signatures, both questioned and known, it was not possible to perform a proper forensic comparative handwriting examination of the signatures. Although the Known and Questioned Amy Michaels signatures were consistent, the significance of the handwriting characteristics was limited due to the simplistic nature of the signatures. Note: Additionally, I have concerns that the Amy Michaels signatures written by Carl Stevens may have been improperly collected. I believe that the Carl Stevens writer may have been instructed (or shown) how to write "Amy Michaels". Carl Stevens chose to write "Amy Michaels" in the same abbreviated manner that appears on the questioned documents. I find this to be highly suspect and unlikely to occur without some outside influence.
DP3BGB-524	Sample Q2 shows some common characteristics to K2a-c but these are not enough to reach a sound conclusion.
E8G7CU-524	The signature on the questioned documents marked "Q1" was probably executed by the author of the specimen writing marked "K1a" to "K1c". The signature on questioned document marked "Q2" was probably not written by the author of "K2a" to "K2c".
EBKA94-524	Further handwriting specimens of Carl Stevens may allow a conclusion to be reached with respect to whether or not this person wrote the Q2 writing. The findings expressed above are subject to confirmation and possible strengthening following submission for examination of the original questioned and specimen documents. Submission of the original questioned documents would also allow examination of the questioned documents for the possible presence of writing impressions using the Electrostatic Detection Apparatus (ESDA). Such writing impressions if detected can provide further information about the origins of questioned documents. If the receipts come from a book of receipts, receipts that may have been adjacent to the questioned documents should be submitted for ESDA examination. If the receipts are computer generated, comparative examinations of the printed text, printer "trash marks" and printer transportation marks could provide useful additional information regarding their origins. Information should also be provided as to how Mr Stevens was asked to write signatures in the name Amy Michaels on K2a and K2b. From the gross pictorial similarity in styles, it appears in the K2 specimens either that Carl Stevens had knowledge of the general signature style of Amy Michaels or was asked to write a signature imitating her signature style (which would be an irregular occurrence). It could be relevant to know if he had an example of a genuine Amy Michaels signature at the time he was requested to provide the specimen signatures or if he was asked to write it from memory.
EWGHCK-524	IN OUR LABORATORY, WE HAVE A LEVEL BETWEEN "A" AND "B" IN OUR SCALE. IF WE COULD, WE WOULD SELECT, NOT "A" BUT LET'S SAY "B+" ON THE QUESTIONED[sic] WRITING OF Q1(AUG.RECEIPT) OF AMY MICHAELS AND ALSO "B+" ON THE QUESTIONED[sic] WRITING OF Q2(SPT.RECEIPT)OF CARL STEVENS.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
FCREEJ-524	The signature of Q2 is not a real signature, and doesn't contains naturally occurring discriminating elements. A conclusion regarding authorship cannot be reach. [sic]
FJRYFU-524	The simplistic design of the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 precluded a stronger conclusion.
G26ARX-524	The qualified opinion expressed above [Table 2: Conclusions] is due in part to the photographic nature of the submitted evidence. It would be of value in this case to obtain the originals of the questioned and known material for further examination.
GRECUK-524	The signature specimens provided by "K2" for comparison purposes are not natural signatures. As such the signatures do not display discriminating elements on which to base an inclusionary or exclusionary opinion.
HVW97U-524	Q2 signature is of an abbreviated nature and there is a possibility of simulation.
JFEXTQ-524	The nature of the sample digital imaging instaed of the original samples (questionned and know writing) requires some precautions. [sic]
JFXBBV-524	The signatures on Q1 and Q2 are abbreviated and contain limited identifiable individual characteristics.
JH483R-524	See comments above [Table 2: Conclusions] for an explanation of the inconclusive opinion regarding the Q2 signature. Our laboratory uses the SWGDOC conclusion scale. The opinion issued in regards to the Q1 signature would have been one step above the inconclusive level but below the probably wrote level for the K1 contributor. Likewise, the opinion issued in regards to the Q1 signature would have been one step above the inconclusive level but below the probably did not write level for the K2 contributor. Given the choices available to select from to report examination results, choices B and D, seemed the most appropriate for this examination rather than cannot be identified or eliminated.
KCDD4X-523	The results are opinions and interpretations formed using accepted scientific and professional practices. The submission of a sufficient quantity of signature specimens (at least 20-30) from the K1 and K2 writers may result in more definitive conclusions. The submission of additional handprinting and numeral specimens from the K1 and K2 writers that are similar in content and format to Q1 and Q2 may result in more definitive conclusions.
KXBBW6-523	A slightly qualified (highly probable) opinion was expressed with respect to the Q1 signature due to its low complexity. Similarities and differences in handwriting features were observed in comparing the writing appearing on Q2 and the writing appearing on items K1a-c and K2a-c, respectively. An inconclusive opinion (cannot identify or eliminate) was expressed due to the presence of a number of unaccounted for features. Similarities and differences were observed in comparing the questioned signature appearing on Q2 and the submitted specimen signatures appearing on items K1a-c and K2a-c, respectively. An inconclusive opinion (cannot be identified or eliminated) was expressed with respect to the questioned "Amy Michaels" signature appearing on item Q2 due to its low complexity and the presence of some unaccounted for features.
LA7L3Q-524	The questioned signatures in "Q1" and "Q2" cannot be identified or eliminated to the writer "K2" because the specimen signatures are simulated.
M4F4AT-524	Good, fair test.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
M7467M-524	<p>1) It would be standard practice to undertake ESDA examination of the questioned documents. 2) With respect to examination responses: A '1' was entered as a conclusion with respect to the Q1 handwriting and the K2 specimen writer. A '1' was entered as a conclusion with respect to the Q1 signature and the K2 specimen writer. This was purposeful since another writer was identified in relation to the questioned handwriting/signature. No examination was therefore conducted between the already identified questioned handwriting/signature and any other author.</p>
MMPQPD-524	<p>The specimen signature on K2 is not the person's real signature, it does not exhibit natural discrimination[sic] elements. Therefore no conclusions can be made.</p>
NGVHRH-524	<p>Reference Conclusion 3: An examination and comparison of the questioned handwriting (excluding signatures) on Exhibit Q2 with the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2 (a to c) (Carl Stevens) has disclosed some handwriting similarities together with several features that have not been accounted for. The examination, however, has been restricted due to the quality of the specimen handwriting. The specimen handwriting displays areas of inconsistent slope and style of writing. Particularly, the requested writing on K2 (a and b) and the collected handwriting on K2 (c) vary in handwriting style. In order to properly assess the features that have not been accounted for as either differences or variation it is necessary that there is confidence that the specimen handwriting is freely written and displays the full range of natural handwriting habits of the writer. If a further examination is to be performed then I would request additional collected handwriting in an attempt to resolve this issue and reach a more definitive conclusion. Reference Conclusion 4: The questioned signature is comprised of two letters and two wavy lines. The lack of complexity involved in producing this signature has restricted the examination. Reference Conclusion 7: An examination and comparison of the questioned handwritten "Amy Michaels" signature on Exhibit Q2 with the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2 (a to c) (Carl Stevens) has disclosed that there may have been an attempt by a writer to simulate or copy a genuine "Amy Michaels" signature. The questioned signature bears a similar appearance to genuine "Amy Michaels" signatures however there are significant differences between this signature and genuine signatures, K1 (a to c). A simulation by its nature may be void of the individual handwriting habits of the writer. In producing a simulation the writer attempts to copy the appearance of the genuine signature and not write with their normal or usual handwriting habits. It is for this reason that though there are no significant similarities found between the questioned signature on Q2 and K2 specimen signatures a conclusion could not be reached.</p>
NPMQ2U-524	<p>i. In reference to para (v) of question No. 3 [Table 2 - Conclusions] above, as the questioned signature in 'Q1' showed both similarities and differences in handwriting characteristic with/from the specimen signatures in 'K1a' to 'K1c', I was unable to form an opinion regarding the authorship of this question signature.</p>
P6FB4G-523	<p>Submission of two types of additional known writing samples by Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens could enhance a subsequent examination of this case and may result in a more conclusive opinion. These samples are: Requested - These samples should be taken on twenty (20) or thirty (30) sheets of paper, duplicating the questioned document(s) in size, shape, and format. The text of the questioned document(s) should be written verbatim, at the dictation of the investigating officer. Do not allow the writer to see the questioned writing prior to producing the samples, and remove each exemplar from view after it is written. Collected - Provable writing samples that were produced in the past during the course of the subject's normal daily affairs, such as legitimate canceled checks, job applications, court records, etc. These samples help verify that the writing samples taken at the request of the investigating officer are normally written. These samples also offer a broader range of an individual's writing for examination.</p>
PULTWV-524	<p>This examination has been conducted using the adopted ASTM International Standard Guideline for Examination of Handwritten Items.</p>

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
PV93FN-524	Question: Are the signatures genuine signatures of real people or are they 'made up'? If they are not the real signatures of real people but have been made up for the purpose of the trial then they won't show a person's real range of variation and so hinders comparison. We have given level C (cannot be identified or eliminated) as the result for the cheque Q1 signature vs. Amy Michaels. In reality our opinion level is somewhere between levels B and C but we have 'rounded down' rather than rounded up to comply with the prescribed opinion levels.
PXXAXY-524	If submitted as actual case work both the body and signature of both Q1 and Q2 would not be considered individually, unless there were indications (i.e. Video Spectral Comparator) that there were two different authors or two different writing instruments used in the creation of the body and signature found in the Questioned Writings. In reference to Q2, I find several class characteristics common to both the questioned writings and the known standards for Carl Stevens, but not of sufficient weight to outweigh the class and individual differences found. I would normally request additional known requested and non-requested standards from the party Carl Stevens from the investigating officer.
QA6K3Z-524	Some of the finer details of the pen strokes are difficult to see in the photographs.
QK7FAP-524	In reference to Q2, the known handwriting of Carl Stevens exhibits some similar characteristics, however the known writing submitted is not sufficient enough for a more definite determination. Additional verbatim exemplars should be obtained and submitted from Carl Stevens. In reference to the signature in the name of Amy Michaels on Q2, due to the lack of easily discernible letter forms and other limitations that exist in the questioned signature, like pen lifts, it may not be possible to identify or eliminate any subject as having signed the signature.
QV732L-523	More definitive opinions may be possible with the submission of additional known writing from Amy Michaels (K1) and Carl Stevens (K2).
QVQAGY-524	While both the K1 & K2 writers have the skill to have produced the Q2 document there are a large number of missing characteristics in the known writing which would be necessary to consider either one as a potential writer. In the absence of the identification of a writer, K1 & K2 are not completely eliminated.
R9R83B-524	The specimen of signatures K2 are not natural signatures. Natural discriminating elements could not be identified therefore no conclusion[sic] could be made.
RA2CDD-524	In order to conduct a complete analysis regarding the signatures in question, a sufficient amount (15-20) of course-of-business (Collected) signatures of the complainant (Amy Michaels), on any (undisputed) document, such as bank documents, invoices, receipts, claim forms, letters etc, relative to the date of the documents in question, should be obtained and forwarded.
RBXTQB-524	There were some features noted in the questioned signature appearing on Q2 that are often associated with simulations. Signatures of this nature do not contain the normal writing habits of he[sic] writer. Thus it is not normally possible to identify the writer.
RCQJWP-524	See above.[Table 2 - Conclusions]
RHX8DW-524	Although numerous differences were noted between the known writings and signatures of both Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens when compared against the September receipt (Exhibit Q2), the possibility of disguise must be considered before rendering a positive conclusion or qualified conclusion. For this reason, additional known exemplars from both writers should be submitted.
RRMZM9-524	The signature written by K2 is an assimilation (Purported to be of Mr Carl Stevens), this signature cannot be used for comparison to Q1 or Q2.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
RW2DNV-523	Since the signature Q2 was written with the intention to immitate[sic] the authentic signature of K1, it is not possible to decide who wrote it.
T26AWE-523	The handwriting samples of K2 show a few features that indicate left-handedness. No such features were found in Q1 or Q2.
TJ9BKU-524	It is not possible to associate or discard Carl Stevens with the signature of the document of August 31 th[sic] 2014. This is due to the simplicity of the signature which can be imitated by any person who has the ability for doing it.
TNJWHK-524	The questioned signatures appearing in Items Q1 and Q2 are mostly stylized and are lacking in identifying features. Because of this, an identification may not be possible. It may be possible to reach a more definitive conclusion with the submission of additional known writing of both Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens. This should include multiple samples of non request known handwriting comparable to the questioned material such as canceled checks, employment applications, course of business writings, personal correspondence, etc. The identification is demonstrable with enlarged illustrative charts. If the need for testimony is anticipated, please return the evidence allowing at least two (2) weeks for the necessary preparation.
TPFDUG-524	The signature on Q2 is not significantly individualized, some differences and some similarities coexist in regards to the writer of K1. Because of the low complexity level of the characteristics, their low numbers, and the low complexity of the whole signature, writer of K1 cannot be id. or elim.
TVY9LR-524	There were both common characteristics and differences observed between Q-2 and K-2 which precluded a definite conclusion. Specific details are documented in case file notes. The signatures on Q-1 and Q-2 lacked characteristic detail which prevented a comparison.
VG9KEH-524	Digitized copy of test compromised the examination of the writing line. Under magnification, small toner dots are present as opposed to writing line of each letter form. Characteristics obscured include tracking pen direction, pen pressure, subtle pen lifts or stops.
VH7K9V-523	The questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 contain insufficient features for identification of their source(s) by a handwriting comparison examination.
W8M749-523	The signing of the bill referred to as Q2 is an imitated signature. Graph shows little mass, which makes its own graphical features author lost.[sic] Therefore, it is not possible to establish identification.
WELX9V-524	If future examinations are desired regarding the hand printing appearing on Item Q2, additional dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from Michaels, the Item K1a-c writer, Stevens, the Item K2a-c writer, and any other logical suspect(s). The known writing should be hand printed and comparable to the questioned writing in wording and format. Dictated known writing should be obtained on separate sheets of lined forms similar to the questioned item, and each repetition should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, canceled checks, and/or applications.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
WFCN6E-524	<p>Comments: These examinations were limited by the following: All of the questioned and known writing consists of photographic material. Photographs, no matter how good, may not show all of the detail necessary for a complete handwriting examination. If the original questioned and known writing is received, additional examinations are possible. Most of the Known writing consists of request writing. It would be helpful to obtain additional non-request writing from both writers, which contains the same letters and letter combinations, as they appear in the questioned material. If this additional non-request writing is received, additional examinations are possible. Intra handwriting comparisons [sic] the known request and known non- request writing submitted from Carl Stevens revealed this writer has a wide range of handwriting ability. This makes it more difficult to identify a writer as the producer of the questioned material. It is very important to submit a large amount of known non-request writing as well as known request writing, so that the full range of writing variation of the writer can be determined. Examinations of the two questioned signatures at the bottoms of each of the Q1 and Q2 document were limited because there are very few individual characteristics present in these signatures.</p>
WHK7GC-524	<p>4.1 The findings were made through the application of the Law of ACE (Analysis, Comparison and Evaluation), a fundamental principle underling handwriting and signature examination. 4.2 A stereo microscope would be used to view and analyzethe[sic] various elements of the known and questioned writing and signatures in order to identify their discriminating elements. 4.3 ESDA test for impressions in the event of the original documents being available. Impressions of former writing of one of the writers may be present on either of the documents. 4.4 Non-destructive ink test (using a Video Spectral Comparator) to determine if different inks are present on either documents, especially to prove or refute the proposition that the writer "always uses the same writing instrument". May be of limited value to the investigation.</p>
WMDBAG-524	<p>Although the present evidence reveals numerous handwriting differences in the comparisons of K1 and K2 with the Q2 writing and signature, however, the present evidence precludes being able to determine whether K1 or K2 wrote Q2 in a disguised or alternate hand. The submission of additional known handwriting samples by K1 and K2 would provide the basis for further examinations and the possibility of rendering of a definitive opinion.</p>
WP3HRR-524	<p>It should be noted this examination was conducted from copies and not originals. Since ESDA of VSC examinations cannot be done unless examinations indicate the contrary the QD exams begin as one body of writing. [sic]</p>
WWGVJG-524	<p>The Q-1 and Q-2 signatures are not complex, but rather simplistic and exhibit low skill. Due to this, execution of a simulation and/or disguise of these signatures could be completed rather easily by a writer. Thus, no determination of authorship can be made at this time.</p>
X2VEM-523	<p>These results are based on the instructions received from Collaborative Testing Services stating that "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." In actuality, the documents examined are not originals and treating them as originals is not entirely scientific. Therefore, the results below may not accurately reflect the results we would obtain in live casework with original documents.</p>
XEFZEC-524	<p>4.1 A stereo microscope would be used to view and analyzethe[sic] various elements of the known and questioned writing and signatures in order to identify their discriminating elements. 4.2 ESDA test for impressions in the event of the original documents being available. Impressions of former writing of one of the writers may be present on either of the documents. 4.3 Non-destructive ink test (using a Video Spectral Comparator) to determine if different inks are present on either documents, especially to prove or refute the proposition that the writer "always uses the same writing instrument". May be of limited value to the investigation.</p>

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
XUMUTJ-524	The limited individuality and simple nature of the questioned signatures on Q1 and Q2 preclude an adequate comparison to the known signatures of Amy Michaels (K1) and to the request simulations on K2.
Y6AD4Q-523	There are evident 'differences' between the limited writing features within the questioned 'Amy Michaels' signature on Exhibit Q-2 and the known writings of both Amy Michaels and Carl Stevens. Given the possibility of auto-forgery, simulation, alternate style, etc., a 'probably' did not conclusion is too strong and not warranted. If an 'indications' conclusion was available for this test, my conclusion with respect to the 'Amy Michaels' signature on Exhibit Q-2 would have utilized that conclusion as a more accurate reflection of the probability neither writer wrote the questioned Q-2 signature.
YBAGLK-524	No conclusion was reached because I would like to examine more quickly written stylized and truncated known signatures from the K1 writer.
YBAX4Z-524	The comparison samples provided by "K2" (ie signatures) are not natural signatures, and therefore lack natural individuality (discriminating elements). As a result, normal variations cannot be determined, and the significance of features cannot be assessed. For this reason, common authorship cannot be identified or eliminated.
YDEXAK-524	The questioned signatures on items #Q1 and #Q2 do not contain enough complex writing characteristics for a determination of authorship.
YWVUH7-524	A thorough examination regarding the questioned signatures could not be conducted due to a lack of proper specimen signatures. It is requested that a sufficient amount (15-20) of course-of-business (collected) signatures of the complainant on any (undisputed) document, such as bank documents, invoices, receipts, claim forms, letters etc, relative to the date of the documents in question, be obtained and forwarded for re-examination.
YXKZZG-524	No conclusion could be reached concerning the signature on Item Q2 due to the abbreviated structure of the signature. The signature lacked sufficient detail and structural characteristics necessary to arrive at a conclusion. These types of simplified signatures are easily simulated and are of limited value in a handwriting comparison.
Z4TJYA-524	Some elements of the handwriting on Q2 have features that are generally associated with disguised writing.

Appendix: Data Sheet

Collaborative Testing Services ~ Forensic Testing Program

Test No. 14-523: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE RECEIVED BY December 01, 2014 TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code:

WebCode:

Accreditation Release Section

CTS submits external proficiency test data directly to ASCLD/LAB and ANSI-ASQ NAB/FQS. Please select one of the following statements to ensure your data is handled appropriately.

- This participant's data is intended for submission to ASCLD/LAB and/or ANSI-ASQ NAB/FQS. (Accreditation Release section on the last page must be completed and submitted.)
- This participant's data is NOT intended for submission to ASCLD/LAB or ANSI-ASQ NAB/FQS.

Online Data Entry

Visit www.cts-portal.com to enter your proficiency test results online. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact CTS.

For this test, you are not limited to conducting only on-screen comparisons and may employ any other method you wish. However, because of differences in printing technology, CTS cannot guarantee the quality of images you print from the DVD.

Scenario:

A woman who has a subletting arrangement is accusing her roommate of withholding rent payments. Amy Michaels is subletting a room in her home to Carl Stevens, for which he pays her in cash each month. At the time of payment, Ms. Michaels writes a receipt to acknowledge that she has been paid and provides it to Mr. Stevens. Ms. Michaels claims that she has not been paid for August and September's rent, but Mr. Stevens has provided receipts of payment for those months to investigators. Known course of business writing and dictated exemplars of the receipts have also been collected from each party. Please examine the questioned receipts to determine which, if either, of the individuals is the source of the handprinting and signature in each document.

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

Items Submitted (Sample Pack HWD):

Item K1a-c: Known writings of original renter, Amy Michaels

Item K2a-c: Known writings of subletter, Carl Stevens

Item Q1: Receipt of payment for August 2014 rent, dated July 31, 2014

Item Q2: Receipt of payment for September 2014 rent, dated August 31, 2014

Please return all pages of this data sheet.

Page 1 of 4

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.

- 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.) Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on each of the questioned receipts?

	Amy Michaels (K1)	Carl Stevens (K2)
Q1 (Aug. receipt)		
Q2 (Sep. receipt)		

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

2.) Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on each of the questioned receipts?

	Amy Michaels (K1)	Carl Stevens (K2)
Q1 (Aug. receipt)		
Q2 (Sep. receipt)		

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

Participant Code:
WebCode:

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

4.) Additional Comments

<p>Return Instructions: Data must be received via online data entry, fax (please include a cover sheet), or mail by <i>December 01, 2014</i> to be included in the report.</p> <p>QUESTIONS? TEL: +1-571-434-1925 (8 am - 4:30 pm EST) EMAIL: forensics@cts-interlab.com www.ctsforensics.com</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Participant Code:</p> <p>ONLINE DATA ENTRY: www.cts-portal.com</p> <p>FAX: +1-571-434-1937 or Toll-Free: 1-866-FAX-2CTS (329-2287)</p> <p>MAIL: Collaborative Testing Services, Inc. P.O. Box 650820 Sterling, VA 20165-0820 USA</p>
--	--

Please return all pages of this data sheet.

RELEASE OF DATA TO ACCREDITATION BODIES

The following Accreditation Releases will apply only to:

Participant Code:

WebCode:

for Test No. **14-523: Handwriting Examination**

This release page must be completed and received by **December 1, 2014** to have this participant's submitted data included in the reports forwarded to the respective Accreditation Bodies.

ASCLD/LAB RELEASE

If your lab has been accredited by ASCLD/LAB and you are submitting this data as part of their external proficiency test requirements, have the laboratory's designated individual complete the following.

The information below must be completed in its entirety for the results to be submitted to ASCLD/LAB.

ASCLD/LAB Legacy Certificate No. _____ ASCLD/LAB International Certificate No. _____

Signature _____ Date _____

Laboratory Name _____

Location (City/State) _____

ANSI-ASQ NAB/FQS RELEASE

If your laboratory maintains its accreditation through ANSI-ASQ NAB/FQS, please complete the following form in its entirety to have your results forwarded.

ANSI-ASQ NAB/FQS Certificate No. _____

Signature and Title _____ Date _____

Laboratory Name _____

Location (City/State) _____

Accreditation Release

Return Instructions

Please submit the completed Accreditation Release at the same time as your full data sheet. See Data Sheet Return Instructions on the previous page.

*Questions? Contact us 8 am-4:30 pm EST
Telephone: +1-571-434-1925
email: forensics@cts-interlab.com*

Please return all pages of this data sheet.

Page 4 of 4