



Handwriting Examination Test No. 16-523/524 Summary Report

This test was sent to 254 participants. Each sample set contained a photograph of a school early dismissal form (Q1) and photographs of known writings from two individuals. Participants were requested to examine these items and report their findings. Data were returned from 215 participants, 56 for the 16-523 DVD test and 159 for the 16-524 photo test (85% 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>4</u>
<u>Table 2: Conclusions</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>Table 3: Additional Comments</u>	<u>50</u>
<u>Appendix: Data Sheet</u>	<u>65</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 an elementary school early release form (Q1) and five photographs of known writings. These included course of business and dictated writing exemplars provided by Bobbi Meeks (K1) and course of business writing exemplars provided by Hank Cooper (K2). Participants were asked to determine if the handprinted text and/or signature on the release form was produced by either of the two individuals.

SAMPLE PREPARATION-

During production of dictated writing, both writers were instructed on capitalization, punctuation, and general formatting in order to maintain uniformity of appearance. The questioned Q1 document was selected from several versions created by dictated writing. The dictated writing exemplars completed by the K2 writer were not provided as known items to participants, per the scenario. The handprinted text and signature on the Q1 release form were produced by the K2 writer, Hank Cooper.

The writer of K1 is female and right-handed. The writer of K2 is male and left-handed.

SAMPLE ASSEMBLY: Once predistribution results were obtained, all sample packs were prepared. For each sample pack, the six 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-

Predistribution testing confirmed the manufacturer's expected results. All predistribution laboratories stated that the Q1 handprinted text was produced by the K2 writer and was not produced by the K1 writer. They were unable to identify or eliminate the K2 writer as the source of the signature, and the K1 writer was either eliminated or inconclusive as the source of the Q1 signature.

Summary Comments

This test was designed to provide participants with a handprinted text and signature identification challenge involving a questioned elementary school early dismissal form. Each sample set contained a photograph of the early dismissal form (Q1) and photographs of known writings provided by mother Bobbi Meeks (K1) and uncle Hank Cooper (K2). For the K1 writer, both course of business writings and dictated exemplars were provided; for the K2 writer, only course of business writings were provided. Participants were requested to determine which, if any, of the handprinted text and/or signature on the form was produced by either of the two individuals. The K2 writer produced the handprinted text and signature on Q1 (Refer to Manufacturer's Information for preparation details).

For Question 1 (Table 1a), "Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form?", 211 of 215 participants (98%) identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the writer of the handprinted text in Q1. Of these, a majority (209) also eliminated the K1 writer (reported "D" or "E"). The other two participants identified the K2 writer, but gave no response for the K1 writer.

Three participants could not identify or eliminate the K2 writer as the source of the Q1 text (reported "C"). Of those, two eliminated the K1 writer, and one identified the K1 writer. Finally, one participant eliminated the K2 writer and identified the K1 writer, which is a direct reversal from their written conclusions.

For Question 2 (Table 1b), "Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on the early dismissal form?", 174 of 215 participants (81%) could not identify or eliminate the K2 writer as the source of the signature in Q1 (reported "C"). Of these, 110 participants eliminated the K1 writer as the source (reported "D" or "E"). The remaining 64 participants could not identify or eliminate the K1 writer as the source of the signature. Participants most commonly reported being unable to identify or eliminate the K2 writer because they had no dictated or course of business signature exemplars to compare. Many stated that they could not perform a comparison between the questioned cursive signature and the handprinted K2 course of business writing to make a determination.

Thirty-one participants identified the K2 writer (reported "A" or "B") as the source of the signature in Q1. Of those, 29 participants eliminated the K1 writer as the source of the signature. The other two participants gave no response for the K1 writer. Finally, ten participants eliminated both the K1 and K2 writers as the source of the signature in Q1.

Although the K2 writer served as the actual source of both the handprinted text and signature in the questioned early dismissal form Q1, no dictated writing, including signatures in the name of "Bobbi Meeks", was provided by the K2 writer for comparison. As such, responses that identify ("A", "B") or cannot identify or eliminate ("C") the K2 writer as the source of the Q1 signature are not marked as outliers to the consensus. Those who were unable to identify or eliminate ("C") the K1 writer as the source of the Q1 signature are not marked as outliers to the consensus, as the only "Bobbi Meeks" signatures provided to participants were dictated exemplars and not course of business exemplars.

Examination Results

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form?

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
26RXDQ-524	D	B	67PPPM-524	E	A
2BTAAN-524	E	A	69UAJE-524	D	B
2HGW4T-524	E	A	6AL9QK-524	E	A
2MNPUH-524	E	A	6GNFAU-524	E	A
2V2C8T-524	E	A	6PJD4N-524	E	A
2VZMYP-524	D	B	78JMML-524	E	B
32LYBW-523	E	A	7A84WT-524	E	A
32NJ6R-524	E	A	7CBRFP-524	E	A
34TGAT-523	E	A	7CCRCJ-524	E	A
37FTD6-523	D	B	7D7D6A-523	E	A
3C4G9A-524	E	A	7M86AU-524	E	A
3DGALP-523	E	A	7QCQ4L-524	E	B
3KWQFK-524	A	E	7RMDXU-523	D	B
3LVRKQ-524	E	A	7WDPTQ-524	E	A
3QNVBA-524	E	A	7XT7RP-523		A
3RYXX9-524	E	B	7ZHDE8-524	D	B
3TRUKG-523	E	A	88WNYL-524	E	B
3VEBUP-524	E	A	8AFV3F-524	D	B
42F2HD-524	E	A	8DYUDP-524	E	A
42HUDY-524	E	A	8Q442Y-523	E	B
4JGTHT-524	E	A	8RJ3LN-523	E	A
4L6HL7-524	E	B	93FV6Y-523	E	A
4PLVHM-524	E	A	97XVKE-524	D	B

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
986DGP-523	E	A	CKKCZM-524	E	A
9BRWHM-523	E	A	CQNFPL-524	E	A
9C2YAD-524	D	B	CXUWJF-524	E	A
9NCCLL-524	E	B	CY7PF3-524	E	A
9Q8T4B-524	D	B	DAHC4U-524	E	A
9RJMNG-524	E	A	DBFLXC-524	D	B
A9GCAD-523	E	A	DBV3T6-524	E	A
AAVRRK-523	E	B	DLEE73-524	E	A
ADB2YW-524	E	A	DRL7DF-524	E	A
ADQPVH-524	E	B	DVHMUF-524	E	A
AH7T9E-524	E	A	DW9XJM-523	E	A
AH9MNE-524	D	B	DX9VXP-524	E	A
AHBDWH-524	E	B	EBCJLC-524	E	A
AMWPME-523	E	B	EDG8Z3-524	E	A
AQZZPY-524	D	B	EKU3YG-524	E	A
AT6XRF-524	E	A	EVECMB-524		A
ATPCMJ-524	E	A	EXKRZ9-524	D	B
BDNZME-524	E	A	EYFDUZ-523	E	A
BJCXV3-524	E	A	EYG9D6-524	E	A
BNQDRL-524	E	A	EZT3WC-524	E	A
BV88LG-523	E	A	F2KFWA-524	E	A
BVBHFF-524	E	A	FJ2RJ9-524	E	A
BW3PJC-524	E	A	FZ62ME-523	D	B
C2EUZJ-524	E	A	G6WTB3-524	E	B
C8DJAV-523	D	A	G7AD4C-524	D	B
CEXQQF-524	E	A			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
G8LW4A-524	E	A	KTDA99-524	E	A
GHMHA9-524	E	A	L2HNNF-524	E	B
GNNWVA-524	E	A	L2ZVM7-523	E	A
GQ29WY-524	D	B	L4QU4P-524	E	A
GV8Y2Q-524	E	A	L887Z7-524	B	C
GY8ATK-524	E	A	LCK4CY-524	D	B
H33JFQ-524	E	A	LDU9PN-524	E	C
H8VKH7-524	D	B	LGC98P-524	E	B
HF9C84-523	D	B	LHKLM6-524	E	A
HG2D6E-524	E	A	LKRL46-524	E	A
HLE9R4-524	D	B	LNR347-523	E	A
HN7862-524	E	A	LRXBR6-524	E	A
HV8J4K-524	E	B	LX3CMT-524	E	A
HXVTF7-524	E	A	MB66RA-523	E	A
J7J9D9-524	E	A	MKP92V-523	D	B
JAYG29-524	E	A	MT2KW8-523	E	A
JFQLWX-524	D	B	MWJPPB-523	E	B
JLVMWR-524	E	A	MWKMY7-524	E	A
JUNW3G-523	E	A	MYQ6X3-524	E	A
JXLDGW-524	D	B	N73L63-524	D	B
JZBK2T-524	E	A	NCQ7B4-524	E	A
K6KF39-524	D	C	NGQCVZ-524	E	B
KKU9M6-524	E	B	NQQ6ZL-524	E	A
KLNUFV-523	D	B	NXA98N-524	E	A
KQJNDW-524	E	A	P32YTP-524	D	B
KRBPB9-524	E	B			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
PBDZ9Y-524	E	A	UJBCCCH-524	D	B
PDMW34-524	D	B	UVKV77-523	D	B
PEFU9P-523	E	A	V4R7HU-524	E	A
PNFRPW-524	E	A	VKMC9C-523	D	B
PRKCJP-524	D	B	VKY7NC-524	D	B
PYZZC6-523	D	B	VWFXB2-523	E	A
Q6L7N7-524	E	A	W3Z94W-524	E	B
QAF3DX-523	D	B	W94EET-524	E	A
QWWBX4-524	E	B	WAX32U-524	E	A
R94NM3-524	E	A	WETU87-524	E	A
R9DWA9-524	E	A	WML887-524	E	A
RL4LBY-524	E	B	WR2GF4-523	E	B
RLN826-523	E	A	WTBNJW-524	E	A
RQWTP2-523	E	A	X2GQJM-523	E	B
RT7KZ4-524	E	A	XACTLY-523	E	A
RVCYQH-524	E	B	XE8H7C-523	E	A
RWL9FU-524	E	A	XKBLWB-524	D	B
RX6UCQ-524	D	B	XM2QPH-524	D	B
T2DUMM-524	E	B	XQ2UJP-524	E	A
T429BW-524	D	B	XUEYT6-524	E	B
T8MV76-523	E	B	XYDBQP-524	E	A
TAAE84-524	E	A	XYU923-523	D	B
TGPBTP-523	E	A	Y2EM2W-524	E	A
THH92V-523	E	A	Y4H9YU-524	E	A
TJCVW9-523	E	A	YBLDPT-524	E	A
UCPGBE-524	D	B			

TABLE 1a- Handwriting on Q1

WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1		WebCode-Test	Handwriting on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YCDBYK-524	E	A			
YD7A8R-524	E	B			
YPLYCN-524	E	A			
YQHEMZ-523	E	A			
YRQMPT-523	E	A			
YYPAJD-523	E	B			
Z33ETT-523	E	A			
Z4YRFL-524	E	B			
ZEXMBV-523	E	A			
ZKNVZV-523	D	B			
ZLUH9U-523	E	A			
ZN8WYN-524	E	A			
ZQDCCL-523	E	B			
ZQUNR7-523	D	A			
ZR6DAW-524	E	B			
ZV8A2C-524	E	A			

Response Summary Handwriting on Q1 Total Participants: 215

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form?

Response	Handwriting on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	1	136	Note: The totals do not add up to the total number of participants because not all participants marked a response for all items. Response Key: A: Was WRITTEN by; B: Was PROBABLY WRITTEN by (some degree of identification); C: CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED; D: Was PROBABLY NOT WRITTEN by (some degree of elimination); E: Was NOT WRITTEN by.
B	1	75	
C	0	3	
D	45	0	
E	166	1	

Examination Results

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on the early dismissal form?

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
26RXDQ-524	C	C	67PPPM-524	E	C
2BTAAN-524	E	D	69UAJE-524	C	C
2HGW4T-524	E	C	6AL9QK-524	E	C
2MNPUH-524	E	C	6GNFAU-524	E	C
2V2C8T-524	E	C	6PJD4N-524	E	C
2VZMYP-524	C	C	78JMML-524	E	C
32LYBW-523	E	C	7A84WT-524	E	B
32NJ6R-524	E	C	7CBRFP-524	D	C
34TGAT-523	C	C	7CCRCJ-524	E	A
37FTD6-523	D	C	7D7D6A-523	E	C
3C4G9A-524	C	C	7M86AU-524	E	C
3DGALP-523	E	C	7QCQ4L-524	C	C
3KWQFK-524	C	C	7RMDXU-523	D	C
3LVRKQ-524	C	C	7WDPTQ-524	E	C
3QNVBA-524	C	C	7XT7RP-523		B
3RYXX9-524	E	C	7ZHDE8-524	D	C
3TRUKG-523	E	B	88WNYL-524	E	E
3VEBUP-524	E	A	8AFV3F-524	C	C
42F2HD-524	E	C	8DYUDP-524	E	E
42HUDY-524	E	A	8Q442Y-523	C	C
4JGTHT-524	E	C	8RJ3LN-523	E	C
4L6HL7-524	D	C	93FV6Y-523	E	C
4PLVHM-524	E	C	97XVKE-524	D	C

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
986DGP-523	E	C	CKKCZM-524	E	C
9BRWHM-523	E	B	CQNFPL-524	E	A
9C2YAD-524	C	C	CXUWJF-524	E	A
9NCCLL-524	C	C	CY7PF3-524	D	C
9Q8T4B-524	C	C	DAHC4U-524	E	D
9RJMNG-524	C	C	DBFLXC-524	D	C
A9GCAD-523	E	C	DBV3T6-524	C	C
AAVRRK-523	C	C	DLEE73-524	E	C
ADB2YW-524	D	C	DRL7DF-524	D	C
ADQPVH-524	E	C	DVHMUF-524	E	C
AH7T9E-524	C	C	DW9XJM-523	E	C
AH9MNE-524	D	C	DX9VXP-524	E	B
AHBDWH-524	E	C	EBCJLC-524	E	C
AMWPME-523	E	C	EDG8Z3-524	E	C
AQZZPY-524	D	C	EKU3YG-524	E	C
AT6XRF-524	C	C	EVECMB-524		A
ATPCMJ-524	E	E	EXKRZ9-524	C	C
BDNZME-524	E	B	EYFDUZ-523	E	C
BJCXV3-524	C	C	EYG9D6-524	C	C
BNQDRL-524	E	B	EZT3WC-524	E	C
BV88LG-523	C	C	F2KFWA-524	E	D
BVBHFF-524	C	C	FJ2RJ9-524	E	C
BW3PJC-524	C	C	FZ62ME-523	C	C
C2EUZJ-524	C	C	G6WTB3-524	D	C
C8DJAV-523	D	C	G7AD4C-524	D	C
CEXQQF-524	C	C			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
G8LW4A-524	E	C	KTDA99-524	E	C
GHMHA9-524	E	D	L2HNNF-524	E	B
GNNWVA-524	D	C	L2ZVM7-523	E	C
GQ29WY-524	D	C	L4QU4P-524	E	C
GV8Y2Q-524	D	C	L887Z7-524	E	C
GY8ATK-524	E	A	LCK4CY-524	D	C
H33JFQ-524	C	C	LDU9PN-524	E	C
H8VKH7-524	C	C	LGC98P-524	E	C
HF9C84-523	D	C	LHKLM6-524	E	B
HG2D6E-524	E	A	LKRL46-524	E	A
HLE9R4-524	C	C	LNR347-523	C	C
HN7862-524	E	C	LRXBR6-524	C	C
HV8J4K-524	E	C	LX3CMT-524	E	C
HXVTF7-524	C	C	MB66RA-523	D	B
J7J9D9-524	E	C	MKP92V-523	D	C
JAYG29-524	E	C	MT2KW8-523	E	C
JFQLWX-524	C	C	MWJPPB-523	D	C
JLVMWR-524	E	C	MWKMY7-524	E	C
JUNW3G-523	E	C	MYQ6X3-524	E	C
JXLDGW-524	C	C	N73L63-524	C	C
JZBK2T-524	C	C	NCQ7B4-524	E	B
K6KF39-524	C	C	NGQCVZ-524	E	E
KKU9M6-524	E	C	NQQ6ZL-524	E	C
KLNUFV-523	C	C	NXA98N-524	C	C
KQJNDW-524	E	C	P32YTP-524	C	C
KRBPB9-524	E	C			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
PBDZ9Y-524	E	B	UJBCCH-524	D	C
PDMW34-524	C	C	UVKV77-523	D	C
PEFU9P-523	C	C	V4R7HU-524	E	B
PNFRPW-524	E	A	VKMC9C-523	D	C
PRKCJP-524	C	C	VKY7NC-524	D	C
PYZZC6-523	C	C	VWFXB2-523	E	C
Q6L7N7-524	E	C	W3Z94W-524	E	C
QAF3DX-523	D	C	W94EET-524	E	C
QWWBX4-524	E	C	WAX32U-524	C	C
R94NM3-524	E	C	WETU87-524	E	B
R9DWA9-524	E	B	WML887-524	C	C
RL4LBY-524	E	C	WR2GF4-523	C	C
RLN826-523	E	B	WTBNJW-524	E	C
RQWTP2-523	D	B	X2GQJM-523	D	C
RT7KZ4-524	E	E	XACTLY-523	E	C
RVCYQH-524	E	C	XE8H7C-523	D	C
RWL9FU-524	C	C	XKBLWB-524	D	C
RX6UCQ-524	C	C	XM2QPH-524	C	C
T2DUMM-524	C	C	XQ2UJP-524	E	C
T429BW-524	C	C	XUEYT6-524	E	C
T8MV76-523	D	C	XYDBQP-524	C	C
TAAE84-524	C	C	XYU923-523	E	C
TGPBTP-523	D	B	Y2EM2W-524	C	C
THH92V-523	E	C	Y4H9YU-524	E	C
TJCVW9-523	E	C	YBLDPT-524	E	C
UCPGBE-524	D	C			

TABLE 1b- Signature on Q1

WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1		WebCode-Test	Signature on Q1	
	K1	K2		K1	K2
YCDBYK-524	C	C			
YD7A8R-524	E	C			
YPLYCN-524	C	C			
YQHEMZ-523	E	C			
YRQMPT-523	C	C			
YYPAJD-523	C	C			
Z33ETT-523	E	B			
Z4YRFL-524	E	C			
ZEXMBV-523	C	C			
ZKNVZV-523	C	C			
ZLUH9U-523	E	E			
ZN8WYN-524	E	B			
ZQDCCL-523	E	C			
ZQUNR7-523	D	C			
ZR6DAW-524	E	B			
ZV8A2C-524	C	C			

Response Summary Signature on Q1

Total Participants: 215

Which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on the early dismissal form?

Response	Signature on Q1		
	K1	K2	
A	0	10	<p>Note: The totals do not add up to the total number of participants because not all participants marked a response for all items.</p> <p>Response Key:</p> <p>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	21	
C	64	174	
D	36	4	
E	113	6	

Conclusions

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
26RXDQ-524	1. The hand printed entries on the Q-1 Dismissal form were probably written by the Hank Cooper (K-2). 2. The hand printed entries on the Q-1 Dismissal form was probably not written by Bobbi Meeks (K-1). 3. It could not be determined if Bobbi Meeks (K-1) signed their name to the Q-1 Dismissal form. 4. It could not be determined if Hank Cooper (K-2) signed the Bobbi Meeks signature on the Q-1 Dismissal form.
2BTAAN-524	There is evidence to support that the disputed writing on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing on documents marked "K2a" to "K2b" and was not written by the writer of the specimen writing on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". The evidence does not support that the authorship of questioned signature on document marked as "Q1" was probably not written by the author of the specimen signature on documents marked as "K2a" to "K2b" and was not written by the author of the specimen signature on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c"
2HGW4T-524	The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question was written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b". The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question was not written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". No definite conclusion can be reach due to the fact that the signature "Q1" and "K2b" are incomparable.
2MNPUH-524	It was determined, that the questioned writing on the early dismissal form /Q1/ was written by K2 /Hank Cooper/. There were similarities in general characteristics and in individual features between the questioned writing and his samples. The questioned signature was not written by Bobbi Meeks /K1/. The writer of K2 /Hank Cooper/ cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature.
2V2C8T-524	3.1 Pertaining to the signature in question: 3.1.1 The evidence at hand suggests that the signature in question was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures marked as "K1a" to "K1c" (written by "Bobbi Meeks"). 3.1.2 The specimen signatures marked "K2a" and "K2b" and the signature marked as "Q1" and are not comparable, therefore no conclusive finding can be made regarding authorship. 3.2 Pertaining to the writing in question: 3.2.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question was written by the writer of the specimen writing marked as "K2a" and "K2b".
2VZMYP-524	A definite determination could not be reached whether or not the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by BOBBI MEEKS, writer of Item 2 (Item K1a-c), or HANK COOPER, writer of Item 3 (Item K2a-b), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited amount of comparable known writing. From the examinations that could be conducted, MEEKS, Item 2 (Item K1a-c), may not have prepared the hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1) and COOPER, Item 3 (Item K2a-b) may have prepared the hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1). It could not be determined whether or not the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by BOBBI MEEKS, writer of Item 2 (Item K1a-c), or HANK COOPER, writer of Item 3 (Item K2a-b), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the limited amount of comparable known writing.
32LYBW-523	Based on the documents submitted for examination, it is my professional opinion that the person who printed Items K2-a-b is the author of the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form labeled as Item Q1. Based on the documents submitted for examination, it is my professional opinion that the person who wrote and signed Items K1-a-c is not the author of the questioned signature on the early dismissal form labeled as Item Q1.
32NJ6R-524	The writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen writing and signatures on the documents marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". The writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b". No definite finding could be made regarding whether

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	the signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b".
34TGAT-523	According to the documents examined the conclusion is as follows: 1) Similarities were found in relation to the texts contained in documents K2a-b. 2) Texts within K1 a-c contain differences in relation to the document subject to study Q1. 3) It is concluded, the document text Q1 was written by Mr. Cooper (Tests performed under the method of handwriting / signature examinations).
37FTD6-523	Bobbi Meeks (K1): It is probable that Bobbi Meeks (K1) did not write any of the questioned writing on Q1 with the exception of the Bobbi Meeks signature. Additionally, there are indications that Bobbi Meeks did not write the questioned Bobbi Meeks signature on Q1. Limitations associated with the limited number of known handwriting and signature samples hindered my examinations and preclude a more conclusive opinion. Hank Cooper (K2): There are indications that Hank Cooper (K2) wrote all of the questioned writing with the exception of the Bobbi Meeks signature on Q1. Additionally, the questioned Bobbi Meeks signature on Q1 can neither be identified nor eliminated with the known writing of Hank Cooper. Limitations associated with the limited number of known handwriting samples, in addition to the lack of comparable writing containing the same names, words, and word combinations hindered my examinations, and preclude a more conclusive opinion.
3C4G9A-524	1. COOPER wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 3(Q1). 2. MEEKS did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 3(Q1). 3. COOPER and MEEKS can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit 3(Q1). This finding is limited due to the minimal amount of known writing by MEEKS and the absence of comparable known writing by COOPER submitted for comparison.
3DGALP-523	I ANALYZE THE QUESTIONED WRITING Q1 BY EXAMINING IN GENERAL ABOUT ITS LOCATION, POSITION AND SPACES, I IDENTIFIED GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS LIKE BASE ALIGNMENT, TILT, WRITING HABILITY AND GRAPHIC GESTURES, IDENTIFYING ENDINGS AND DIRECTION CHANGES. I ANALYZED THE COLLATION WRITING (K1 AND K2) BY EXAMINING IN GENERAL ABOUT ITS LOCATION, POSITION AND SPACES, I IDENTIFIED GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS LIKE BASE ALIGNMENT, TILT, WRITING HABILITY AND GRAPHIC GESTURES, IDENTIFYING ENDINGS AND DIRECTION CHANGES. I COMPARE FACING THE QUESTIONED WRITING AND THE COLLATION WRITING: A) I ANALYZED SIMILARITIES OF THE EXTRINSIC POINTS (LOCATION, SPACES) ON THE COMPARATIVE Q1 AND K2 B) I ANALYZED SIMILARITIES OF THE INTRINSIC POINTS (GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS) ON THE COMPARATIVE Q1 AND K2 C) I ANALYZED SIMILARITIES OF THE GRAPHIC GESTURES ON THE COMPARATIVE Q1 AND K2 (BEGININGS OF THE BUTTON AND HOOK AND CLOSING WITH HOOK AND STEELY AND MIXED CHANGE OF DIRECTIONS (ANGLE, OVAL AND CURVED. I COMPARED FACING THE MATCHING ITEMS WITH THE SIGNATURED QUESTIONED, I ANALYZED THE DIFFERENCES OF THE ESTRINSISIC POINTS (LOCATION , SPACES) ON THE COMPRATIVE (K1 AND K2) AND Q1. I ANALYZED THE DIFFERENCES OF THE INTRINSIC POINTS (GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS) ON THE COMPRATIVE (K1 AND K2) AND Q1. I ANALYZED THE DIFFERENCES OF THE ESTRINSISIC POINTS (LOCATION , SPACES) ON THE COMPRATIVE (K1 AND K2) AND Q1. I ANALYZED THE DIFFERENCES OF THE INTRINSIC POINTS (GENERAL CHARACTERISTIC) ON THE COMPARATIVE (K1 AND K2) AND Q1. I I ANALYZED THE DIFFERENCES OF THE GRAPHIC GESTURES (BEGINING AND CLOSING AND THE DIRECTION CHANGES) ON THE COMPARATIVE (K1 AND K2) AND Q1
3KWQFK-524	It was determined that Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 3 (K2a-b), prepared the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on Item 1 (Q1). Although pictorial inconsistencies were observed between the Item 2 (K1a-c) signatures and the Item 1 (Q1) signature, no conclusion could be reached whether or not Bobbi Meeks, Item 2 (K1a-c), or Hank Cooper, Item 3 (K2a-b), prepared the Item 1 (Q1) signature due to the limited nature of the questioned signature, the limited known signatures for comparison and the presence of unexplained characteristics with the Item 2 (K1a-c) signatures, and a lack of known signatures for comparison with Item 3 (K2a-b). Furthermore, due to the limited nature of the Item 1 (Q1) questioned signature it is doubtful that the questioned signature will ever

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	be associated to a known writer.
3LVRKQ-524	Handwriting: The comparison between questioned handwriting on Q1 and specimen handwriting on documents K2a and K2b disclosed a significant combination of similarities in writing habits, with no unexplained differences. These similarities include gross and subtle features such as spacing, proportions, alignment, general arrangement as well as general construction characteristics. Accordingly, it is my opinion that the author of specimen handwriting on documents K2a and K2b, attributed to Hank Cooper, wrote the questioned handwriting on document Q1. Signature: The comparison between questioned signature on Q1 and specimen signatures/handwriting on documents K1a to K1c and K2a to K2b was severely limited by the nature of the questioned signature (i.e. it is a single repetition), the slow execution of the questioned signature, and a lack of directly comparable specimen samples for the K2 writer. Accordingly, no conclusion has been reached regarding potential authorship of the questioned signature on document Q1.
3QNVBA-524	1. Hank Cooper wrote the questioned hand printed text reproduced on Exhibit 3. 2. Hank Cooper could neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature reproduced on Exhibit 3. a. Due to the absence of comparable known cursive writing there is no basis to determine whether or not Hank Cooper wrote the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature reproduced on Exhibit 3. b. An adequate basis for an opinion statement may be provided through an examination of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature reproduced on Exhibit 3 in conjunction with signature exemplars completed by Hank Cooper in the name of "Bobbi Meeks." c. If possible, the original document used to produce Exhibit 3 should also be submitted for examination. 3. Bobbi Meeks could neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature reproduced on Exhibit 3. a. The questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature reproduced on Exhibit 3 is a text-based signature (i.e. all of the letter forms in the name are present and legible) where as the two known signature standards completed by Bobbi Meeks reflect a mixed-based signature style in which some letter forms are present and legible while other letterforms are abbreviated, illegible, and/or are absent. (Note: It is not uncommon for individual writers to have more than one signature style such that the type of document (e.g., formal/informal) may influence the type of signature a writer will utilize.) b. An adequate basis for an opinion statement may be provided through an examination of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature reproduced on Exhibit 3 in conjunction with contemporaneous known signatures produced by Bobbi Meeks during the normal course of business (i.e., standards). If possible, known signatures produced on different document types (formal documents and informal documents) should be collected and submitted for comparison purposes.
3RYXX9-524	1. According to the individual characteristics, the hand written portion of document "Q1" excluding the questioned signature were "probably written" by Hank Cooper (K2a-b). 2. According to the individual characteristics, the signature portion on document "Q1" excluding the questioned hand writings "can not be identified or eliminated" from Hank Cooper (K2a-b) at this time. 3. There are numerous points of individualization between document "Q1" and Hank Cooper (K2a-b). Due to the limited number of hand writings and lack of signature writings from Hank Cooper, I would have to request sufficient known one to one elimination standards that would include wording from document "Q1". 4. According to the individual characteristics, both the hand written portion and the signature portion on document "Q1" were not produced by Bobbi Meeks (K1a-c).
3TRUKG-523	Bobbi Meeks not make neither handwriting nor signature of Q1. Hank Cooper made the handwriting of Q1. It is possible that Hank Cooper made the signature of Q1.
3VEBUP-524	Analyzed and collated the writings for the processing and signature present in the Q1 document against the extraproceto material allowed evidence matches grafonomicas of dynamic order and morphostructural which indicate that they were produced by Hank Cooper
42F2HD-524	Examination, comparison, and evaluation of the questioned document and known writing samples resulted in the following opinions: Laboratory item #3 (Q1/handwriting and signature on form), Invoice #Q111883 was not written by the author (Bobbi Meeks/K1a-c) of the known writing samples (Laboratory item #1/Invoice#Q111883). Laboratory item #3 (Q1/handwriting on form), Invoice#Q111883 was written by the author (Hank Cooper/K2a-b) of the known writing samples

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	(Laboratory item #2/Invoice #Q111883). No conclusion can be made between Laboratory #3, Invoice #Q111883(Q1/signature on form), and Laboratory item #2, Invoice #Q111883 (K2a-b/Hank Cooper). The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: no comparable known writing samples (Hank Cooper executing "Bobbi Meeks" signature).
42HUDY-524	Questioned Handwriting: The examination and comparison between the questioned document Q1 and the specimen handwriting written by writer K2a-K2b 9(purported to be of Hank Cooper) shown a significant similarities with explainable divergences. These similarities include style, slope, size and construction characteristics. Using these observations, I have concluded that the writer of the specimen handwriting purported to be Hank Cooper (K2a-K2b) wrote the questioned handwriting associated with early dismissal form on document Q1. Questioned Signature: The examination and comparison between the questioned signature and the specimen material written by writer K2a-K2b, purported to be of Hank Cooper shown a significant similarities with explainable divergence. These similarities include style, slope, size and construction characteristics. Based on that, I have concluded that the writer of the specimen material associated with Hank Cooper, wrote the questioned early dismissal form signature on the document Q1.
4JGHT-524	The writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b". The writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a" and "K1c". The possibility of disguise on the signature on the document marked "Q1" cannot be excluded.
4L6HL7-524	3.1a) The Q1, questioned writing consisting of the handprinting (excluding the signature) was not written by the author – Bobbi Meeks of the K1(a-c) writing samples. 3.1b) The Q1, questioned signature was probably not written by the author – Bobbi Meeks of the K1(a-c) writing samples, the lack of sufficient known signatures from Bobbi Meeks K1(a-c) precludes a definitive elimination at this time. 3.2a) The questioned writing (excluding the signature entry) was probably written by the author – Hank Cooper of the K2(a,b) writing sample. The lack of sufficient directly comparable known hand-printed samples from Hank Cooper K2(a,b) precludes a more definitive conclusion at this time. 3.2b) No definitive conclusion concerning authorship of the "Bobbi Meeks" signature entry on item Q1 by Hank Cooper K2(a,b) can be made due to the lack of directly comparable cursive writing from Hank Cooper K2(a,b). Remarks: 1) The submission of additional known writing from Hank Cooper K2(a,b) may result in a more definitive conclusion concerning authorship of the entries on item Q1. The additional known writing should consist of approximately 15 to 20 repetitions of the questioned hand-printed entries and written cursive signature entry, written on separate sheets of lined paper approximating the size and line spacing of the Q1 item. 2) The submission of additional known signatures from Bobbi Meeks K1(a-c) may result in a more definitive conclusion concerning authorship of the signature entry on item Q1. The additional signatures should consist of approximately 15 to 20 non-request "course of business" signatures, written contemporaneously with the Q1 document.
4PLVHM-524	The questioned writing (excluding the signature) was elaborated by Hank Cooper and not by Bobbi Meeks. The questioned signature was not made by Bobbi Meeks, however it can not be ruled out that it was elaborated by Hank Cooper.
67PPPM-524	Considering the material provided by Mr. Hank Cooper (k2a, k2b) it is concluded that the application of the child's early departure form was made by Mr Cooper. As for the signature on the child's departure form, it was not possible to identify or eliminate Mr Hank Cooper because of the lack of similarity of the manuscripts analyzed.
69UAJE-524	There is no same character between K2 and signature of K1
6AL9QK-524	1. The questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form WAS WRITTEN BY Hank Cooper (K2). 2. CANNOT BE confirm or deny that the questioned signature was written by Hank Cooper due to lack of proper comparative material. 3. The questioned writing and signature WERE NOT WRITTEN BY Bobbie Meeks (K1).

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
6GNFAU-524	<p>Handwriting: In view of the significant similarities observed, the questioned handwriting in "Q1" (Dismissal Form) was written by Hank Cooper, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2b". In view of the significant differences observed, the questioned handwriting in "Q1" (Dismissal Form) was not written by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K1a" to "K1c". Signature: In view of the significant differences observed, it is highly unlikely that the questioned signature in "Q1" (Dismissal Form) was written by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of the known specimen signatures in "K1a" to "K1c". Although similarities were observed, other cursive formations and connecting strokes in the questioned signature were not observed in the mainly discrete, handprinted letters in "K2a" to "K2b". In view of the difference in writing style and absence of comparable signature specimens from Hank Cooper, the evidence is inconclusive as to whether Hank Cooper, the writer of the known specimen handwriting in "K2a" to "K2b", wrote the questioned signature in "Q1" (Dismissal Form). Additional specimens of Hank Cooper in the form of cursive handwriting and signatures, if available, should be provided for further examination.</p>
6PJD4N-524	<p>The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". The evidence supports the proposition that the writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" to "K2c". The evidence supports the proposition that the signature in question was not written by the author of the specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". No conclusion regarding authorship of the signature in question can be reached with regards to "K2" given the evidence at hand.</p>
78JMML-524	<p>1. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the questioned signature 'Bobbi Meeks' and the questioned writing on Exhibit Q1 (Dismissal Form) were executed by the K1 (a-c) specimen writer. 2. The questioned signature 'Bobbi Meeks' on Exhibit Q1 (Dismissal Form) has not been identified or eliminated as having been executed by the K2 (a-b) specimen writer due to the lack of additional requested specimen signatures. 3. It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned writing on Exhibit Q1 (Dismissal Form) was executed by the K2 (a-b) specimen writer.</p>
7A84WT-524	<p>HANDWRITING EXAMINATION -We compared Q1 with K1 and K2 and we concluded that Q1 was written by Hank COOPER (K2). SIGNATURE EXAMINATION -We compared signature on Q1 which composed of character with Bobbi MEEKS (K1), we concluded that Q1 was not written by Bobbi MEEKS (K1), -We saw similarities from the point of structure of some characters (especially B,M,e) between signature on Q1 and Hank COOPER's (K2) handwritings so we concluded that Q1 was probably written by Hank COOPER (K2) Thank you.</p>
7CBRFP-524	<p>The writing on the Questioned Form, item Q1, shows significant differences to the specimens of Bobbi Meeks. These differences are such that, in my opinion, there is conclusive evidence that this Form (Q1) was not written by Bobbi Meeks. I therefore consider that the possibility of her being responsible can be excluded. The writing on the Questioned Form, item Q1, shows a number of significant similarities to the specimens of Hank Cooper. This combination of similarities is such that, in my opinion, there is conclusive evidence that this Form (Q1) was written by Hank Cooper. I therefore consider that the possibility of another person being responsible can be excluded. The signature on the Questioned Form, item Q1, shows barely any similarities to the specimen signatures of Bobbi Meeks and appears less fluently written. Assuming the two specimen signatures on items K1a and K1b are representative it is not her normal genuine signature and there is some limited evidence that she did not write it. The signature on the Questioned Form, item Q1, does not appear to be an attempt to copy the genuine signature of Bobbi Meeks. While the 'B' is reasonably similar to the writing of Hank Cooper on the Form (Q1), other characters appear to differ from his writing. In the absence of additional writings, no opinion can be expressed as to whether Hank Cooper wrote the questioned signature.</p>
7CCRCJ-524	<p>In agreement with the analysis, the material and the pattern used for comparison and the technical elements exposed, it is determined that: 3.1 Between the samples of writing of MR Hank Cooper and the manuscripts showed in the Q1 format there are graphonomic convergence in</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>physiognomic characteristics (morphology, distribution, axial direction, proportion) graph grammars (caliber line, starting point continuity); kinetical (oval-shaped canals, movement directions) and individual characteristics related with design and building of graphs. Nonetheless, there are some graph differences, which can be product of voluntary causes of writing modification, as the will of modifying the own writhing to make it looks different. 3.2 Between the samples of writing of Mr Hank Cooper and the signature provided in the Q1 format, there are graphonomic divergences and convergences. The questioned signature presents some typical characteristics of an imitate signature with stops between connecting lines and tremor in the design of the surname Meeks. From the samples of Mr Hank, there are not signatures or manuscripts made in script typeface that allows a systematic, riorous and objetive comparison, which forced to make this study only with the manuscripts made in print typeface. Characteristics as prportion between "B" and "o", writing of vowels "e", morphology of "b" and "m" have traces of graph identity that allows inferring that MR Hank made the signature of similar characteristics of the MRS Meeks siganture, failing in the attempt. There are similar proportion in extensionand height between the questioned signature (Parent Signature) and the name Bobbie Meeks that is found at the beginning of the format.</p>
7D7D6A-523	<p>It is the conclusion of this examiner that the Item Q1 questioned form was not written or signed by the writer of Item K1, which was submitted as the known writing of Bobbi Meeks. It is the conclusion of this examiner that the handwriting in the body of Item Q1 was written by the writer of Item K2 which was submitted as the known writing of Hank Cooper. No conclusion can be reached regarding the questioned signature due to the lack of comparable cursive writing in the Item K2 known writing.</p>
7M86AU-524	<p>Based on the documents submitted for examination I have made the following opinions: 1) I have identified the handwritten words and numbers (other than the signature) found on Q1 as matching the writing found on K2A and K2B, given to be that of Hank Cooper. 2) I am inconclusive as to whether or not the signature found on Q1 was written by the writer on K2A and K2B. This is primarily due to the lack of cursive writing submitted for comparison purposes. 3) I have eliminated the writer of K1A, B and C, given to be that of Bobbi Meeks, as the writer of Q1 for both the handwriting and the signature.</p>
7QCQ4L-524	<p>There is a strong probability that the writer of the known handwriting on K2 wrote the questioned handwriting on Q1. I am unable to determine which, if either, of the of the writers of the known questioned signature on K1 or the known handwriting on K2 wrote the questioned signature on Q1.</p>
7RMDXU-523	<p>FIRST: "It is estimated under certain reservations, that the questioned manuscript text Q1, has not been written by the author of the K1a, K1b y K1c specimen, Ms Bobb1 Meeks". SECOND: "It is estimated under certain reservations, that the questioned manuscript text Q1, has been written by the author of the K2a and K2b specimen, Mr Hank Cooper". THIRD: "It is estimated under certain reservations, that the questioned signature Q1, has not been written by the author of the K1a, K1b y K1c specimen, Ms Bobb1 Meeks". FOURTH: "Is not possible to establish whether the author of the K2a and K2b specimen, Mr Hank Cooper is the author of the questioned signature Q1.</p>
7WDPTQ-524	<p>Strong correspondences in respect of design and construction were identified between the writing on Q1 and the writing on K2a-b which support the proposition that the questioned writing on Q1 was written by Hank Cooper the author of specimen writing K2a-b. The are differences between the signature and writing of K1a-c and Q1 which support the proposition that it was not written by the same author. No finding with regard to the authorship of the signature marked Q1 can be made.</p>
7XT7RP-523	<p>1. Hank Cooper, the writer of K2a and K2b, wrote the entries appearing on Q1. 2. Due to the lack of comparable known writing in the same wording as the questioned signature, a definite determination could not be reached as to whether Hank Cooper, the writer of K2a and K2b, prepared the questioned signature on Q1. However, characteristics in common were observed that indicate Hank Cooper(K2a, K2b), may have prepared the questioned signature appearing on Q1.</p>
7ZHDE8-524	<p>The handwriting and signature on item Q1 was probably NOT written by the writer items K1a-c, Bobbi Meeks. While unlikely, the possibility that the writing and signature on item Q1 is an</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	alternate writing style of Bobbi Meeks cannot be excluded. The non-signature portions of item Q1 were probably written by the writer of items K2a and K2b, Hank Cooper. An examination of additional known writing of Hank Cooper may provide the basis for a more definitive conclusion. Hank Cooper can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on item Q1.
88WNYL-524	The following conclusions were reached after an examination: 7.1 The writer of the specimen writing marked "K1a-c" is not the writer of the disputed writing marked "Q1". 7.2 Similarities occur between the questioned marked "Q1" and specimen documents marked "K2a-b", which support the evidence that same writer probably wrote the documents. 7.3 The disputed signature on the document marked "Q1" are a forgery and therefor none of the writers of the specimen documents marked "K1a-c" or "K2a-b" can be link to the disputed signature.
8AFV3F-524	Results of Examinations: Due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing not accounted for in the available known writing, a definite determination could not be reached whether the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned writing was prepared by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of Item 2 (Item K1 a-c). However, characteristics were observed which indicate that the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned writing, excluding the signature, may not have been prepared by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of Item 2 (Item K1 a-c). Due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing not accounted for in the available known writing, a definite determination could not be reached whether the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned writing was prepared by Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 3 (Item K2 a-b). However, characteristics were observed which indicate that the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned writing, excluding the signature, may have been prepared by Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 3 (Item K2 a-b). Due to the lack of comparability between handwriting and hand printing and characteristics in the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned signature not observed in the available known writing, no conclusion could be reached whether the Item 1 (Item Q1) questioned signature was or was not prepared by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of Item 2 (Item K1 a-c) or Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 3 (Item K2 a-b).
8DYUDP-524	The signature in question is a forgery and not signed by either "K1" or "K2" as it is in cursive while "k1" signes a mixture of stylised and letter based signature. "K2"s signature is letter based but in print script. The writing in question is a forgery as it does not belong to "K1",there are too many differences as compared to similarities. While when "Q1" is compared to "K2" there are more similarities as compared to the differences.
8Q442Y-523	The exemplar writer (K1) did not write the writing on the questioned early dismissal form. It could not be determined whether or not this exemplar writer wrote the questioned signature. Although dissimilarities exist between the questioned and known signatures, the writer can't be completely discounted as having written the signature because it is not possible to anticipate all the ways a writer can alter his or her writing, consciously or not. It is probable that the exemplar writer (K2) wrote the writing, excluding the signature, on the questioned early dismissal form. Similarities exist between the questioned and known writing, however this examination is limited by the exemplar provided. Additional contemporaneous exemplar writing in the same style and size, containing the same letter combinations, and written using the same type of writing instrument as the questioned material is needed for re-examination. It could not be determined whether or not this exemplar writer wrote the questioned signature, since no comparable exemplar signatures were submitted.
8RJ3LN-523	1) We have performed an analysis of the following samples: Q1, K1 (a, b, c), K2 (a, b) by identification of individual features for conducting a graphic-comparative analysis. The submitted samples were qualified for the assessment. 2) We have conducted a comparison of distinctive features specified in Q1 sample (that is, ordinary handwriting, a digital record of) and we established that it was entirely written by one person. Subsequently, it was tested for the presence of the features specified in K1 (a, b, c) sample. In the result of the conducted analysis we have established that the handwriting in Q1 sample was not made by K1 - Bobbi Meeks. 3) In the next step, we compared the distinctive features specified in Q1 sample (that is, ordinary handwriting, a digital record of) by testing for the presence of distinctive features of K2 (a, b) graphism. In the result of conducted analysis we have established that the handwriting in Q1 sample was made by

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>K2 - Hank Cooper. 4) In the subsequent stage we have compared the features specified in "Bobbi Meeks" signature in Q1 sample with the features specified in K1 sample (a, b, c). In the result of the conducted analysis we have concluded that the signature has not been made by K1 - Bobbi Meeks. 5) Finally, we analyzed the signature "Bobbi Meeks" (Q1) with the comparative sample marked as K2 - Hank Cooper. We concluded that the comparative samples is faulty. The sample of Hank Cooper consists of two sheets of a document (that has not been made on request, but most probably collected from the suspect's resources) with handwriting of different tempo, where the signature "Bobbi Meeks" signature is not compliant with their original signature. Moreover, there are no handwritings that are made on demand, of adequate content to the signature "Bobbi Meeks", made on the form analogous to the evidence material. Therefore it cannot be qualified for the analysis.</p>
93FV6Y-523	<p>Hank Cooper wrote the questioned note, excluding the signature. Hank Cooper cannot be identified or excluded as the writer of the questioned signature. Bobbi Meeks did not write or sign the questioned note.</p>
97XVKE-524	<p>A definite determination could not be reached whether Bobbi Meeks, writer of Item 2 (K1 a-c), or Hank Cooper, writer of Item 3 (K2 a-b), did or did not prepare the questioned Item 1 (Q1) hand printed and signed early dismissal form due to the limited amount of known writing and handwriting characteristics not explained in the available known writing. However, dissimilarities were observed which indicate Meeks, Item 2 (K1 a-c), may not have prepared the questioned Item 1 (Q1) hand printed and signed ("Bobbi Meeks") early dismissal form. In addition, characteristics in common were observed which indicate Cooper, Item 3 (K2 a-b), may have prepared the questioned Item 1 (Q1) hand printed portion of the early dismissal form. No conclusion could be reached whether Hank Cooper, writer of Item 3 (K2 a-b), did or did not prepare the questioned Item 1 (Q1) signed ("Bobbi Meeks") portion of the early dismissal form due to lack of comparability. If future handwriting comparisons are desired, extensive dictated and undicated known writing should be obtained from Meeks, Item 2 (K1 a-c), Cooper, Item 3 (K2 a-b) and anyone else suspected of having prepared the questioned writing. The known writing should be hand printed/handwritten and comparable to the questioned writing in wording and format. Dictated known writing should be in the exact wording as the questioned writing, similar in writing instrument, and obtained on forms similar to the questioned item. Each exemplar should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Undicated known writing consists of handwriting prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undicated known writing include business papers, letters, greeting cards, and applications.</p>
986DGP-523	<p>1. The questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form: was not written by Bobbi Meeks, was written by Hank Cooper. 2. The questioned signature on the early dismissal form: was not written by Bobbi Meeks. The questioned signature cannot be identified or eliminated as written by Hank Cooper.</p>
9BRWHM-523	<p>The hand printed writings personal characteristics in early dismissal form Q1, and the known writing (K2) are the same . It is concluded that (Q1) was written by the writer of (K2). The hand printed signature personal characteristics in early dismissal from Q1, differs and the known exemplars of the writer of (k1). It is concluded the hand printed signature was not by the writer of (K1). the characteristics of same letters in hand printed Q1 similar and the characteristics of the same letters written by the writer (K2). It is concluded the hand printed signature was probably written by the writer of (K2).</p>
9C2YAD-524	<p>A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by BOBBI MEEKS, the known writer of Item 2 (Item K1 a-c), due to a limited quantity of comparably worded known writing, the limited clarity and detail in the submitted items, and the presence of unexplained characteristics in the questioned writing. However, inconsistencies were observed to indicate MEEKS may not have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding extraneous markings. Furthermore, while pictorially dissimilar from the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) signature, no conclusion could be reached whether BOBBI MEEKS, the known writer of Item 2 (Item K1 a-c), did or did not prepare the questioned signature due to</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>possible distortion of the questioned signature, limited quantity of handwritten known writing in the name "Bobbi Meeks", the limited clarity and detail in the submitted items, and the presence of unexplained characteristics in the questioned writing. A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by HANK COOPER, the known writer of Item 3 (Item K2a-b), due to the limited quantity of comparably worded known writing, the limited clarity and detail in the submitted items, and the presence of unexplained characteristics in the questioned writing. However, similarities were observed to indicate COOPER may have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1), excluding extraneous markings. No conclusion could be reached whether HANK COOPER, the known writer of Item 3 (Item K2a-b), did or did not prepare the questioned Item 1 (Item Q1) signature due to possible distortion of the questioned signature, the lack of known writing in name "Bobbi Meeks", the limited clarity and detail in the submitted items, and the presence of unexplained characteristics in the questioned writing. If future handwriting examinations are desired, the original questioned item should be submitted to this Laboratory. In that event, additional known writing should be obtained from MEEKS, COOPER, or any other logical suspect(s). The known writing should consist of hand printing comparable in wording and format to the questioned writing. Handwriting in the name "Bobbi Meeks" should be obtained as well. Dictated known writing should be obtained on separate 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.</p>
9NCCLL-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
9Q8T4B-524	<p>Based on the examination and comparison of the question writing located in the normal writing areas of Q1 with the listed known writing of Bobbi Meeks listed as K1a, K1b & K1c and Hank Cooper listed as K2a & K2b, I find the following: I find that Bobbi Meeks probably did not author the writing in question with the exception of the question 'Bobbi Meeks' signature located on the 'Parent Signature' line. I also find the Hank Cooper probably authored the writing in question with the exception of the 'Bobbi Meeks' signature located in the 'Parent Signature' line of Q1. The author of the question 'Bobbi Meeks' signature cannot be determined from the submitted known standards of either person. This finding is based on similarities found between the question and known writing of Hank Cooper and dissimilarities from Bobbi Meeks. The probable finding of Hank Cooper is based if it can be shown that the non-requested writing submitted was authored by him.</p>
9RJMNG-524	<p>There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on early dismissal form document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of most of the specimen writing on documents marked "K2a" to "K2b".</p>
A9GCAD-523	[No Conclusions Reported.]
AAVRRK-523	<p>The specimen material submitted in the name Hank COOPER (K2) was brief in nature and was produced using fluid ink, which prevented some of the constructions from being determined. These were both limitations that existed in the examination. Similarities and a lack of fundamental differences were observed between the writing on Q1 and the specimen writing in the name Hank COOPER (K2). Given the limitations mentioned above, in my opinion, there is qualified support for the proposition that the writer of the Hank COOPER (K2) specimen material also produced the entries on Q1. Fundamental differences were observed between the writing on Q1 and the specimen writing in the name Bobbi MEEKS (K1). Based on the specimen material provided, in my opinion, the writer of the Bobbi MEEKS (K1) specimen material did not produce the entries on Q1. My opinion in regard to the authorship of the signature on Q1 is inconclusive.</p>
ADB2YW-524	<p>1. I have found identification in handwriting characteristics between the questioned handwriting Q1, excluding the signature, and the handwriting samples in the name of Hank Cooper, and in my opinion the questioned writing was written by him beyond reasonable doubt. 2. I have found</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>significant dissimilarities in handwriting characteristics between the questioned handwriting, excluding the signature, and the handwriting samples in the name of Bobbi Meeks that were received for examination. 3. There is only one questioned signature and it shows signs of not being written fluently, nevertheless I have found a number of dissimilarities in handwriting characteristics between the questioned signature and sample signatures in the name of Bobbi Meeks that were received for examination. 4. I am not able to express an opinion regarding the connection or lack of connection between the questioned signature and the handwriting samples in the name of Hank Cooper due to lack of data for comparison. It is possible that with more of his handwriting samples I would be able to express an opinion.</p>
ADQPVH-524	<p>K1 can be eliminated as having authored the note, Q1. The range of variation exhibited in Q1 when compared to K1 contains substantial significant dissimilarities. Dissimilarities were noted in spacing, slant, letter formations, beginning and ending strokes, and baseline habits. Substantial significant similarities were noted in K2 when compared to the note, Q1. Similarities were noted in spacing, slant, letter formations, diacritics, and connecting strokes. Of particular mention were similarities in the stemless "u", "n", and "m"; pronounced stem "a"; connecting stroke "pe", the shape and size of the "k"; the upward ending stroke of the "r"; long lower extension of the "g"; tilted back "e". It is highly probable that K2 is the author of the note, Q1. The Q1 signature could not be compared to K1 due to the fact that no cursive handwriting samples were submitted written by K1. The K2 signatures, Bobbi Meeks, were compared to the Q1 signature. K2 can be eliminated as having authored the Q1 signature.</p>
AH7T9E-524	<p>3.1 There is evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in questioned marked as "Q1" were written by the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2b" and were not written by the writer of specimen material marked "K1a" to "K1c". 3.2 Proper examination and comparison could not be conducted between the questioned signature on document marked "Q1" and the specimen signature on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2b" due to differences in respect of design and construction.</p>
AH9MNE-524	<p>A determination could not be made as to whether or not Bobbi Meeks, the writer of Item 1 (K1a-c), prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item 3 (Q1), due to the limited amount of comparable known handwriting submitted for examination and characteristics in the questioned writing that could not be accounted for on the basis of the available known writing. However, dissimilarities observed indicate that Meeks may not have prepared the questioned writing or signature on Item 3 (Q1). A determination could not be made as to whether or not Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 2 (K2a-b), prepared the questioned writing and signature on Item 3 (Q1), due to the very limited amount of comparable known handwriting submitted for examination and characteristics in the questioned writing that could not be accounted for on the basis of the available known writing. However, characteristics in common indicate that Cooper may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 3 (Q1). No conclusion could be made as to whether or not Cooper prepared the questioned signature on Item 3 (Q1) due to the lack of any comparable known handwriting.</p>
AHBDWH-524	<p>[No Conclusions Reported.]</p>
AMWPME-523	<p>Q1 was not written by the writer of K1a-c, Bobbi Meeks. Q1 was also not signed by Bobbi Meeks. Q1 was probably written by the writer of K2a-b, Hank Cooper. The signature of Q1 cannot be identified at being the writing of Hank Cooper.</p>
AQZZPY-524	<p>Bobbi Meeks probably did not write the handwritten entries or signature on the questioned early dismissal form, 001-A1. Hank Cooper probably wrote the handwritten entries on the questioned early dismissal form, 001-A1. No conclusion could be reached whether or not Hank Cooper wrote the questioned signature on 001-A1 due to the lack of comparable known writing available for examination. The examination of additional known writing of both Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper, including that of Hank Cooper signing the name "Bobbi Meeks", may provide the basis for more conclusive opinions.</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
AT6XRF-524	<p>The extended, (i.e. non-signature) writing in the early dismissal form shows many similarities to the writing of Hank Cooper in items K2a, K2b, and K2c. No single similarity is conclusive but the combination of similarities leads me to conclude that Hank Cooper made that writing. The signature in the name of Bobbi Meeks in the early dismissal form, item Q1, differs greatly from the genuine examples of Bobbi Meeks' signature in items K1a and K1b. Either it was written by her in a style differing from that of the genuine examples or it was written by some other person. The writing of the questioned signature differs also from the writing of Hank Cooper in items K2a and K2b. Again, it is possible that it was written by him in a different style but it is equally possible it was written by some other person.</p>
ATPCMJ-524	<p>writings was made by Hank Cooper the firm in question did not perform any of the two authors</p>
BDNZME-524	<p>1- The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (Q1) was written by Hank Cooper (k2). 2- The questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1) was probably written by Hank Cooper (k2).</p>
BJCXV3-524	<p>All of the submitted documents are considered to be original. No indented writing, DNA, or latent print processing is recommended for these evidence items. The hand printing and signature on item Q-1, the early dismissal form, were compared to the submitted known writing of two authors as represented on items K-1a-c and K-2a-b using visual comparison and sketching. The submitted standards were evaluated and found to be internally consistent and natural. The questioned Bobby Meeks signature on item Q-1 exhibits less skill than the rest of the questioned document. This signature does not appear to be naturally written. If the submitted Bobbi Meeks signatures in item K-1 are the free and natural writing of this author, then the questioned signature on item Q-1 is not the free and natural writing of this author. I must remain Inconclusive as to whether or not this writer is responsible for this signature. No hand writing or signatures were submitted for Hank Cooper. While some similarities were observed between the core of the capital letters in the questioned signature to the printing of Hank Cooper, I must remain Inconclusive based on the submitted standards. Submission of further standards from this writer, reportedly, Hank Cooper, particularly cursive writing and Bobbi Meeks signatures, might allow for an opinion. Significant gross and subtle similarities were observed between the hand printed material on item Q-1 and hand printing submitted as item K-2; reportedly the writing of Hank Cooper. The writer of these standards is identified as the writer of the questioned hand printed material on the questioned document. All other writers, therefore, are eliminated as possible sources of this writing.</p>
BNQDRL-524	<p>It is concluded that the questioned writing was made by Hank Cooper. It is concluded that the questioned signature was probably written by Hank Cooper. It is concluded that the questioned writing and signature was not made by Bobbie Meeks.</p>
BV88LG-523	<p>I have examined the questioned handwriting (excluding signature) appearing on the document in Item Q1 and the specimen handwriting of "MEEKS" appearing on the documents in Items K1 and the specimen handwriting of "COOPER" appearing on the documents in Items K2. I have evaluated the quality and quantity of questioned and specimen handwriting, and the similarities and/or dissimilarities observed when compared. The propositions I have considered are that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimen "MEEKS" handwriting; that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimen "COOPER" handwriting; and that the questioned handwriting was written by a writer other than the writers of the specimen handwriting. The questioned handwriting (excluding signature) appearing on the document in Item Q1 displays some similarities and some significant dissimilarities/differences in features such as, slant, spacing, alignment, character constructions, and connections, when compared with the specimen "MEEKS" handwriting appearing on the documents in Items K1. The questioned handwriting (excluding signature) appearing on the document in Item Q1 displays very strong similarities in features including, but not limited to, style, skill, speed and fluency, slant, spacing, alignment, proportions, character constructions, and connections, when compared with the specimen "COOPER" handwriting appearing on the documents in Items K2. No significant differences in features were observed. In my opinion there is very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimen "COOPER" handwriting,</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>as opposed to the alternatives. Therefore, it is my opinion that the questioned handwriting appearing on the document in Item Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen "COOPER" handwriting appearing on the documents in Item K2. I have examined the questioned signature appearing on the document in Item Q1 and the specimen handwriting and signatures of "MEEKS" appearing on the documents in Items K1 and the specimen handwriting of "COOPER" appearing on the documents in Items K2. The questioned signature appearing on the document in Item Q1 displays significant constructional differences to the specimen "MEEKS" signatures appearing on the documents in Item K1. Further, some evidence of possible attention to the writing process was observed in the questioned signature. The questioned signature is not comparable with the specimen handwriting and signatures provided in either Item K1 or K2. Therefore, the result of my examination of the questioned signature is inconclusive, that is, I am unable to identify or eliminate either specimen writer.</p>
BVBHFF-524	<p>3.) I first identified the handwriting characteristics and the range of variation in the letters and numbers in Q-1, the questioned writing. These variations were then compared to those in the two samples labeled K-1a through K-1c and K-2a –K-2b. Based on comparing the hand writing characteristics in Q-1 to the K-1 samples, I identified repeated and unexplained differences in the handwriting characteristics. Therefore, I concluded that the writer of the K-1 samples did not fill out Q-1. I identified many similarities in the handwriting characteristics in Q-1 and in the K-2 samples. As examples, these similarities included letter configurations, height ratios, internal spacing, and the buckle and final legs of the letters k. There were no unexplained differences. I concluded that the writer of the K-2 samples also filled out Q-1. Because the signature of Bobbi Meeks in Q-1 was in cursive and the writing in the K-2 samples were all printed, no conclusion was reached whether the writer of the K-2 samples signed the name Bobbi Meeks on Q-1. There were no cursive samples of writing present in the K-2 samples to use for comparison.</p>
BW3PJC-524	<p>1. There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on the document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of specimen writing on documents marked "K2a" to "K2b". 2. There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the writer of specimen writing on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". 3. Common authorship could not be identified or eliminated between the questioned signature on document marked as "Q1" and specimen signatures on documents marked as "K2b" and "K1a" to "K1b".</p>
C2EUZJ-524	<p>It is my opinion that: 1: The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwritten entries appearing on the document, item Q1, were written by the writer of the Hank COOPER handwriting specimens, items K2a-b. 2: Structural dissimilarities were observed between the questioned 'Bobbi Meeks' signature appearing on the document, item Q1, and the signature specimens submitted as that of Bobbi Meeks, items K1a-c. These structural dissimilarities could be the result of either disguise behaviour by the specimen writer or forgery/simulation behaviour by someone other than the specimen writer, however due to the nature of such signatures the authorship of the questioned signature could not be determined and as a result the examination was inconclusive.</p>
C8DJAV-523	<p>D: There are indications that Bobbi Meeks did not write the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form. A: It is highly probable that Hank Cooper wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form. D: There are indications that Bobbi Meeks did not write the questioned signature on the early dismissal form. C: We couldn't make any conclusion if Bobbi Meeks wrote the questioned signature on the early dismissal form, or not.</p>
CEXQQF-524	<p>3.1 There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of specimen writing on documents marked "K2a" and "K2b" i.e Hank Cooper. 3.2 There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on document marked "Q1" was not written by the writer of specimen writing on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" i.e Bobbi Meeks. 3.3 The disputed signature on document marked "Q1" is a forgery.</p>
CKKCZM-524	<p>On comparison, I found,: 1.The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (Q1) was not written by the writer of K1 (Bobbi Meeks). 2. The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (Q1) was</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	written by the writer of K2 (Hank Cooper). 3. The questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1) was not written by the writer of K1 (Bobbi Meeks). 4. The known signatures of K2 (Hank Cooper) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1).
CQNFPL-524	(a). Comparing the questioned writing (including the signature) on item Q1 with the known writings of Bobbi Meeks (K1) and Hank Cooper (K2), respectively, showed that more significant similarities than differences in the formation of the letters and numerals were found between the questioned writing on item Q1 and the known writings on items K2a and K2b. (b). Based on the above findings, I am of the opinion that the writer of the known writings on items K2a and K2b (Hank Cooper) wrote the questioned writing and signature on the early dismissal form (item Q1).
CXUWJF-524	The processing and signature against the contributed material was filled out by the Mr. HANK COOPER
CY7PF3-524	The writer of Item 2 (2.1-2.2) (K2 a & b) (Hank Cooper) has been identified as the writer of the questioned entries 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. There is no conclusion as to whether the writer of Item 2 (2.1-2.2) (K2 a & b) (Hank Cooper) wrote the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on Item 3 (Q1). The range of variation exhibited in the questioned signature and in the known writing contains insufficient significant similarities and insufficient significant dissimilarities. Additionally, there were limitations due to lack of cursive "Bobbi Meeks" signature standards submitted for comparison purposes. The writer of Item 1 (1.1-1.3) (K1 a-c) (Bobbi Meeks) has been eliminated as the writer of the questioned entries appearing on Item 3 (Q1). 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 1 (1.1-1.3) (K1 a-c) (Bobbi Meeks) probably did not write the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on Item 3 (Q1). The range of variation exhibited in the questioned signature and in the known writing contains some significant dissimilarities. Additionally, there were limitations present in the known writing due to the limited quantity of requested "Bobbi Meeks" signature standards and normal course of business "Bobbi Meeks" signatures submitted for comparison purposes. For Investigative Purposes Only: It is requested that Hank Cooper (Item 2) (K2 a & b) provide twenty-five (25) "Bobbi Meeks" signature standards. It is also requested that Bobbi Meeks (Item 1) (K1 a-c) provide twenty-five (25) requested and normal course of business signatures. The original of Item 3 (Q1) is also requested.
DAH4U-524	In our opinion, we think that the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on dismissal form was written by Hank Cooper (K2). In our opinion, we think the questioned signature on dismissal form was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1) and was probably not written by Hank Cooper (K2).
DBFLXC-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 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). Assuming that we deal with originals in this examination the wording in our report would be: The questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form was probably written by Hank Cooper. He cannot be identified or eliminated as an originator of the questioned signature. The questioned signature was probably not written by Bobbi Meeks.
DBV3T6-524	Based on the observed characteristics the questioned handwriting (text) made by Hank Cooper.
DLEE73-524	It was determined the dismissal form including the signature were not written by Bobbie Meeks, K1. It was also determined the body of the dismissal form (excluding the signature) was written by Hank Cooper, K2. A comparison of the signature was not conducted to Hank Cooper due to non

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	comparable known writing standards to the signature.
DRL7DF-524	<p>Purpose: To determine which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form; To determine which, if either, of the known writers wrote the questioned signature on the early dismissal form; The handwriting and the signature on document Q1 were considered separately. Handwriting Consideration of the handwriting for Q1, K1A, K1B, K1C, K2A and K2B was undertaken in order to assess the following pairs of competing hypotheses: 1st Set 1) The writer of the K1 specimen documents wrote the document Q1; 2) Someone other than the writer of the K1 specimen documents wrote the document Q1. The evidence provides very strong support for proposition 2) rather than the alternative proposition 1). 2nd set 3) The writer of the K2 specimen documents wrote the document Q1; 4) Someone other than the writer of the K2 specimen documents wrote the document Q1. The evidence provides strong support for proposition 3) rather than the alternative proposition 4). Signature Consideration of the signature on Q1 was undertaken in order to assess the following pairs of hypotheses: 1st Set 1) The writer of the signature on Q1 is also the writer of the K1 specimen documents K1A, K1B and K1C; 2) Someone other than the writer of the K1 specimen documents wrote the signature on document Q1; The evidence provides strong support for proposition 2) rather than the alternative proposition 1). 2nd set 3) The writer of the signature on Q1 is also the writer of the K2 specimen documents; 4) Someone other than the writer of the K2 specimen documents wrote the signature on document Q1. The evidence provides approximately equal support for propositions 3) and 4).</p>
DVHMUF-524	<p>Comparison of the questioned handwriting on the early dismissal form Q1 with the control handwriting of Bobbi Meeks (K1) revealed differences in characteristic writing features relating to line quality, writing movements, proportionality and connection of letters. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on the early dismissal form Q1 was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). Comparison of the questioned handwriting on the early dismissal form Q1 with the control handwriting of Hank Cooper (K2) revealed similarities in characteristic writing features relating to line quality, writing movements, proportionality and connection of letters. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting on the early dismissal form Q1 was written by Hank Cooper (K2). Comparison of the questioned signature on the early dismissal form Q1 with the control handwriting of Bobbi Meeks (K1) revealed differences in design details, line quality and writing movements. In view of the above findings, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature on the early dismissal form Q1 was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). As there are no control signature specimens written by Hank Cooper (K2) available for comparison with the questioned signature on the early dismissal form Q1, I can neither confirm nor eliminate that the questioned signature on the early dismissal form Q1 was written by Hank Cooper (K2).</p>
DW9XJM-523	<p>Questioned writing (Q1) was not written by known writers of K1a, K1b and K1c. There is no similar characteristic with questioned writing. Questioned writing was written by known writers of K2a and K2b. There is similar characteristic with questioned writing.</p>
DX9VXP-524	<p>After the analysis and comparison I reached the following conclusions: 7.1 The writer of the collected and requested specimen writing and signatures of Bobbie Meeks marked "K1a – K1c" did not write the disputed writing and signature on the early dismissal form marked "Q1". 7.2 The writer of the collected specimen writing of Hank Cooper marked "K2a – K2b" also wrote the disputed writing on the early dismissal form marked "Q1". 7.3 A degree of resemblance exist between the capital letters (B and M) on the disputed signature on the early dismissal form marked "Q1" and the collected specimen writing of Hank Cooper marked "K2a – K2b". A definite conclusion cannot be reached. More specimen writing of Hank Cooper marked "K2a – K2b" in both capital and small letters in cursive writing to be obtained for further analysis.</p>
EBCJLC-524	<p>It was determined that the Form, Q-1 (excluding signature), was written by Cooper, K-2. Due to the lack of comparable known writing a comparison between the signature, Q-1, and Cooper, K-2, was not conducted. It was determined that the signature, Q-1, was not written by Meeks, K-1.</p>
EDG8Z3-524	<p>Laboratory item #3: The handwriting appearing on Q1 was written by the author of the known writing samples, laboratory item #2 Hank Cooper/HC1-2. Laboratory item #3: The handwriting</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>appearing on Q1 was not written by the author of the known writing samples, laboratory item #1 Bobbi Meeks/BM1-3. Laboratory item #3 "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on Q1 was not written by the author of the known writing samples, laboratory item #1 Bobbi Meeks/BM1-3. No conclusion could be made between laboratory item #3 signature "Bobbi Meeks" (Q1) and laboratory item #2 known writing samples of Hank Cooper/HC1-2. The following limitations preclude a more definitive opinion: Lack of directly comparable signatures: If further attention is required please submit directed known writing samples from Hank Cooper executing "Bobbi Meeks".</p>
EKU3YG-524	<p>1. Differences were identified between the questioned writing and signature on document marked Q1 and specimen writing and signatures on documents marked K1a-K1c with regards to elements of style and execution indicating that they were not written by the same author. 2. Similarities were identified between the questioned writing on document marked Q1 and specimen writing on documents marked K2b with regards to elements of style and execution indicating that they were written by the same author. 3. No conclusion with regards to the author of the questioned signature on document marked Q1 can be made.</p>
EVECMB-524	<p>Hank Cooper (K2) has written the early dismissal form (Q1). Hank Cooper (K2) has signed on the early dismissal form (Q1) with Bobbi Meeks (K1) signature.</p>
EXKRZ9-524	<p>A definitive determination could not be reached whether Bobbi Meeks, the writer of Item 2 (K1 a-c), or Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 3 (K2 a-b), prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1), due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned writing that are not present in the available known writing and the lack of sufficient comparable known writing. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate that Cooper, Item 3 (K2 a-b), may have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1). In addition, dissimilarities were observed which indicate that Meeks, Item 2 (K1 a-c), may not have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1 (Item Q1). No conclusion could be reached whether Bobbi Meeks, the writer of Item 2 (K1 a-c) or Hank Cooper, the writer of Item 3 (K2 a-b) did or did not prepare the questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1), due to the presence of characteristics in the questioned signature that are not present in the available known writing, the lack of sufficient comparable known writing and the limited nature of the questioned signature.</p>
EYFDUZ-523	<p>Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwritten entries appearing in image 16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001 and the handwritten entries (reportedly) authored by Bobbi Meeks appearing in images 16-523_K1A.tif through 16-523_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 handwritten entries appearing in image 16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001 and the handwritten entries (reportedly) authored by Bobbi Meeks appearing in images 16-523_K1A.tif through 16-523_K1C.tif do not share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned handwritten entries appearing in image 16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001 and the handwritten entries (reportedly) authored by Hank Cooper appearing in images 16-523_K2A.tif and 16-523_K2B.tif in Submission 001 revealed numerous similarities in individual handwriting characteristics and habits. Based on these similarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that the Questioned handwritten entries appearing in image 16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001 and the handwritten entries (reportedly) authored by Hank Cooper appearing in images 16-523_K2A.tif and 16-523_K2B.tif in Submission 001 share common authorship. Inter-comparison examination and analysis between the Questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing in image 16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001 and the "Bobbi Meeks" signatures (reportedly) authored by Bobbi Meeks appearing in images 16-523_K1A.tif and 16-523_K2B.tif revealed several dissimilarities in individual signature characteristics and habits. Based on these dissimilarities, it is the opinion of the undersigned examiners that the Questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing in image 16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001 and the "Bobbi Meeks" signatures (reportedly) authored by Bobbi Meeks appearing in images 16-523_K1A.tif and 16-523_K1B.tif in Submission 001 do not share common authorship. Due to the lack of "Bobbi Meeks" signatures (reportedly) authored by Hank Cooper, no comparison could be made to the Questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing in image</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	16-523_Q1.tif in Submission 001.
EYG9D6-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
EZT3WC-524	<p>1)The questioned handwriting on "Q1" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting was not written by the writer of the specimens (Bobbi Meeks). 2)The questioned handwriting on "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in handwriting characteristics as the specimen handwriting "K2a" and "K2b". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimens (Hank Cooper). 3)The questioned signature on "Q1" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that the questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens (Bobbi Meeks). 4)The questioned signature on "Q1" was different in structure from the specimen signature from the specimen signature "K2b". Hence, it is not possible to carry out a suitable comparison of the handwriting characteristics to ascertain the authorship of this questioned signature.</p>
F2KFWA-524	<p>There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on the document marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen on the document marked as "K2a" to "K2b". There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on the document marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen on the document marked as "K1a" to "K1c". The evidence also support that the authorship of the questioned signature marked as "Q1" was probably not written by the author of the specimen marked as "K2a" to "K2b". The evidence also support that the authorship of the questioned signature marked as "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen marked as "K1a" to "K1c".</p>
FJ2RJ9-524	<p>The comparative study reveals notorious similarities between the writing (excluding signature) of folio Q1 with text written by Hank Cooper viewed in the samples (K2a, K2b). The similar findings more important are: vertical tilt of the signs , graphic links manufacturing and signs: "pe", "M", "me" and the guarimos "2" and "6", among other details. The text of the document questioned identified as Q1 were not written by Bobbi Meeks, according to the comparative study with he text of the leaves (K1a, K1b, K1c). After the comparative study the writings of Hank Cooper (K2a, b) can not be identified or eliminated front the signature of the questioned documento Q1. The firm of the document questioned identified as Q1, were not written by Bobbi Meeks according to the comparative study with he text of the leaves (K1a, K1b,K1c).</p>
FZ62ME-523	<p>ASTM E1658-07, Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions of Forensic Document Examiners, has been used in the preparation of the opinions expressed in this report. The following scale provides the levels for expressing conclusions: Identification (definite conclusion of identity), Strong probability (highly probable), Probable, Indications (evidence to suggest), No conclusion (inconclusive or indeterminable), Indications did not, Probably did not, Strong probability did not, Elimination. There are significant similarities between the questioned document and the K2 comparison writings and significant differences between the questioned document and the K1 comparisons. These include the formation of the M, B, k, 6, and 2, the connection of the letter after "f", the arrangement of the text, the proportion of the "l" dot to the rest of the letters in the words, and the size of the hyphens between the numbers in the phone number. Based on the review of the questioned document in comparison to the known exemplars, I conclude that the questioned writing, excluding the signature, was probably written by Hank Cooper and was probably not written by Bobbi Meeks. I conclude that the author of the signature cannot be identified or eliminated. Due to the limited about of comparison signatures and the comparison writings are copies, the findings in this report are qualified. Original documents may present additional evidence, which could change the opinions provided in this report. Therefore, I recommend the original documents be provided for examination. In addition, I recommend that additional signature exemplars of Bobbie Meeks made through the normal course of business be obtained.</p>
G6WTB3-524	<p>If it can be shown that the non-requested standards K2a-K2b can be attributed to the uncle Hank Cooper, I offer the following: There is evidence the conclusion that Hank Cooper probably wrote</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	the questioned writings found in Q1. There is sufficient evidence to support a proposition or conclusion that the questioned writings Q1 was not written by Bobbi Meeks. There are indications that Hank Cooper may have authored the signature found on Q1, however the class characteristics common to both do not support any real degree of authorship or support an elimination, based on the evidence.
G7AD4C-524	The results of the examination support that the questioned writing, excluding the signature, was not written by Bobbi Meeks (Level -2). The results of the examination support that the questioned signature was not written by Bobbi Meeks (Level -2). The results of the examination strongly support that the questioned writing, excluding the signature, was written by Hank Cooper (Level +3). No comparison between the questioned signature and the samples from Hank Cooper was possible.
G8LW4A-524	There is not graphic identity between the manuscripts made in the early exit format (Q1) and the reference patterns made by the Lady Bobbi Meeks (K1a), (K1b), (K1c). There is not graphic identity between the signature made in the early exit format (Q1) and the reference signatures made by the Lady Bobbi Meeks (K1a), (K1b), (K1c). There is graphic identity between the manuscript made in the output format (Q1) and the manuscripts made by the Lord Hank Cooper (K2a), (K2b).
GHMHA9-524	After examination and comparison I reached the following conclusions: 7.1 The writer of the collected specimen writing and signatures marked K2A – K2B of Mr Hank Cooper also wrote the questioned writing on the early dismissal form marked "Q1". 7.2 The writer of the collected specimen writing and signature marked K1A-K1C of Mrs Bobbie Meeks did not write the questioned signature next to Parent. 7.3 There are differences between the questioned signature next to parent signature: space on the early dismissal form marked "Q1" with the specimen signatures marked K2A-K2B of Mr Hank Cooper that's occur, which indicates that it was probably not written by the writer of the collected specimens.
GNNWVA-524	I find many similarities and no significant differences between the questioned non-signature writing on Q1 and the reference writing of Hank Cooper. The similarities are such that, in my opinion, there is conclusive support for the proposition that Hank cooper is the author of the questioned non-signature writing on Q1. I find significant differences between the questioned non-signature writing on Q1 and the reference writing of Bobbi Meeks. Given these findings and my conclusion for Hank Cooper, in my opinion, Bobbi Meeks did not write the questioned non-signature writing on Q1. Where comparisons can be made I find differences between the questioned signature on Q1 and the reference signatures and writing of Bobbi Meeks. The differences are such that, in my opinion, there is strong support for the proposition that someone other than Bobbi Meeks is the author of the questioned signature on Q1. Where comparisons can be made I find both similarities and differences between the questioned signature on Q1 and the reference writing of Hank Cooper. Taking into consideration the nature of the questioned signature (see additional comments), I am unable to identify or exclude Hank Cooper as the author of the questioned signature. My findings are therefore inconclusive.
GQ29WY-524	The evidence contained in the handwriting points strongly to the questioned writings excluding the "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Q1 and the K2a-b exemplar writings attributed to Hank Cooper as having been authored by the same writer. However, not all of the features present in the Q1 handwriting could be accounted for with the K2a-b exemplar writings due to a lack of sufficient quantity of comparable text (same word and letter combinations). The questioned writings excluding the "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Q1 were probably authored by the writer of the K2a-b exemplars submitted as being authored by Hank Cooper. Should additional comparable exemplar writings be obtained it is recommended that they be submitted for examination. The evidence contained in the handwriting points strongly to the questioned writings excluding the "Bobbi Meeks " signature on Q1 as having been not authored by the same writer as the K1a-c exemplar writings attributed to Bobbi Meeks. Significant dissimilarities were noted between the questioned and exemplar writings. The questioned writings excluding the "Bobbi Meeks " signature on Q1 were probably not authored by the same writer as the K1a-c exemplar writings attributed to Bobbi Meeks. Due to a lack of sufficient comparable exemplar writings no opinion could be reached as to common authorship between the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on Q1 and the exemplar writings,

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	K2a-b, attributed to Hank Cooper. It is recommended that exemplar writings comparable to the "Bobbi Meeks" signature be obtained and submitted for examination. The evidence contained in the handwriting indicates that the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on Q1 may not have been authored by the writer of the exemplar writings, K1a-c, attributed to Bobbi Meeks. While this is a weak opinion, there were sufficient dissimilarities to indicate some likelihood of non-authorship.
GV8Y2Q-524	The writer of Item K2a-b (Hank Cooper) prepared the non-signature portions of Item Q1. Due to the absence of comparable signature samples Hank Cooper can be neither identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned 'Bobbi Meeks' signature on Item Q1. There are indications (meaning a high degree of likelihood) the writer of K1a-c (Bobbi Meeks) did not write the questioned 'Bobbi Meeks' signature on Item Q1.
GY8ATK-524	Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that Q1 was hand printed and signed by Hank Cooper, the author of K2a-b. Based upon the available evidence it is my professional opinion that Q1 was not hand printed and signed by Bobbi Meeks, author of K1a-c.
H33JFQ-524	The questioned handwriting has been naturally completed with no evidence of copying or disguise. A number of similarities were noted between the questioned handwriting and the specimens attributed to Hank Cooper (K2). These similarities are in gross and subtle features such as writing style, slope, size relationships and individual letter constructions. Based on these similarities it is my opinion that the author of the specimens attributed to Hank Cooper completed the questioned handwriting on the early dismissal form. The questioned Bobbi Meeks signature does not follow the signature style seen in the specimens attributed to Bobbi Meeks. It contains differences in letterforms to the handwriting specimens attributed to Bobbi Meeks. Accordingly, based on the specimens submitted there is no evidence that Bobbi Meeks completed the questioned signature. The questioned signature lacks fluency and has been completed in a semi-cursive writing style. This has limited the comparison possible with the specimens attributed to Hank Cooper which are in a disconnected, printed style. As a result, it has not been possible to determine whether the differences observed are due to the difference in writing style or the involvement of another writer. Accordingly, the examination to determine what involvement, if any, Hank Cooper may have had in completing the questioned Bobbi Meeks signature was inconclusive.
H8VKH7-524	A definite determination could not be reached whether BOBBI MEEKS, writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), did not prepare the questioned hand printing and numerical entries on Item 1 (Q1) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and limited known writing submitted for comparison. However, numerous inconsistencies were observed which indicate MEEKS may not have prepared the Item 1 (Q1) hand printing and numerical entries. Furthermore, although inconsistencies were observed, no conclusion could be reached whether BOBBI MEEKS did or did not prepare the Item 1 (Q1) signature due to the limited nature of the questioned signature, the presence of unexplained characteristics, and the limited quantity of comparable known signatures submitted for comparison. A definite determination could not be reached whether HANK COOPER, writer of Item 3 (K2a-b), prepared the questioned hand printing and numerical entries on Item 1 (Q1) due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and limited known writing submitted for comparison. However, characteristics in common were observed which indicate COOPER may have prepared the Item 1 (Q1) hand printing and numerical entries. Furthermore, no conclusion could be reached whether HANK COOPER did or did not prepare the Item 1 (Q1) signature due to the absence of comparable known signatures submitted for comparison.
HF9C84-523	KI Bobbi Meeks: Based on the known writing submitted, Bobbi Meeks (K1) probably did not write the questioned hand printing, numerals and signature on Exhibit Q1; however, the following factors should be noted: The known writing repetitions for the entries above the signature line are a mix of printing and writing rather than being fully printed. There is a limited amount of cursive known writing for comparison to the questioned signature. The submission of additional known material may be of value in providing the basis for a more comprehensive comparison; in particular, course of business signatures and writing may be of value. K2 Hank Cooper: Based on the known writing submitted, there are indications that Hank Cooper (K2) may have written the questioned hand

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>printing and numerals on Exhibit Q1; however, the lack of sufficient, directly comparable known material containing the same letters and letter combinations as the questioned entries precluded a more definite conclusion. No conclusion could be reached regarding whether or not Hank Cooper (K2) wrote the questioned signature on Exhibit Q1 due to a lack of comparable cursive writing in the known writing submitted. The submission of additional known writing would be of value for further examination. The known specimens should consist of at least 5-10 repetitions of the actual questioned entries (printed for printed entries and cursive for the cursive signature) on separate pieces of paper. Additional course of business printing and writing may also be of value.</p>
HG2D6E-524	<p>In conclusion, I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the signature and writing in question ("Q1") was written by the writer of the specimens marked "K2A" and "K2B"</p>
HLE9R4-524	<p>A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned hand printing on Item 1 was prepared by HANK COOPER, purported writer of Item 3 (K2a-b), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics and the lack of dictated known writing. However, numerous characteristics in common were observed which indicate that COOPER, Item 3 (K2a-b), may have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1, excluding the symbols. A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned hand printing on Item 1 was prepared by BOBBI MEEKS, purported writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), due to the presence of unexplained characteristics. However, inconsistencies were observed which indicate that MEEKS, Item 2 (K1a-c), may not have prepared the questioned hand printing on Item 1, excluding the symbols. No conclusion could be reached whether the questioned signature on Item 1 was or was not prepared by BOBBI MEEKS, purported writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), or HANK COOPER, purported writer of Item 3 (K2a-b), due to the slowly prepared nature of the questioned signature. If additional examinations are desired with the hand printed portion of Item 1 (Q1), additional dictated and undictated unknown writing should be obtained from BOBBI MEEKS, purported writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), HANK COOPER, purported writer of Item 3 (K2a-b), and any other logical suspect(s). The known writing should be comparable in wording, numerals and format (hand printed) to the questioned writing. Dictated known writing should be obtained on separate sheets of paper similar to Item 1 (Q1) and should be removed from the writer's view upon completion. Numerous repetitions may be necessary in order to obtain naturally prepared writing. Undictated known writing consists of writing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters and/or applications. The undictated known writing should be contemporaneous to the questioned document.</p>
HN7862-524	<p>(i) The questioned handwriting on "Q1" showed sufficient significant similarities in characteristics as the specimen handwriting "K2a-K2b" but showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen handwriting "K1a-K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned handwriting was written by the writer of the specimen "K2" ("Hank Cooper") but not the writer of the specimen "K1" ("Bobbi Meeks"). (ii) The questioned signature on "Q1" showed sufficient significant differences in handwriting characteristics from the specimen signatures "K1a-K1c". Hence, I am of the opinion that this questioned signature was not written by the writer of the specimens "K1" ("Bobbi Meeks"). (iii) I am not able to ascertain the authorship of the questioned signature on "Q1" whether or not this questioned signature was written by the writer of the specimens "K2" ("Hank Cooper") or not.</p>
HV8J4K-524	<p>1. After an analysis and comparison I came to the following conclusions: 1.1 I found several differences in respect of elements of style and execution to support the proposition that the handwriting and signature in question marked as "Q1" were not written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a" to "K1c". 1.2 I found several correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" were probably written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2b". 1.3 I further found that the signature in question marked as "Q1" is a letter-based signature which consists of cursive letters, however the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b" consists of mainly a combination of connected capital and lowercase printscript letters. Subsequently, the specimen handwriting ("K2a" and "K2b") contains a very limited amount of corresponding letters which are comparable to the letters as contained in the signature in question. Due to limiting</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	factors, I am not able to positively identify or eliminate the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" and "K2b" as the writer of the signature in question marked as "Q1".
HXVTF7-524	3.1 WRITING: 3.1.1 There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing on documents marked "K2a" and "K2b" (Hank Cooper). 3.1.2. There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on document marked "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" (Bobbi Meeks). 3.2 SIGNATURE: 3.2.1 Common authorship between the disputed signature on document marked "Q1" and specimen signatures on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" could not be identified or eliminated. 3.2.1 Common authorship between the disputed signature on document marked "Q1" and specimen signature on document marked "K2b" could not be identified or eliminated.
J7J9D9-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
JAYG29-524	1) Author of the handwriting and figures on Q1 (the early dismissal form): a) In my opinion, there is strong evidence that Hank Cooper (K2a & K2b) wrote the Q1 (the early dismissal form). b) In my opinion, there is strong evidence that Bobbi Meeks (K1a, K1b & K1c) did not write the Q1 (the early dismissal form). 2) Author of the parent signature on Q1 (the early dismissal form): a) In my opinion, there is strong evidence that Bobbi Meeks (K1a, K1b & K1c) did not write the parent signature on Q1. b) It has not been possible to express a definite opinion as to whether or not the parent signature on Q1 was written by Hank Cooper (K2a & K2b).
JFQLWX-524	Visual and microscopic examination and comparison of the submitted documents revealed the following: The note in Q1 (excluding the signature) was probably not written by the writer of the samples in K1. This is based on substantial significant differences with no significant similarities between the questioned and known writing; however, additional comparable samples would be of value for examination. There are indications that the writer of K1 may not have written the signature on Q1. This is based on some differences between the questioned and known writing; however, the evidence is far from conclusive due to the limited amount of comparable sample. The note in Q1 (excluding the signature) was probably written by the writer of the samples in K2. This is based on substantial significant similarities with no significant differences between the questioned and known writing; however, additional comparable samples would be of value for examination. No opinion can be offered regarding the signature on Q1 and the samples in K2. This is due to the lack of comparable sample from the writer of K2. Please, submit additional non-requested and requested samples from the submitted writers. The requested samples should consist of the writers signing the name in question and printing the information on the note in Q1 multiple times.
JLVMWR-524	The handwritten entries on Q1 were written by the writer of items K2 (a-b). The signature "Bobbi Meeks" on Q1 was not written by the writer of the signatures Bobbi Meeks on K1. The writer of items K2 (a-b) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the signature "Bobbi Meeks" on Q1.
JUNW3G-523	Questioned writing (Q1) was not written by known writers of K1a, K1b and K1c. there is no similar characteristic with questioned writing (Q1). Questioned writing was written by known writers of K2a and K2b. There is similar characteristic with questioned writing (Q1).
JXLDGW-524	The questioned writing appearing on Q1, excluding the signature, was probably written by Hank Cooper, K2. Bobbi Meeks, K1, probably did not write the questioned writing appearing on Q1, excluding the signature. Bobbi Meeks, K1, and Hank Cooper, K2, could neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature appearing on Q1.
JZBK2T-524	Excluding the signature, Hank Cooper wrote the questioned hand printing on Q1. Hank Cooper can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Q1, due to the absence of comparability between the questioned signature and known writing of Cooper. Bobby Meeks can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Q1, due to the minimal comparability between the questioned and the known writing of Meeks.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
K6KF39-524	3.1 In my opinion, the evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the writer of the K1 sample, Bobbi MEEKS, did not write the questioned form Q1. 3.2 No opinion can be expressed as to whether or not the questioned form Q1 was written by the writer of the K2 handwriting sample, Hank COOPER, due to the presence of both similarities and dissimilarities. See 4.3 below for further details. 3.3 No opinion can be expressed as to authorship of the signature depicted on Q1. See 4.4 below for further details.
KKU9M6-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
KLNUFV-523	No conclusion is offered on the drawn "x" in the box and the circle around "PM" on the printed line "dismissed early (before 2:00 PM)..." in Q1 in comparison to K1 and K2. K1 has limited repetitions and K2 has no exact repetitions of these features. It is probable that Bobbi Meeks (K1) was not the writer of the hand printing and numbers depicted on Q1. Bobbi Meeks (K1) cannot be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signature depicted on Q1. The known writing in K1 has limited repetitions of the full signature and the repetitions that are in K1 are written more quickly and stylized. It is probable that Hank Cooper (K2) was the writer of the hand printing and numbers depicted on Q1. Hank Cooper (K2) cannot be identified to or eliminated as the writer of the "Bobbi Meeks" signature depicted on Q1. The known writing of Hank Cooper (K2) does not contain cursive writing or repetitions of the signature "Bobbi Meeks" for comparison to Q1.
KQJNDW-524	K1: Bobbi Meeks: The author of the known writing on K1a through K1c did not write the questioned handwriting and signatures appearing on Q1. This finding is based on the disagreement of a combination of significant, individualizing handwriting characteristics. K2: Hank Cooper: The author of the known writing on K2a and K2b wrote the questioned handwriting appearing on Q1 (excluding signature). This finding is based on the agreement of a combination of significant, individualizing handwriting characteristics and no significant differences. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the author of the known writing appearing on K2a and K2b wrote the questioned signature appearing on Q1. No comparable known writing was submitted for examination. If further analysis is requested, cursive known writing in the name "Bobbi Meeks" from the subject should be submitted for examination.
KRBPB9-524	In light of the analysis and comparison in respect of the request, I came to the following conclusion: 1.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting and signature in question on the document marked as "Q1" were not written by the writer of the specimen material on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c". 1.2 Due to limiting factors (difference in writing styles and limited corresponding letters), I am not able to positively identify or eliminate the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" and "K2b" as the writer of the signature in question marked as "Q1", therefore no conclusion can be reached regarding the authorship of the questioned signature. 1.3 Despite the presence of limitations (similarities and dissimilarities observed between questioned and specimen, the lack of requested specimen and difference between writing instruments used), I however found evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" were, in all probability, written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" and "K2b".
KTDA99-524	The comparison of the respective material revealed to me the following facts: 3.1 In respect of the questioned writing on the document marked "Q1": 3.1.1 Strong correspondences were identified between the questioned writing on the document marked "Q1" and the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b" with respect to the discriminating elements of design and construction, such as letter design, slant, connections, proportions, alignment, spacing and placement. 3.1.2 Significant differences were identified between the questioned writing on the document marked "Q1" and the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" with respect to the discriminating elements of design and construction, such as letter design, slant, connections, proportions, alignment, spacing and placement. 3.2 In respect of the questioned signature on the document marked "Q1": 3.2.1 Significant differences were identified between the questioned signature on the document marked "Q1" and the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c" with respect to the discriminating elements of design and

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>construction, such as letter design, slant, proportions, alignment, spacing and placement. 3.2.2 The specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K2a" to "2b are quantitatively and more so qualitatively inadequate for comparison purposes, due to them being constructed in a different writing style (print script) with different letter combinations to that of the questioned signature, therefore no finding could be deduced. 3.3 In light of the afore-mentioned analysis and comparison I came to the following conclusions: 3.3.1 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c". 3.3.2 The evidence supports the proposition that the writing on the document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing on the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b". 3.3.3 The evidence supports the proposition that the signature on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K1a" to "K1c". 3.3.4 The evidence supports neither proposition that the signature on the document marked "Q1" was written nor was not written by the writer of the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b".</p>
L2HNNF-524	I would report the writing and signature together and conclude: 'The details on Q1 were not written by Bobbi Meeks and there is very strong evidence to support the view that they were written by Hank Cooper'
L2ZVM7-523	1. The handwriting and signature that are in the disputed document described in the point Q1 is not reciprocated in the same first and letter with respect to the manuscript described in the points K1a, K1b and K1c of the "C" of Bobbi Meeks. 2. The handwriting that is in the document described in the point Q1, it corresponds to the same graphic origin with respect to the handwriting indicated with the keys K2a and K2b.
L4QU4P-524	1 - Document Q1 was written by the writer of documents K2(a and b), submitted as being written by M. Hank Cooper. 2- a) The signature " Bobbi Meeks ", on document Q1, was not submitted as being written by Mme Bobbi Meeks; b) While there is some similarities between the signature " Bobbi Meeks " on Q1 and the documents submitted as being written by M. Hank Cooper (K2 a and b), the comparison writings are not sufficient to proceed to a complete comparison. M. Cooper is therefore not identified nor eliminated as being the writer of the signature " Bobbi Meeks " on document Q1.
L887Z7-524	The questioned texts in the Q1 document were probably written by Meeks Bobbi. The questioned signature of document Q1 was not written by Bobbi Meeks. The disputed texts in Q1 can not be identified or removed from Mr. Hank Cooper.
LCK4CY-524	Very strong evidence that Bobbi Meeks did not sign or complete the non-signature handwriting of Q1. Strong evidence that Hank Cooper completed the non-signature handwriting of Q1. The evidence as to whether or not Hank Cooper sign Q1 was inconclusive.
LDU9PN-524	Bobbi Meeks didn't write any of the questioned writings. We cannot give an opinion regarding Hank Cooper. (lack of directly comparable documents)
LGC98P-524	Bobbi Meek's did not write the questioned dismissal form or the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature. 2. With the limited amount of standards, Hank Cooper can be identify with some degree identification as to the writer of the questioned dismissal form. 3. Hank Cooper cannot be identified or eliminated as to the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature due to no standards submitted to the effect.
LHKLM6-524	At the comparative test was established: a) Individual characteristics for manuscript writing: Nr. The name of individual Concrete manifestation in: d/o characteristics Writing Writing samples of samples of Bobbi Meeks Hank Cooper 1.Horizontal / vertical extending: second element of letter „B" difference similarity third element of letter „M" difference similarity second element of letter „R" difference similarity 2.Form of movement in execution: elements of letter „f" difference similarity elements of letter „n" difference similarity first element of letter „t" difference similarity first element of letter „m". difference similarity elements of letter „u" difference similarity 3.Point of incipient movement in execution: letter "C" difference similarity 4.The direction of movement in the final

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>execution second element of letter „r” difference similarity 5. Form of link: elements of letter „g”. difference similarity CONCLUSION E A b) Individual characteristics for signature: Nr. The name of individual Concrete manifestation in: d/o characteristics Writing samples Writing samples of Bobbi Meeks of Hank Cooper 1. Horizontal / vertical extending: second element of letter „B” difference similarity third element of letter „M” difference similarity second element of letter „M” difference similarity 2. Form of movement in execution: oval of letter „o” difference similarity letter „e” difference similarity superior part of letter „e” difference similarity letter “s” difference difference 3. Placing the initiation point of movement execution: letter “e” difference similarity 4. Connecting strokes to letters: “b” difference difference “k” difference difference 5. The placement of the upper part: second element to the third element of letter “M” difference similarity letters “ee” difference similarity 6. The placement of the lower part: second element to the third element of letter “M” difference similarity CONCLUSION E B [Table format was unable to be reproduced]</p>
LKRL46-524	The dubbed handprints and signature of the early exit form (Q1), present manuscriptual uniprocidence with the standard comparison material of Mr. Hank Cooper (K2 a-b).
LNR347-523	(i) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned handwriting sample Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting sample K2. (ii) The evidence provides very strong support for the proposition that the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Q1 is not a genuine signature when compared to the specimen "Bobbi Meeks" signatures on K1.
LRXBR6-524	<p>3.1. The evidence supports the proposition that the disputed writing on document marked “Q1” was not written by the same author of the specimen writing on documents marked “K1a” to “K1c”. 3.2. The evidence supports the proposition that the disputed writing on document marked “Q1” was written by the same author of the specimen writing on documents marked “K2a” and “K2b”. 3.3. Common authorship between the disputed signature on document marked “Q1” and specimen signatures on documents marked “K1a”, “K1b” and “K2b” could not be identified or eliminated.</p>
LX3CMT-524	It has been concluded that Hank Cooper (K2) wrote the questioned hand printing appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. With the material available for comparison, it could not be determined whether or not Hank Cooper (K2) wrote the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item. It has been concluded that Bobbi Meeks (K1) did not write the questioned material appearing on the Exhibit Q1 item.
MB66RA-523	<p>1. The author of samples K2a-b (Hank Cooper) wrote the hand printed entries depicted on Q1. There are limited indications Hank Cooper may have written the signature depicted on Q1. The K2a-b samples by Hank Cooper had limited comparability with the cursive Q1 signature; should additional cursive writings by Hank Cooper become available for comparison, a more definitive opinion might be possible. 2. The author of K1a-c (Bobbi Meeks) did not write the hand printed entries on Q1. Bobbi Meeks probably did not write the signature on Q1. 3. The slow, simple nature of the signature on Q1 was a limitation in these examinations.</p>
MKP92V-523	It is probable the writer/signer of K1a thru K1c did not write or sign Q-1. It is probable the writer of K2a and K2b wrote the writing (excluding the signature) appearing on Q1. The writer of K2a and K2b cannot be identified or eliminated as the signer of Q1.
MT2KW8-523	When we compare the document identified as Q1, with the documents identified as K1a, K1b and K1c, we find different writing traits, including the signature. When we compare the document identified as Q1, with the documents identified as K2a and K2b, we find similar characteristics of writing. The signature of the document identified as Q1, has some similarities when we compare it with the document's identified K2a and K2b.
MWJPPB-523	It is my opinion the questioned writing (excluding the signature) and the K1 exemplars were not written by the same person. It is my opinion it is highly probable the questioned writing and (excluding the signature) the K2 exemplars were written by the same person. Indications were found that the Q1 signature and the K1 exemplars were not written by the same person, however this evidence is not conclusive due to the limited number of comparable, cursive entries. The Q1

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	signature can neither be identified nor eliminated with the K1 exemplars. The K2 exemplars are not comparable to the Q1 signature and they lack cursive writing for comparison.
MWKMY7-524	FIRST. The graphic origin –author- of the questioned writing and the questioned signature which appear on the handprinted and signed early dismissal form (Q1) is not the same. This, related to the reference writing and signature obtained from Bobbi Meeks. SECOND. The questioned writing appearing on the handprinted and signed early dismissal form (Q1) have the same graphic origin – author-, related to the reference writing and signature obtained from Hank Cooper. THIRD. Regarding the writing and signature obtained from Hank Cooper, in Graphology, it is impossible to determine if the graphic origin –author- of the signature on the handprinted and signed dismissal form (Q1) is the same, or if it is different.
MYQ6X3-524	1. The writers the document of know Q1, is identify with the writers on the extra-processed K2a-b. 2. The writers and signature or the document know Q1 is not identify with the writers on the extra-processed K2a-b. 3. Is not feasilde to determine the signature of document known Q1, is identify or not with the siganture the extra-processed K2a-b.
N73L63-524	A definite determination could not be reached whether the questioned hand printing on Item 1 was or was not prepared by Bobbi Meeks, writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), or Hank Cooper, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c) due to characteristics present in the questioned writing not accounted for in the available known writing and limited comparability of the Item 3 (K2a-c) known writing. However, characteristics were observed which indicate that the questioned hand printing located on Item 1 (Q1) may have been prepared by the writer of Item 3 (K2a-c), Hank Cooper. In addition, characteristics were observed which indicate that the questioned hand printing located on Item 1 (Q1) may not have been prepared by the writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), Bobbi Meeks. No conclusion could be reached whether the questioned signature on Item 1 (Q1) was or was not prepared by Bobbi Meeks, writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), or Hank Cooper, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c) due to possible distortion of the questioned signature and lack of comparable known writing from Hank Cooper, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c). It should be noted that distorted writing is not representative of an individual's normal handwriting. Therefore, it is unlikely that the distorted signature will ever be identified with a specific writer(s) through a handwriting comparison. If future hand printing examinations are desired, additional dictated and undictated known writing should be obtained from Bobbi Meeks, writer of Item 2 (K1a-c), Hank Cooper, writer of Item 3 (K2a-c), or anyone suspected of having prepared the questioned writing. The dictated known writing should be hand printed and in the exact wording as the questioned writing, obtained on forms similar to the questioned item, and 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 hand printing prepared during normal course of business activity. Possible sources of undictated known writing include business papers, letters, and applications.
NCQ7B4-524	1.The Q1 was not written and signed by Bobbi Meeks. 2.The Q1 was written by Hank Cooper and probably signed by Hank Cooper
NGQCVZ-524	After examination and comparison I reached the following conclusion: 7.1 There is a strong degree of similarity which occur between the questioned writing marked "Q1" and the specimen writing marked "K2a-b", suggesting that the same writer was probably involved. 7.2 The writer of the specimen marked "K1a-c" did not wrote the questioned document marked "Q1". 7.3 The writers of the signatures on the documents marked "K1a-c" and "K2a-b", did not wrote the signature on the questioned document marked "Q1".
NQQ6ZL-524	In my opinion, Hank Cooper is the writer of the dismissal form in item Q1. I am satisfied that Bobbi Meeks is not the writer of the dismissal note in item Q1 and I am satisfied that she did not sign the form as the questioned signature differs significantly from her specimen signatures. The questioned signature on Q1 is in cursive writing and the specimens of Hank Cooper are largely in script writing and an effective comparison cannot be carried out.
NXA98N-524	1. COOPER wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. 2. COOPER and MEEKS can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi MEEKS" signature on

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	Exhibit Q1. The primary limiting factor is the absence of sufficient comparable known writing by COOPER and MEEKS.
P32YTP-524	The K2 writer probably wrote the Q1 text. The K1 writer probably did not write the Q1 text. It can not be determined if the K2 writer wrote the Q1 signature from the standards submitted as no Q1 signature standards were provided. The Q1 signature could not be determined/is not the normal genuine signature of the K1 writer based on the standards submitted. These are not conclusive opinions. This examination was limited by the small amount of standards as well as the lack of request and Q1 signature standards from the K2 writer. This exam was also limited by the limited amount of signature standards and the lack of non request signature standards which in this case prevent the examination of the K1 writer's range of variation and the possibility of an alternate style.
PBDZ9Y-524	1-The writings on the early dismissal form was written by Hank Cooper (K2). 2-The early dismissal form was not signed by Bobbi Meeks (K1). 3-The questioned signature was probably written by Hank Cooper (K2).
PDMW34-524	Conclusion scale used by our laboratory (based on the ASTM/SWGDOC standard): WAS WRITTEN by, HIGHLY PROBABLE WRITTEN by, PROBABLE WRITTEN by, EVIDENCE SUPPORTIVE WRITTEN by, INCONCLUSIVE, EVIDENCE SUPPORTIVE NOT WRITTEN by, UNLIKELY WRITTEN by, HIGHLY UNLIKELY WRITTEN by, WAS NOT WRITTEN by. The propositions considered for the handwriting examinations are: P1(HW): the questioned handwriting was written by the specimen writer; and P2(HW): the questioned handwriting was not written by the specimen writer. Results of comparing handwriting on Q1 with specimen handwriting on K1: My observations provide very strong support for P2(HW) and no support for P1(HW). On the basis of the assumption that the questioned handwriting on Q1 is the product of only one writer and within the limitation of examining reproductions, I concluded that it is highly unlikely that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by the writer of the K1 specimens attributed to Bobbi Meeks. Results of comparing handwriting on Q1 with specimen handwriting on K2: My observations provide very strong support for P1(HW) and no support for P2(HW). On the basis of the assumption that the questioned handwriting on Q1 is the product of only one writer and within the limitation of examining reproductions, I concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned handwriting on Q1 was written by the writer of the K2 specimens attributed to Hank Cooper. The propositions considered for the signature examinations are: P1(S): the questioned signature was written by the specimen writer P2(S): the questioned signature was not written by the specimen writer. Results of comparing the signature on Q1 with specimen signatures and handwriting on K1(S): My observations do not provide support for P1(S) and provide support for P2(S) but it is limited. Within the limitation of examining reproductions and there being only two specimen signatures, I concluded that there is evidence supportive of a proposition that the questioned signature was not written by the writer of the K1 specimens attributed to Bobbi Meeks. Results of comparing the signature on Q1 with specimen handwriting on K2(S): In the absence of cursive specimen handwriting, there is a very limited basis for a useful comparison between the questioned signature on Q1 and the K2 specimens attributed to Hank Cooper. No conclusion can be expressed as to whether the questioned signature was or was not written by the writer of the K2 specimens attributed to Hank Cooper. The conclusions (on handwriting and signature issues) with respect to the Hank Cooper (K2) specimens are independent of the conclusions expressed above with respect to the Bobbie Meeks (K1) specimens, and vice versa. [NOTE TO CTS: As to K1(S): It is ambiguous whether our conclusion level "evidence supportive not written by" should fall within "C" or "D" on the five level conclusion scale. By the strict definition given on the CTS data sheet ("some degree of elimination"), it would appear that "evidence supportive not written by" should fall within "D" (and, conversely, "evidence supportive written by" should fall within "B"). However, our understanding of industry use of a five level conclusion scale is that "evidence supportive not written by" (and "evidence supportive written by") would fall within "C" for the reason that such low strength conclusions have a higher risk of error and some would argue that they, therefore, should not be expressed. This being the case, there is some discomfort in our laboratory forcing an "evidence supportive not written by" conclusion into what prima facie appears to be a stronger conclusion level of "D" for the purpose of the CTS tests. For this reason, when forced to use a five level

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	conclusion scale, we are conservative and nominate a conclusion level of "C". May we respectfully ask CTS to consider addressing this, seeking further information/advice from reputable forensic handwriting examination experts, and perhaps clarifying this on the data sheets for future tests. We would be very keen to discuss this further with CTS if the opportunity arises.]
PEFU9P-523	The K1 writer (MEEKS) has been eliminated as the writer of the handprinting and numerals on Q1. An opinion of "elimination" is a definitive conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provide very strong evidence to support non-authorship. The K2 writer (COOPER) has been identified as the writer of the handprinting and numerals on Q1. An opinion of "identification" is a conclusion with the highest degree of certainty and means that the features present in the comparable portions of the questioned and known documents provide very strong evidence supporting common authorship. The K1 writer (MEEKS) and the K2 writer (COOPER) have neither been identified nor eliminated as the writer of the signature on Q1. This is an inconclusive result because the material present in the questioned and known documents does not allow for a meaningful analysis and comparison. It is unreasonable and not appropriate to assign a conclusion of authorship or non-authorship given the evidence submitted.
PNFRPW-524	1- The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (Q1) was written by Hank Cooper (k2). 2- The questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1) was written by Hank Cooper (k2).
PRKCJP-524	Upon conclusion of an examination, this examiner opines that the K-1 writer probably did not complete the Q-1 writing. I also opine that the Q-1 writing was probably written by the K-2 writer. In regards to the Q-1 signature, this examiner opines that no conclusion of authorship could be reached due to the limited amount of standards for comparison. The limiting factors in this examination are the lack of sufficient available non-request standards for the K-1 writer, and the lack of available request standards of the K-2 writer signing the K-1 writers name.
PYZZC6-523	It is my opinion that the evidence provides qualified support for the proposition that the author of K2a-b is the author of Q1 (excluding signature), over the proposition that K1a-c is the author of Q1 (excluding signature). No opinion can be expressed regarding authorship of the signature appearing on Q1.
Q6L7N7-524	I am of the opinion that there is strong support that Hank Cooper is the writer.
QAF3DX-523	Bobbi Meeks: Due to differences in the line quality (i.e. skill level and speed), the writer of Exhibit K1 a-c (Bobbi Meeks) probably did not write the questioned handwritten entries and "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1; however, as a result of an insufficient amount of comparable known writing, the evidence falls short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion. Hank Cooper: The writer of Exhibit K2a-b (Hank Cooper) probably wrote the questioned handwritten entries (excluding the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature) on Exhibit Q1; however, due to an insufficient amount of comparable known writing, the evidence falls short of that necessary to support a conclusive opinion. Due to a lack of comparable cursive writing, the writer of Exhibit K2a-b (Hank Cooper) could neither be identified, nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1.
QWWBX4-524	The writer of Item K1 can be eliminated as having written the questioned handwriting and signature on Item Q1. The writer of Item K2 probably wrote the questioned handwriting on Item Q1. I am unable to identify or eliminate this writer as having written the questioned signature on Item Q1.
R94NM3-524	The evidence supports the proposition that writing in question on the document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b". No definite finding could be reached in respect of whether the author of the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b" executed the questioned signature on the document marked "Q1". The evidence supports the proposition that writing and signature in question on the document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen writing and signatures on the documents marked "K1a", "K1b" and "K1c".

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
R9DWA9-524	1. The Q1 document printing/signature was not authored by the same hand as the K1 documents which excludes Bobbi Meeks as a possible author. 2. The Q1 document printing was authored by the same hand as the K2 documents which identifies Hank Cooper as the author. 3. The Q1 signature shares significant similar characteristics with the author of the K2 documents; however, the identification is limited due to lack of cursive exemplars for the purpose of this examination. 4. There is a strong probability that the author of the Q1 signature is Hank Cooper whereby he cannot be excluded as a possible author, and this is based on the evidence I have been provided.
RL4LBY-524	1. No evidence of significance was found to indicate that the questioned signature 'Bobbi Meeks' and the questioned writing on Exhibit Q1 were executed by the K1 (a-c) specimen writer. 2. It has been concluded that it is highly probable that the questioned writing on Exhibit Q1 was executed by the K2 (a-b) specimen writer. 3. The questioned signature 'Bobbi Meeks' on Exhibit Q1 has not been identified or eliminated as having been executed by the K2 (a-b) specimen writer. This is due to the lack of requested specimen signatures.
RLN826-523	The text was written by Hank Cooper and was not written by Bobbie Meeks, likewise the signature was not written by Bobbie Meeks and it was probably written by Hank Cooper.
RQWTP2-523	Based upon the documents examined and after careful examination and comparison of these documents, I opine: The writing (excluding the signature) on Q1 was written by Hank Cooper. The signature on Q1 was probably written by Hank Cooper. The signature on Q1 was probably not written by Bobbi Meeks.
RT7KZ4-524	In conclusion, I found the evidence to support the proposition that the questioned writing on the "Early Dismissal" form marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the known writing marked "K2(a-b)" and NOT by the writer of the known writing marked "K1(a-c)". The signature in question on the "Early Dismissal" form was NOT written by the writer of the known writing marked "K1(a-c)" and by the writer of the known writing marked "K2(a-b)".
RVCYQH-524	Handwriting: On examination, I noted significant differences in stroke quality, slant and the formation and relative positioning of alphabet letters and numerals between the questioned handwriting shown in "Q1" and the specimen handwriting of Bobbi Meeks shown in 'K1a', 'K1b' and 'K1c'. (Please see the Comparison Chart attached.) The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen handwriting shown in 'K1a', 'K1b' and 'K1c' did not write the questioned handwriting shown in 'Q1'. I noted consistent similarities in stroke quality, slant and the formation and relative positioning of alphabet letters and numerals between the questioned handwriting shown in "Q1" and the specimen handwriting of Hank Cooper shown in 'K2a' and 'K2b'. (Please see the same Comparison Chart attached.) The evidence shows that it was probable that the writer of the specimen handwriting shown in 'K2a' and 'K2b' wrote the questioned handwriting shown in 'Q1'. Signature: I noted significant differences in stroke fluency, slant and the formation and relative positioning of strokes between the questioned signature shown in "Q1" and the specimen signatures of Bobbi Meeks shown in 'K1a', K1b and 'K1c'. (Please see the bottom portion of the same Comparison Chart attached.) The evidence shows that the writer of the specimen signatures shown in 'K1a', 'K1b' and 'K1c' did not write the questioned signature shown in 'Q1'. I noted similarities in certain features in respect of the formation of the capital letters between the questioned signature shown in 'Q1' and the specimen handwriting of Hank Copper shown in 'K2a' and 'K2b'. However, I also noted differences in some other aspects between them. In view of the observation and the lack of specimen signatures provided, I was unable to ascertain if the writer of the specimen handwriting in 'K2a' and 'K2b' wrote the questioned signature in 'Q1'. [Comparison Chart not included]
RWL9FU-524	It was concluded the author of K2, Hank Cooper, prepared the handprinted entries on Q1. It was also concluded the author of K1, Bobbi Meeks, did not prepare the handprinted entries on Q1. No conclusion could be reached whether or not the authors of K1 or K2 prepared the questioned signature on Q1 due to the slow and deliberate manner in which the signature was prepared. This type of signature may be the result of a simulation or autoforgery and is of limited value in a handwriting comparison.

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
RX6UCQ-524	<p>Visual examination and comparison of the submitted documents utilizing a hand lens revealed the following: Comparison to writing from Bobbi Meeks: The questioned note in Item #3 (Q1) (excluding the signature) was probably not written by the writer of the known samples in Item #1 (K1), based on substantial significant differences with no significant similarities noted between the questioned and known writing. However, the writer cannot be conclusively eliminated as eliminations are based on skill level and/or require a significant amount of known sample. There are indications that the questioned signature on the note in Item #3(Q1) was not written by the writer of the known samples in Item #1 (K1), based on differences noted between the questioned and known writing. However, the evidence is far from conclusive. Comparison to writing from Hank Cooper: The questioned note in Item #3 (Q1) (excluding the signature) was probably written by the writer of the known samples in Item #2 (K2), based on substantial significant similarities with no significant differences noted between the questioned and known writing. Additional known samples would be necessary for a more conclusive opinion. No opinion can be offered regarding the questioned signature in Item #3 (Q1) and the known writer in Item #2 (K2) due to the lack of directly comparable sample. This examination was limited by the quantity and direct comparability of the known samples submitted. Submission of additional requested/non-requested samples from both writers that are similar in style and content to the questioned writing, including writing the questioned name in cursive, would be of value. Should additional examinations be requested, please resubmit all items in their original packaging.</p>
T2DUMM-524	<p>There is a strong probability that Hank Cooper wrote the hand printed entries on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of significant similarities, no differences, and some unrepresented variations between the questioned and known writings submitted. Bobbie Meeks did not write the questioned hand printed entries on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of significant differences and some similarities between the questioned and known writings submitted. No conclusion could be reached as to whether Hank Cooper or Bobbi Meeks wrote the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Item Q1. This opinion is based on the notation of differences between Item Q1 and the known writings of Bobbi Meeks, a lack of "Bobbi Meeks" signature standards from Hank Cooper, as well as characteristics of simulation within the written line of the questioned signature. Should an additional examination be desired, it is requested that more hand printed standards and exact text "Bobbi Meeks" signature exemplars be obtained from Hank Cooper, and that additional collected and contemporary signature standards be obtained from Bobbi Meeks.</p>
T429BW-524	<p>Item 2 (Item K1a-c) Bobbi Meeks comparison with questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1): Due to characteristics not observed in the known writing, a definitive determination could not be reached whether or not the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by Bobbi Meeks, whose known writing appears on Item 2 (Item K1a-c). However, inconsistencies were observed to indicate Bobbi Meeks may not have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). Item 2 (Item K1a-c) Bobbi Meeks comparison questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1): Due to characteristics of distortion and characteristics not observed in the known writing, no conclusion could be reached whether or not the "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by Bobbi Meeks, whose known writing appears on Item 2 (Item K1a-c). Item 3 (Item K2a-b) Hank Cooper comparison with questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1): Due to limited comparability and characteristics not observed in the known writing, a definitive determination could not be reached whether or not the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by Hank Cooper, whose known writing appears on Item 3 (Item K1a-b). However, similarities were observed to indicate Hank Cooper may have prepared the questioned writing on Item 1 (Item Q1). Item 3 (Item K2a-b) Hank Cooper comparison with questioned signature on Item 1 (Item Q1): Due to characteristics of distortion, characteristics not observed in the known writing, and limited comparability, no conclusion could be reached whether or not the "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Item 1 (Item Q1) was prepared by Hank Cooper, whose known writing appears on Item 3 (Item K1a-b).</p>
T8MV76-523	<p>Bobbi Meeks (K1) did not write the extended hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. Bobbi Meeks probably did not write the 'Bobbi Meeks' signature depicted on Exhibit Q1. It is highly probable Hank Cooper (K2) wrote the extended hand printed entries on Exhibit Q1. Due to the absence of comparable known writings, Hank Cooper could neither be identified nor eliminated as having</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	written the 'Bobbi Meeks' signature on Exhibit Q1.
TAAE84-524	Text: Findings support the proposition that the questioned text was not written by the same person that wrote K1. Therefore it is our opinion that the questioned text was probably not written K1. Findings support the proposition that the questioned text was written by the same person that wrote K2. Therefore it is our opinion that the questioned text was probably written K2. According to the results of the comparison we can only state answers D (B). Because it was asked by CTS to treat photos as originals we changed the answers for one level to E (A). Signature: Q signature is written in cursive (connected) handwriting. The comparison material (K1 and K2) is script (disconnected) handwriting and K1 signature is partially not readable. That can't be compared. Therefore we can't determine if the Q signature was written by K1 or K2 or not. The only thing we can say is that the Q signature doesn't resemble comparison K1 signatures at all. The Q signature is probably not written spontaneously, but that can't be determined from the photograph.
TGPBTP-523	The findings extremely strongly support the proposition that K2 wrote the questioned writing Q1 compared to the proposition that K1 or an unknown person wrote the questioned writing Q1. The findings strongly support the proposition that K1 did not write the questioned signature Q1 compared to the proposition that K1 did write. The findings support the proposition that K2 wrote the questioned signature Q1 compared to the proposition that an unknown person wrote the questioned signature Q1.
THH92V-523	Bobbi Meeks has not been the authoress of the texts that act in the questioned document "Q1". Neither she has been the authoress of the signature of the questioned document "Q1". Hank Cooper has been the authoress of the totality of the texts from the questioned document "Q1". This laboratory cannot attribute or reject the authorship of the manuscript signature.
TJCVW9-523	Questioned writing (Q1) was not written by known writers of K1a, K1b and K1c. There is no similar characteristic with questioned writing. Questioned writing was written by known writers of K2a and K2b. There is similar characteristic with questioned writing.
UCPGBE-524	An examination and comparison of the questioned handwritten "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1 with the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K1(a to c) have disclosed significant differences with no significant similarities. The examination, however, has been restricted due to the lack of sufficient repetitions of "Bobbi Meeks" specimen signatures of both a collected and collected type. If a further examination is desired, then additional specimen "Bobbi Meeks" signatures will be required. The questioned handwritten "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1 was probably not written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K1(a to c). An examination and comparison of the questioned hand printing on Exhibit Q1 with the specimen hand printing on Exhibits K1(a to c) have disclosed significant differences with no significant similarities. The examination was, however, restricted by the quantity of specimen hand printed material. The questioned hand printing on Exhibit Q1 was probably not written by the writer of the specimen hand printing on Exhibits K1(a to c). An examination and comparison of the questioned handwritten "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1 with the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2(a and b) was not possible due to the lack of specimen handwritten "Bobbie Meeks" signatures. If a further examination is desired, then handwritten "Bobbi Meeks" signatures will be required. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the questioned handwritten "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1 was written by the writer of the specimen handwriting on Exhibits K2(a and b). An examination and comparison of the questioned of the questioned hand printing on Exhibit Q1 with the specimen hand printing on Exhibits K1(a and b) have disclosed several significant hand printing similarities. There are, however, a few features that have not been accounted for due to the lack of sufficient letter and letter combinations within the specimen hand printing. If a further examination is desired, then additional specimen hand printing preferably of a requested and collected type will be required. The questioned hand printing on Exhibit Q1 was probably written by the writer of the specimen hand printing on Exhibits K2(a and b).
UJBCCH-524	Based on examination of the questioned form (Item 1a, questioned early dismissal form, dated 9/12/16), and examination and comparison with known exemplars – known handwriting specimens of Contributor #1 (Items 1b-1d, two dictated exemplars and course of business

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>exemplars attributed to Bobbi MEEKS) and known handwriting specimens of Contributor #2 (Items 1e-1f, course of business exemplars attributed to Hank COOPER), the following conclusions were made in determining the source of the handprinting and signature of the questioned early dismissal form: There is evidence that points rather strongly that Contributor #1 (the author of Items 1b-1d, two dictated exemplars and course of business exemplars attributed to Bobbi MEEKS) did not write the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form. If collected, comparable original and/or copies of early dismissal (and/or similar) forms are available, as well as handprinted exemplars, for examination and comparison with the questioned form, they may provide additional information to confirm the observations made in examining the requested and collected writing submitted and strengthen the conclusion that Contributor #1 was probably not the source of the handprinting of the questioned early dismissal form. There is strong probability that Contributor #1 did not write the signature on the early dismissal form. There are sufficient significant dissimilarities to establish a strong likelihood that Contributor #1 did not write the questioned writing. There is evidence that points rather strongly that Contributor #2 (the author of Items 1e-1f, course of business exemplars attributed to Hank COOPER) probably wrote the questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the early dismissal form. While this is a qualified conclusion, there are significant similarities that demonstrate the likelihood of common authorship. While there are variations or features which cannot be fully reconciled, it is unlikely that they indicate another writer. No conclusion could be determined regarding common authorship of the signature on the early dismissal form in comparison with the exemplars of Contributor #2. No comparable cursive style handwriting was included with the handwriting exemplars attributed to Contributor #2. It is recommended that comparable cursive style handwriting exemplars (including handwriting representing "Bobbi Meeks" signatures) be submitted for examination and comparison with the questioned early dismissal form. Without comparable exemplars of sufficient quantity, comparison and determination of common authorship of the authorizing signature of the early dismissal form ("Bobbi Meeks") cannot be determined based on the exemplars of Contributor #2.</p>
UVKV77-523	<p>The writer of Exhibits K2a-b (Hank Cooper) probably wrote the questioned entries in the body (excluding the signature) of Exhibit Q1, however due the limited amount of comparable known hand printing, a conclusive opinion could not be rendered. Due to a lack of comparable known cursive writing, no conclusion could be reached as to whether or not the writer of Exhibits K2a-b (Hank Cooper) wrote the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1. The writer of Exhibits K1a-c (Bobbi Meeks) probably did not write the questioned entries or signature on Exhibit Q1.</p>
V4R7HU-524	<p>After an examination I reached the following conclusion: 7.1 The disputed writing was not written by the writer of the specimens marked "K1". 7.2 The disputed signature is not an authentic signature of the person who wrote the specimen signatures marked "K1". 7.3 The disputed writing was written by the writer of the specimens marked "K2". 7.4 There exists a degree of similarity between the writing of the writer of the specimens marked "K2" and the capital letters of the disputed signature marked "Q1". The disputed signature however contains cursive writing and the specimens of the writer do not contain such writing. A definite conclusion can therefore not be reached with the specimens of the writer at hand.</p>
VKMC9C-523	<p>It is probable that Bobbi Meeks did not write the questioned manuscript printing on Q1. The limited amount of known writing submitted for comparison precludes a more conclusive opinion. There are indications that Bobbi Meeks did not write the Bobbi Meeks signature on Q1. The limited amount of known writing and the slowly written appearance of the questioned signature preclude a more conclusive opinion. There are indications that Hank Cooper wrote the manuscript printing on Q1. The limited amount of known writing bearing the same words and letter combinations combined with the small amount of known writing submitted for examination hindered the examination and preclude a more conclusive opinion. The questioned Bobbi Meeks signature on Q1 can neither be identified nor eliminated with the known writing of Hank Cooper. The questioned signature is in cursive and not comparable to the manuscript printed writing submitted for comparison.</p>
VKY7NC-524	<p>There are indications that Bobbi Meeks may not have written the signature in the name of Bobbi Meeks on the questioned document, Q1; however the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. There are indications that Bobbi Meeks may not have written the filled in portions of the questioned</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	document, Q1; however the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. There are indications that Hank Cooper may have written the filled in portions of the questioned document, Q1; however the evidence to that effect is far from conclusive. There is no basis for an identification or elimination of Hank Cooper as having written the signature in the name of Bobbi Meeks on the questioned document, Q1.
WVFXB2-523	First: The stamped handwriting and signature in the Questioned document Q1 don't graphically originate from the Known document, identified as K1 a-c Second: The stamped handwriting in the Questioned document Q1 graphically originates from the Known document, identified as K2 a-b Third: It is not possible to identify or eliminate the stamped signature in the Questioned document Q1 to the writer of the Known document K2 a-b, due to the lack of comparison elements or signatures.
W3Z94W-524	There are few similarities and many differences between the known handwriting of Bobbi Meeks and the questioned handwriting. The nature of these differences is such that there is no evidence that Bobbi Meeks was responsible for the questioned handwriting. There are many similarities and no significant differences between the known handwriting of Hank Cooper and the questioned handwriting. The nature of these similarities is such that it is probable that Hank Cooper was responsible for the questioned handwriting. By "probable" we consider it unlikely that an individual other than Hank Cooper is responsible for the questioned handwriting. There are no similarities and many significant differences between the known signatures of Bobbi Meeks and the questioned signature. The nature of the differences is such that there is no evidence that Bobbi Meeks is responsible for the questioned signature. We are unable to comment further on the author of the questioned signature.
W94EET-524	1. WRITING AND SIGNIN THE FORM "THOMAS JEFFERSON/3624 PECH LANE/LAKEWWOD, OH 44/07/216-555-2016" Q1 NOT PRESENT IDENTITY GRAPHICS, WITH THE WRITINGS OF THE LADY BOBBI MEEKS (K1A-K1C). 2. THE WRITTEN OF THE FORM "THOMAS JEFFERSON/3624 PECH LANE/LAKEWWOD, OH 44/07/216-555-2016" Q1, PRESENT IDENTITY GRAPHIC WITH THEM WRITTEN OF THE mR HANK COOPER (K2A-K2B) 3. CANNOT BE IDENTIFIED OR ELIMINATED MR HANK COOPER (K2A-K2B) IN THE PREPARATION OF THE SIGNATURE OF THE FORM "THOMAS JEFFERSON/3624 PECH LANE/LAKEWWOD, OH 44/07/216-555-2016" Q1.
WAX32U-524	The comparison of the specimen writings on documents K2a-b (purportedly written by Hank Cooper) to the questioned handwriting (excluding questioned signature) on Q1 has disclosed a significant combination of similarities in handwriting habit. Accordingly, the writer of the specimen writings on documents K2a-b (purportedly written by Hank Cooper) wrote the questioned writings on Q1 (excluding the questioned signature). The comparison of the specimen writings on documents K1a-c (purportedly written by Bobbi Meeks) to the questioned handwriting (excluding questioned signature) on Q1 has disclosed a significant combination of differences in handwriting habit. Accordingly, the writer of the specimen writings on documents K1a-c (purportedly written by Bobbi Meeks) did not write the questioned handwriting on Q1 (excluding the questioned signature). Examination of the questioned signature disclosed that it is of moderate complexity and a text based signature wherein the letter forms are nearly all legible. The examination further disclosed that the signature has lower line quality including a lack of fluency and some portions with tremor. Accordingly, for the questioned signature on document Q1, due to the nature of the writing, it was not possible to determine whether or not the writers of: K1a-c (purportedly Bobbi Meeks) and K2a-b (purportedly Hank Cooper) wrote the questioned signature on document Q1.
WETU87-524	In light of the above analysis and comparison I came to the following conclusion: 10.1 I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting and signature in question marked as "Q1" were not written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a" to "K1c". 10.2 I found the evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in questioned marked as "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2b". 10.3 I found a degree of similarity between "Q1" and the writer of specimens marked "K2". The specimens however do not contain cursive writing as is visible in the disputed signature. A definite conclusion

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	can therefore not be made.
WML887-524	There is evidence to support the proposition that the disputed writing on early dismissal form document marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen writing on documents marked "K2a" to "K2b". Common authorship between the disputed signature on early dismissal form document marked "Q1" and specimen signatures on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2b" could not be identified or eliminated, therefore no conclusion can be reached.
WR2GF4-523	The K2's handwriting has many identical similarities to the Q1's handwriting but there are also some missing letters (in the Q1 text) so there is no possibility them to be compared (to the known material). No strong (valuable) differences were observed. The K1's handwriting has many repeatable differences.
WTBNJW-524	1. There is very strong support that the writer of K2, Hank Cooper is the writer of the handprinted writing on the early dismissal form identified as the questioned document, Q1. 2. There is strong support that the signature of 'Bobbi Meeks' in the Questioned document, Q1 is not signed by Bobbi Meeks (K1). 3. There is no comparative signature of Hank Cooper (K2) in the documents provided. Hence, the identification of the signatory on the early dismissal form, Q1 cannot be identified.
X2GQJM-523	The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (excluding the signature) was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (excluding the signature) was probably written by Hank Cooper (K2). The questioned signature on the early dismissal form was probably not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). We cannot identify or eliminate if Hank Cooper (K2) wrote the questioned signature on the early dismissal form.
XACTLY-523	The Q-1 document form was not filled out or signed by the same hand that executed K-1a, b & c. The Q-1 document form was filled out (excluding the signature) by the same hand that executed K-2a, b & c. The writer of K-2a, b & c could not be identified or eliminated as the writer of the signature on the Q-1 document.
XE8H7C-523	It has been concluded, that the questioned handwriting (excluding the questioned signature) on the document Q1 was written by Hank Cooper (K2). With the material available for comparison, no evidence was found to suggest that Bobbi Meeks (K1) wrote the questioned handwriting on the Dismissal Form (Q1). The questioned signature on the Dismissal Form (Q1) probably was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). Hank Cooper (K2) can neither be identified nor eliminated as an author of the questioned signature on the Dismissal Form (Q1).
XKBLWB-524	The writer of Item K1, submitted as the known writing of Bobbi Meeks, probably did not prepare the writing on Item Q1. The evidence indicates that this writer may not have prepared the signature on Item Q1, but this evidence falls far short of that necessary to support a definite conclusion. The writer of Item K2, submitted as the known writing of Hank Cooper, probably did prepare the writing on Item Q1. No conclusion could be reached as to whether or not this writer prepared the signature on Item Q1.
XM2QPH-524	Upon completion of an examination and comparison of the exhibit and standards submitted in this case, this examiner has reached the following opinions: There is a strong probability that the K-2 writer wrote the questioned text appearing on the Q-1 exhibit. The K-1 writer probably did not write the questioned text appearing on the Q-1 exhibit. It could not be determined if either the K-1 or K-2 writer wrote the questioned signature appearing on the Q-1 exhibit, thus no opinion of authorship can be given at this time. This is due to only 2 known exemplars of the K-1 signature submitted as well as no comparable writing/signature standards by the K-2 writer of this text. These opinions are not conclusive due to the aforementioned factors as well as the somewhat limited standards for each writer available for comparison.
XQ2UJP-524	In light of the analysis i made the following conclusion: I found the evidence to support the preposition that the handwriting in questioned marked "Q1" was written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" to "K2b" and where not written by the writer of the specimen material marked "K1a" to "K1c". I found the evidence to support the preposition that the signature in questioned marked "Q1" was not signed by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a" to

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	"K1c". The writer of specimen material "K2a" to "K2b" could not be eliminated or identified as the one who signed.
XUEYT6-524	<p>After an analysis and comparison of the elements identified in the writing and signatures as contained on the respective documents I made the following observations which presented me with the following facts: 1.1 Several significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the handwriting and signature in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting and signatures of the writer of the current specimen material marked as "K1a" to "K1c". 1.2 In light of the above analysis and comparison I came to the following conclusion: I found sufficient evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting and signature in question marked as "Q1" was not written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1a" to "K1c" and the writer thereof is thus eliminated as a possible writer of the handwriting and signature in question marked as "Q1". 2.1 Several correspondences in respect of elements of style were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting of the writer of the current specimen material marked as "K2a" and "K2b", however certain differences in respect of elements of style ,which are not fully addressed by the current specimen material, were also identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b". 2.2 In light of the above analysis and comparison I came to the following conclusion: Despite the limitations presented by the current specimen material ("K2a" and "K2b")I however found evidence to support the proposition that the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" were probably written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" and "K2b". 3.1 The signature in question marked as "Q1" is a letter-based signature which consists of cursive allographs (letters), however the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b" consists of mainly a combination of connected capital and lowercase printscript allographs. Subsequently, the specimen handwriting ("K2a" and "K2b") contains a very limited amount of corresponding allographs which are comparable to the allographs as contained in the signature in question. 3.2 In light of the above analysis and comparison I came to the following conclusion: Due to the limitations presented by current specimen material ("K2a" and "K2b") I am not able to positively identify or eliminate the writer of the specimen material marked as "K2a" and "K2b" as the writer of the signature in questioned marked as "Q1".</p>
XYDBQP-524	<p>The questioned handwriting on item(Q1) had some unique characters that were similar to those observed on the specimen handwriting alleged to be of the suspect(K2a-b), hence suggesting that both the handwriting on the questioned item(Q1) and the alleged suspects handwriting on items(K2a-b) originated from the same author. There were also some elements of writing that eliminated the said complainants handwriting on items(K1a-c) from the authorship of the handwriting on the questioned item(Q1). The signature comparison gives evidence that the questioned signature on item(Q1) is not authentic.</p>
XYU923-523	<p>The person whose extended writing appears on items K1a-c, probably did not fill in the handwritten portion of the disputed Q1 document. Bobbie Meeks (K1a-b) did not sign that name where it appears on disputed dismissal form (Q1). Hank Cooper (K2a-b), probably wrote the extended writing appearing on item Q1. Mr. Cooper, however, cannot be identified or eliminated as having signed the "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on item Q1.</p>
Y2EM2W-524	<p>The questioned hand printed entries appearing on Q1 were authored by the writer of K2a and K2b. Neither writer could be identified or eliminated as the author of the questioned signature "Bobbie Meeks" appearing on Q1.</p>
Y4H9YU-524	<p>In respect of the questioned writing on document marked "Q1": The writing on the questioned document marked "Q1" was written by the author of the specimen writing marked "K2". The writing on the questioned document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen writing marked "K1". In respect of the questioned signature on document marked "Q1": The signature on the questioned document marked "Q1" was not written by the author of the specimen signatures marked "K1". No definite finding could be reached with regards to "K2" being the author of the signature on document marked "Q1". The questioned signatures differ completely in</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	respect of design and construction to the specimen signatures of "K2" ("Hank Cooper"), and are thus not comparable.
YBLDPT-524	1.The questioned writing (excluding the signature) was not written by Bobbi Meeks. 2.The questioned writing (excluding the signature) was written by Hank Cooper. 3.The questioned signature was not written by Bobbi Meeks. 4.The questioned signature can not be identified or eliminated by Hank Cooper.
YCDBYK-524	[No Conclusions Reported.]
YD7A8R-524	It has been concluded that the Bobbi Meeks of the known material did not write the questioned writing or signature found on Exhibit Q1 . Furthermore, it has been concluded that the Hank Cooper of the known material probably wrote the questioned writing found on Exhibit Q1 , however no conclusion could be reached as to whether or not he wrote the questioned signature.
YPLYCN-524	It was determined that the questioned writing on Item 1 (CTS Item Q1), excluding the "Bobbi Meeks" signature, was prepared by HANK COOPER, writer of Item 3 (CTS Items K2a - K2b). No conclusion could be reached whether BOBBI MEEKS, writer of Item 2 (CTS Items K1a - K1c), or HANK COOPER, writer of Item 3 (CTS Items K2a - K2b), prepared the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Item 1 (CTS Item Q1) due to the limited comparable known signatures for comparison and the possibility that this signature was slowly prepared.
YQHEMZ-523	In my opinion, it were found that, (i) The questioned writing on the early dismissal form (Q1) was written by Hank Cooper (K2) and not by Bobbi Meeks (K1). (ii) The questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1) was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). However, I could not identify or eliminate Hank Cooper (K2) as the writer of the questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1).
YRQMPT-523	(1) The questioned written text appearing on the Q1 document was NOT WRITTEN by the author of the K1 documents, Bobbi Meeks. (2) The questioned written text appearing on the Q1 document was WRITTEN by the author of the K2 documents, Hank Cooper. (3) The author of the K1 documents, Bobbi Meeks, CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED as having written the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on the Q1 document. (4) The author of the K2 documents, Hank Cooper, CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED as having written the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on the Q1 document.
YYPAJD-523	The questioned hand printing was not produced by the writer of the "Bobbi Meeks" exemplars. No determination could be made as to whether or not the questioned signature was produced by the writer of the "Bobbi Meeks" exemplars. This examination was limited due to: There were only requested exemplar signatures provided for comparison. Such after-the-fact writing has the potential to be self-serving. The exemplar signatures' last name is stylized while the questioned last name is legible. The questioned signature appears slowly executed and awkward. There is substantial evidence which indicates that the questioned hand printing was probably produced by the writer of the "Hank Cooper" exemplars. Although this is not a conclusive identification, there are sufficient similarities to establish a strong likelihood that the writer of the "Hank Cooper" exemplars wrote the questioned hand printing. No determination could be made as to whether or not the questioned signature was produced by the writer of the "Hank Cooper" exemplars. This examination was limited because there were no "Bobbi Meeks" exemplar signatures available for comparison with the questioned signature.
Z33ETT-523	The questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the dismissal form (Q1) was written by Hank Cooper, the writer of K2(a-b). The questioned writing (excluding the signature) on the dismissal form (Q1) was not written by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of K1(a-c). The questioned signature on the dismissal form (Q1) was not written by Bobbi Meeks, the writer of K1(a-c). The questioned signature on the dismissal form (Q1) was probably written by Hank Cooper, the writer of K2(a-b).
Z4YRFL-524	In my opinion I conclude that there is a High Probability Hank Cooper has written the 'Questioned' writing on the Dismissal Form. Due to him refusing to give formal comparable samples for

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>comparison purposes has lowered my Probability of Authorship. These 'Questioned' writings have not been written by Bobbi Meeks. I further conclude that the 'Questioned' signature is not a genuine signature of Bobbi Meeks and has not been written by her. There is insufficient evidence to rule out OR confirm the probability of Hank Cooper being the author- therefore he cannot be identified or eliminated.</p>
ZEXMBV-523	<p>First.- The questioned handwriting (excluding the signature) at early dismissal form (Q1), was not written by Bobbi Meeks (K1). Second.- The questioned handwriting (excluding the signature) at early dismissal form (Q1), was written by Hank Cooper (K2). Third.- The questioned signature cannot be identified or eliminated whether or not Bobbi Meeks (K1) could be responsible for the authorship of the document; it was due just three signatures was provided. According to [SOP number], it is required at least 10 signatures to determined authorship. Fourth.- The questioned signature cannot be identified or eliminated whether or not Hank Copper (K2) could be responsible for the authorship of the document; it was due the known writing of Hank Cooper (K2) has no common elements to questioned signature Q1 according to PTDC100 procedure lab.</p>
ZKNVZV-523	<p>My Preliminary opinion based on comparison of the available documents: 2 sheets of request writing and limited 'found' writing is that the Questioned Document writing—on the early dismissal form-- was probably not written by the writer K-1 – Bobbi Meeks. In addition, my Preliminary opinion based on comparison of the available documents: a collection of limited 'found' material, is that the Questioned Document writing---on the early dismissal form—was probably written by the writer K-2 – Hank Cooper. No determination could be made regarding author of the Questioned Document signature with the limited signatures provided for the writer K-1 – Bobbi Meeks, and the absence of request writing of signature by K-2 –Hank Cooper. Should additional material become available, please contact me.</p>
ZLUH9U-523	<p>1. In my opinion there are conclusive evidence to show that the writer K2(Hank Cooper)wrote the question writing(excluding the signature)on the early dismissal form(Q1). 2. Although the question signature on the early dismissal form (Q1)has different writing style with both writer K1 and K2,there are strong evidence to show that Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper did not write the signature.</p>
ZN8WYN-524	<p>Writing and signing the document presents Q1 graphical differences. The signature has them characteristics a school writing may correspond to a disguised signing. We have compared the graphics of the Q1 document to the Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper's writings. Bobbi Meeks's presents incompatible characteristics with writing Q1. So Bobbi Meeks has not written Q1. On the other hand, there are undeniable matching graphic elements between Q1's writing and some elements of Hank Cooper's handwriting. In signature of the question, some elements may be similar to Hank Cooper written as "m" or "b". The other elements of the signature are absent K2a-b and can't be compared. We have found no similar signature elements between the Q1 signature and Bobbi Meeks writing. In conclusion, Hank Cooper wrote Q1 and probably signed Q1.</p>
ZQDCCL-523	<p>A comparative hand printing examination resulted in the following findings: The questioned writing on the Q1 early dismissal form was probably prepared by the K2 writer. Although consistency between numerous significant and substantial corresponding individualizing characteristics was present in both Q1 and K2, this finding was limited due to the lack of comparable exemplar writing from the K2 writer repeating the questioned material on Q1. The questioned writing on the Q1 early dismissal form was not prepared by the K1 writer. This finding is based upon the presence of significant and fundamental differences between the individualizing characteristics represented in Q1 when compared to the K1 writings. A comparative signature examination resulted in the following findings: The questioned signature on the Q1 early dismissal form was not prepared by the K1 writer. This finding is based upon the presence of significant and fundamental differences between the individualizing characteristics represented in Q1 when compared to the K1 writings. No conclusion regarding common authorship between the questioned signature on the Q1 early dismissal form and the K2 writer was possible due to the lack of comparable signatures prepared by the K2 writer.</p>
ZQUNR7-523	<p>Based on the examination and comparison of Exhibit Q1 with Exhibits K1a through K1c, K2a and K2b, the following has been determined: Hank Cooper (Exhibits K2a & K2b) wrote the questioned</p>

TABLE 2

WebCode-Test	Conclusions
	<p>hand printed entries depicted on Exhibit Q1. It is highly probable Bobbi Meeks (K1a through K1c) did not write the questioned entries (hand printed and signature) depicted in Exhibit Q1. Hank Cooper (Exhibits K2a & K2b) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit Q1. The qualified and inconclusive findings are necessitated in some instances by the limited comparable writing of similar style and the lack of verbatim signatures submitted for examination.</p>
ZR6DAW-524	<p>In respect of the WRITING in question on "Q1": Significant differences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the writing in question and the specimen writing marked as "K1(a-c)" (purported to be of one "Bobbi Meeks"). Some significant correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution were identified between the specimen writing marked "K2(a-b)" (purported to be of one "Hank Cooper") and the writing in question. However, only course of business writing (and no requested writing samples) of said writer was obtained and submitted for examination and, subsequently, does not address many of the letter combinations encountered in the questioned material. In light of the above, I found the evidence to support the proposition that the writing in question ("Q1") was NOT written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1(a-c)" (purported to be of one "Bobbi Meeks"). However, I found the evidence to provide strong support for the proposition that the writing in question was ("in all probability") written by the writer of the specimen material marked "K2(a-b)" (purported to be of one "Hank Cooper"). In respect of the SIGNATURE in question on "Q1": Significant differences in respect of elements of rhythm and form were identified between the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature and the specimen signatures on the documents marked as "K1(a-c)" (purported to be of one "Bobbi Meeks"). Some correspondences in respect of elements of style and execution (including, inter alia, letter design, size and spacing) were identified between the signature in question and the specimen writing marked "K2(a-b)" (purported to be of one "Hank Cooper"). However, only course of business writing (and no requested writing samples) of said writer was obtained and submitted for examination and, subsequently, does not address many of the letter combinations encountered in the questioned material. In light of the above, I found the evidence to support the proposition that the signature in question ("Q1") was NOT written by the writer of the specimen material marked as "K1(a-c)" (purported to be of one "Bobbi Meeks"). However, I found evidence to provide some support for the proposition that the signature in question was ("probably") written by the writer of the specimen material marked "K2(a-b)" (purported to be of one "Hank Cooper").</p>
ZV8A2C-524	<p>COOPER wrote the questioned hand printed entries on Exhibit 3. COOPER and MEEKS could neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature on Exhibit 3. This finding is limited due to the insufficient amount of comparable known signature samples submitted for examination.</p>

Additional Comments

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
26RXDQ-524	The author of the Bobbi Meeks signature on the Q-1 Dismissal form could not be determined because only two (2) known signatures of Meeks was submitted and that does not constitute a sufficient number of known signature exemplars from Meeks. There were no signature exemplars of Cooper submitted, only hand printed writing so the known writing of Cooper is not comparable to the questioned Bobbi Meeks signature.
2HGW4T-524	Signature on "Q1" is cursive writing and "k2" is printscript. Could not be compare due to the different letter combinations.
2MNPUH-524	The writer of K2 /Hank Cooper/ cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature. There were no samples of K2 containing the name „Bobbi Meeks” written with cursive letters to compare with the disputed signature. Because of this there was possibility to examine only the hand printing. The questioned signature looks disguised, therefore it would be necessary to have samples sufficient in quantity and quality. There are some similarities /for example B, M, e/ between the questioned signature and the known writings of K2, therefore he can not be eliminated. The quantity of these similarities is not enough to determine that signature probably was written by him, findings only weekly support the proposition that he is responsible for the signature on the form, so he cannot be identified.
2V2C8T-524	Regarding the signatures of the documents marked as K2a & K2b - the signatures are not comparable to that of the questioned signature and therefore authorship cannot be proved nor disproved that the author (K2a & K2b) possibly could have written the signature in question (therefore the "C" on the answer sheet).
32LYBW-523	The author of Items K2-a-b cannot be identified or eliminated as the author of the questioned signature on the early dismissal form labeled as Item Q1, since there is no cursive writing or signatures on Items K2-a-b.
32NJ6R-524	The specimen signatures on the documents marked "K2a" and "K2b" could not be compared to the questioned signature on the document marked "Q1" due to the fact that the two sets of signatures were not executed in the same writing style and no common letter combinations can be found between the two sets of signatures.
34TGAT-523	In relation to question #2 the "Questioned signature" was not performed due to lack of comparators
37FTD6-523	Submission of two types of additional known writing samples by Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper 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) to thirty (30) sheets of paper, duplicating the questioned document in size, shape, and format. The text of the questioned document should be written verbatim, at the dictation of the individual securing the samples. 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 mortgage documents, job applications, court records, etc. These samples help verify that the requested writing samples are normally written. These samples also offer a broader range of an individual's writing for examination and should encompass the same time period as the questioned document.
3DGALP-523	TO BE TO GIVE AN ACCURATE AND SPECIFIC ANSWER RELATED TO THE QUESTION NUMBER 2, IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO HAVE MORE MATCHING ITEMS OF HANK COOPER, BECAUSE OF THE PREVIOUS PROVIDED PRECLUDE THE RESEARCH DUE TO THAT IT IS FUNDAMENTAL TO HAVE MORE SIMILAR ITEMS TO THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE/ INTERROGATED (Q1) OR CURSIVE SCRIPTS TO EVALUATE THE SCRIPTURAL BEHAVIOR. CONCLUSIONS THE QUESTIONED WRITING, WAS NOT WRITING BY BOBBY MEEKS (K1) ACCORDING TO THE

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	ANALYSIS AND THE COMPARATIVE PERFORMED BETWEEN THE QUESTIONED WRITING AND THE COLLATION WRITING, DO NOT MATCH, WITH THE REFERENCES EXTRINSIC POINTS AS WELL AS ITS LOCATIONS, POSITION, SPACES , GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS LIKE ALIGNMETS BASE, TILT AND GRAPHIC GESTURES AND DIRECTION CHANGES. THE QUESTIONED WRITING WAS WRITEN BY HANK COOPER(K2) ACCORDING TO THE COMPARATIVE PERFORMED BETWEEN THE COLLATION WRITING AND THE QUESTIONED WRITING, THEY MATCH THE CONSISTENT GRAPHICS IN ITS WRITING, WITH THE EXTRINSIC REFERENCE POINT AND AS WELL AS ITS LOCATION AND POSITION, SPACES, GENERAL CHARACTERITICS LIKE ALIGNMENT BASE, TILT AND GRAPHIC GESTURES AND DIRECTION CHANGES. THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE WAS NOT WRITEN BY BOBBY MEEKS(K1)ACORDING TO THE ANALYSIS AND THE COMPARATIVE PERFORMED BETWEEN THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE AND THE COLLATION SIGNATURE, DO NOT MACTH, WITH THE REFERENCES EXTRINSIC POINTS AS WELL AS ITS LOCATIONS, POSITION, SPACES, GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS LIKE ALIGNMENT BASE, TILT, AND GRAPHIC GESTURES AND DIRECTION CHANGES. THE QUESTIONED SIGNATURE CAN NOT BE IDENTIFIED OR ELIMINATED BY HANK COOPER (K2) ACCORDING TO THE MATCHING ITEMS THEY ARE NOT HOMOGENEOUS NEITHER HAS ENOUGH EXERSICES OF CURSIVE SCRIPT
3LVRKQ-524	The reproduced nature of all samples limited evaluation of various features including direction of strokes and sequence of strokes. Furthermore, the reproduced nature of the questioned signature precluded sufficient assessment of key elements in the writing, such as possible tremor, disconnections and pen lifts.
42HUDY-524	The differences were observed between document Q1 and the specimen handwriting/signature purported to be of Bobbi Meeks.
4JGTH-524	The letter combinations of the signatures differ and could thus not be compared. ie "Bobbi Meeks" with "Hank Cooper".
4L6HL7-524	4.1) It should be noted that the Q1 "Bobbi Meeks" signature entry appears slowly written; slower than the remaining entries on item Q1. 4.2) Reason for response code "C": No known cursive writing supplied for the K2 writer – Hank Cooper, thus no basis for comparison to the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature entry on item Q1.
4PLVHM-524	Extra-processing material is requested from Mr. Hank Cooper in orden to complete the required study.
67PPM-524	The questioned signature and the calligraphic materials of Mr Hank Cooper do not provide suitable caligraphic comparison elements, since they are not similar typeface manuscripts
6AL9QK-524	Answer C depends on the lack of adequate comparative signatures.
6PJD4N-524	Pertaining to "K2" and the questioned signature - The questioned signature is not comparable to the signature of "K2" (different letter combinations)
78JMML-524	The availability of additional requested specimen signatures, if possible, should allow for a more conclusive scientific examination to be performed with reference to Conclusion 2.
7CCRCJ-524	4.1 For the technical study the next devices were employed: Stereomicroscopic microscope with epicospic lighting and scanner EPSON PERFECTION V200 PHOTO. 4.2 A graphonomic analysis was made using the laws and principles of handwriting. We used scientific method oriented to the examniation of documents as manuscripts and signatures, supported in general and systematic observation of the graph, detailed description of relevant and diferential aspects and comparison of elements with original samples. We made a judgement based only on these findings. We used macro an microscopic techniques. 4.3 The pattern of graphs used to the assesment of MR Meeks and Cooper, showed similar traits, wich makes the identification process hard and complex.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	Nonetheless, individual traits of Mr. Hank Cooper allowed determining the identity of the manuscript. 4.4 As the questioned signature is a product of an imitation, it limits the evaluation and determination of a complete identification of the author. However, the convergent traits allow identifying with good probability, but without absolute certainty, because it is impossible to compare all findings in the samples provided.
7M86AU-524	I used "C" (inconclusive) for response 2, Hank Cooper, due to lack of known Hank Cooper cursive writing samples submitted for comparison. If additional samples are provided, I reserve the right to amend this opinion.
7QCQ4L-524	The known handwriting on K1 and K2 was examined and compared to the questioned handwriting on Q1. Similarities in skill, size, style, slant, proportions, arrangement, and letter design/construction were observed between K2 and Q1. Differences in these same features were observed between K1 and Q1. A stronger conclusion might be possible with the submission of requested exemplars written by the writer of K2, bearing the same wording and layout of Q1, written to dictation. The known signatures on K1 were examined and compared to the questioned signature on Q1. Differences in fluency and design were observed between the known and questioned signatures. Although the quantity of known signatures is limited, these differences are sufficient to establish that the questioned signature does not appear to be naturally written. However, this does not preclude the possibility of disguise for later denial. Due to the absence of any comparable signature on K2, the known handwriting on K2 was examined and compared to the questioned signature on Q1. Differences in style and skill were observed between the known handwriting on K2 and the questioned signature. It is generally not possible to identify the writer of a simulated signature.
7RMDXU-523	We can not achieve strong results within our quality system, as a result of the examined material, since it's based on copies and not originals. We cannot identify or eliminate to Mr Hank Cooper due to the questioned signature Q1 is a forgery by imitation and we have not found strong and enough similarities, but this person is skill enough to perform it.
7WDPTQ-524	The letter combination of the signature "Hank Cooper" differs from the questioned signature "Bobbi Meeks" and therefore it is not comparable.
7ZHDE8-524	Hank Cooper can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on item Q1 due to an absence of comparable known writing. A requested writing specimen from Hank Cooper containing several repetitions of the questioned signature is required for a meaningful comparison.
88WNYL-524	During examination and comparison of the disputed material with specimen material, I observed the following: 6.1 There is significant evidence observed that the writer of the specimen writing marked "K1 a-c" do not correspondences in terms of letter designs and constructions with the questioned writing marked "Q1". 6.2 There are similarities between the specimen writing marked "K2a-b" and the questioned writing marked "Q1". 6.2.1 The collective specimen marked "K2a-b" were all written with a fibre tip instrument and differ from the questioned document marked "Q1". 6.3 The signatures on the specimen documents marked "K1 a-c" and "K2a-b" differ in line quality speed and structure from the disputed signature on the document marked "Q1".
8DYUDP-524	The writing in question does not exhibit characteristics of forgery especially the signature whose line quality shows some tremour and fluidity.
8Q442Y-523	The response "C" was used when stating the examination results for the questioned signature for both K writers. Although dissimilarities were noted between the questioned signature and the known for writer K1, this writer can't be excluded because it isn't possible to anticipate all the ways a writer can change his or her writing, intentionally or not. Since no comparable exemplar signatures were provided for writer K2, this writer can't be identified or eliminated, thus the examination results are inconclusive.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
93FV6Y-523	The quantity of the known cursive writing samples of Hank Cooper was insufficient for a more definitive finding. Additional known writing samples of Hank Cooper, specifically cursive writing with similar letters as the questioned signature, may provide a more definitive finding.
986DGP-523	The questioned signature is written slowly and contains (includes) signs created artificially. Moreover, the signature presents features that point it is written as the imitation of authentic signature or handwriting of Bobbi Meeks. The lack of dictated exemplars from Hank Cooper is the essential drawback during this examination. However, even if the suitable dictated exemplars from Hank Cooper were completed to the examination, there is no certainty the conclusion could be categorical (was written by or not).
9NCCLL-524	There is no sufficiently compelling graphics elements to identify or exclude K1 or K2.
9RJMNG-524	Disputed signature on early dismissal form document marked "Q1" is forged, therefore of the specimen signatures on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2b" could not be identified or eliminated.
AAVRRK-523	My opinion in regard to the authorship of the signature on Q1 is inconclusive. Only 2 x specimen signatures in the name Bobbi MEEKS were provided for comparison to the 1 x questioned signature on Q1. Pictorial differences were observed between the specimen signatures and the questioned signature, however given the limitations that existed in the examination, I am unable to comment on the authorship of the Q1 signature.
ADB2YW-524	1. We gave an answer of "C" regarding the questioned signature in comparison with handwriting samples in the name of Hank Cooper as there were no dictated samples of his writing, the received samples were only handprinted with no joint script writing and there were only a few course of business handwriting samples. 2. In a real case I would have asked for more dictated and course of business handwriting samples and signatures in the name of Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper.
ADQPVH-524	The Q1 signature could not be compared to K1 due to the fact that no cursive handwriting samples were submitted written by K1. The K2 signatures, Bobbi Meeks, were compared to the Q1 signature. K2 can be eliminated as having authored the Q1 signature.
AH7T9E-524	4.1 Identification or elimination could not be done because the questioned signature was forged. Therefore it could have been forged or not forged by either Bobbi Meeks or Hank Cooper.
AHBDWH-524	Hank Cooper can neither be identified nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature since insufficient cursive handwriting samples were provided of Hank Cooper to compare to the questioned cursive "Bobbi Meeks" Parent signature on Q1.
AMWPME-523	Writings in cursive from Hank Cooper would need to be provided in order for a comparison to the signature to be made. Additional writings of Hank Cooper could also be helpful in the overall comparison to the questioned sample, Q1. A greater conclusion could be possible with additional writings.
AQZZPY-524	No conclusion could be reached whether or not Hank Cooper wrote the questioned signature on 001-A1 due to the lack of comparable known writing available for examination.
AT6XRF-524	The purpose of a signature comparison undertaken by a Forensic Document Examiner is to determine whether or not the signature in question was written by the person of that name. My observations in this exercise show that the signature in question differs in overall style and form from the genuine examples. Therefore, the signature in question (i) could have been written by the writer of the genuine examples in a style not present in the genuine examples or (ii) it could have been written by some other person unaware or uncaring of the form of the genuine signature. My observations do not allow me to distinguish between those alternatives.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
BNQDRL-524	Known writing of uncle, Hank Copper, does not present cursive writing, therefore, it is not suitable for this analysis. It is recommended to contribute more known writing.
BV88LG-523	The questioned signature appearing on the document in Item Q1 consists of mostly connected, legible characters, in a cursive style. It displays some reduced line quality and evidence of attention to the writing process in parts. The specimen "MEEKS" signatures appearing on the documents in Item K1 have been freely and fluently written with reasonable skill and speed. The construction of the specimen "MEEKS" signatures is different to that of the questioned signature. As such, they are not comparable. The specimen handwriting appearing on the documents in Item K1 is not comparable with the questioned signature. The specimen "COOPER" handwriting appearing on the documents in Item K2 consists of mostly disconnected characters with occasional connections. It is not fully comparable with the questioned signature. Further examination of the questioned signature can be conducted if additional comparable specimen handwriting is provided.
BVBHFF-524	4.) If this had been a real case, I would have requested additional signatures of Bobbi Meeks to see if she could be eliminated from having signed the signature on Q-1. I would have also requested signatures of the writer of the K-2 samples, as well as cursive samples of his writings.
CEXQQF-524	Elimination and/or Identification of the author of the forged signature is not possible since the forger did not use his/her own writing habits. The process of forgery is in itself an excellent form of disguise.
CKKCZM-524	The reason that Hank Cooper's known signatures (K2) cannot be identified or eliminated as the writer of the questioned signature (Q1) due to they were incomparable.
CY7PF3-524	Response "C" was given on question #2 in regard to Hank Cooper. An examination was not possible as there were no cursive "Bobbi Meeks" signature standards submitted for comparison. The cursive questioned signature cannot be compared to the hand printed extended writing entries.
DAHCU-524	If our had the original evidence, could have examine characteristics such as stroke direction, pen pressure, speed artefacts, direction, physical and chemical manipulations, links between letters, initial and final Strokes.
DBFLXC-524	The reason for the "C" response concerning the comparison of the questioned signature and the specimen K2 is due to deficits of the specimen which includes no signatures in the wording "Bobbi Meeks".
DBV3T6-524	The questioned signature is slow, drawn, disguised. The shape of the letters differs minimally from the copybook style letters, so it does not contains sufficient quantity and quality of characteristics to identify. Against the questioned signature, the name bearer's samples are natural. Hank Cooper's samples doesn't contains any "Bobbi Meeks" name descriptions. That's why it is not possible to determine the writer of the questioned signature.
DLEE73-524	Due to non-comparable known standards of Hank Cooper, K2, for the signature, a comparison was not conducted.
DRL7DF-524	a. Original material always allows for the best foundation on which to base a comparison or examination. The copy quality for the questioned and known documents presented a substantial limitation to the overall assessment of handwriting and signature features. b. Samples of a comparable nature are also always ideal when conducting an examination. The signature on the document Q1 is cursive in nature. The lack of comparable material in the K2 specimens severely limited the comparison. c. The competing hypotheses set in the conclusions were considered given the scenario. Should another scenario be considered, different hypotheses sets may result in the re-evaluation of the evidence. Accordingly, the conclusions provided could be subject to change.
DVHMUF-524	As there are no control signature specimens written by Hank Cooper (K2) available for comparison

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	with the questioned signature on the early dismissal form Q1, I can neither confirm nor eliminate that the questioned signature on the early dismissal form Q1 was written by Hank Cooper (K2).
DW9XJM-523	The Q1 signature is totally different, there is no similar characteristic between Q1 signature and K2a and K2b signature. This is look like to compare apple with orange.
EKU3YG-524	The letter combination and execution of the signature on document marked Q1 differs from that of the signature on document marked K2b and thus not comparable. The writer of specimen marked K2 can not be identified or excluded with the specimen signature received.
EYFDUZ-523	The handwriting on the images was treated as it was from the original documents, however, these images are not originals. The details in the handwriting present on these images is still not of the same quality as the details present in an original document. The response of "C" was used in question 2 because there were no signature exemplars from Hank Cooper to compare to the signature on the Questioned documents. Because no comparison could be done, Hank Cooper cannot be identified or eliminated as the author of the signature.
EZT3WC-524	The questioned signature on "Q1" cannot be identified or eliminated to the writer "K2" because the questioned signature and specimen signature have lack of corresponding characters for comparison (were different in structure). As such, the comparison of handwriting characteristics of these signatures cannot be carry out.
FZ62ME-523	There are not enough comparison signatures from each person to make a determination.
G7AD4C-524	Scale of conclusions: Level +4 "extremely strongly support", Level +3 "strongly support", Level +2 "support", Level +1 "support to some extent", Level 0 "support neither... nor..." (inconclusive), Level -1 "support to some extent that... was not...", Level -2 "support that... was not...", Level -3 "strongly support that... was not...", Level -4 "extremely strongly support that... was not..."
G8LW4A-524	Referring to the comparative analysis of the signature performed in (Q1) ans the manuscripts contributed that were made by the Lord hank Cooper (K2a), (K2b), was established that can not be identified or eliminated, (response C). Because there are no material evidence to establish with certainty its authorship.
GNNWA-524	The questioned signature on Q1 shows areas of poor fluency and breaks in the pen line and as such, I cannot rule out the possibility that the questioned signature contains elements of disguise. Additionally there is limited comparability between the questioned signature which is in a connected style and the reference writing of Hank Cooper which is in a mainly unconnected style.
GQ29WY-524	C (Inconclusive) was selected for the question of whether Hank Cooper authored the Bobbi Meeks signature due to a lack of comparable exemplar writing from this contributor. There were no true cursive writings exemplars to conduct a comparison with the signature.
GV8Y2Q-524	The absence of comparable signature samples from Hank Cooper prevented any meaningful comparison with the questioned 'Bobbi Meeks' signature on Item Q1.
GY8ATK-524	There are a combination of many similarities between Q1 and K2a-b that informed my opinion. Similarities include: 1) i dots that have light pressure or are missing, 2) capital letter B is wider in the lower half and is open on the bottom, 3) capital letter M has a second hump that is shorter and less wide than the first hump, 4) the lower case k is enlarged, and 5) lower case letters m and n begin with an upstroke. There are no significant differences between Q1 and K2a-b. There are many differences between Q1 and K1a-c. These differences include: 1) lower case printed letter u ends with a downstroke in K1a-c but in Q1 this letter ends with an upstroke, 2) the lower case letter k is enlarged in Q1 but not in K1a-c, 3) the capital letter M has a taller second hump in K1a-c but the second hump of the capital M in Q1 is shorter, and 4) placement of the signature and other information is often further to the right along the ruled line in K1a-c than in Q1.

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
H33JFQ-524	If the original of the questioned form was submitted it could be examined for indentations and printing processes, both of which may provide additional evidence regarding its source. Additional specimens for Hank Cooper, completed in a cursive or semi-cursive writing style, could be submitted for further comparison with the questioned signature.
HF9C84-523	I would do an indented writing/ESDA examination and a VSC examination of Exhibit Q1. There should be a choice for "Indentations wrote" and "Indications did not write" in questions 1 and 2.
HN7862-524	As for the conclusion for (iii), On further examination, I found the questioned signature on "Q1" was a cursive signature whereas the specimen signatures on "K2a-K2b" were hand printed signatures. There were significantly limited factors such as limited corresponding characters and minimal identifying features for comparison between these questioned and specimen signatures. As such, I am not able to carry out a suitable comparison of the handwriting characteristics to ascertain the authorship of this questioned signature. Therefore, whether the writer of the specimen signatures "K2" ("Hank Cooper") wrote this questioned signature cannot be identified or eliminated.
HV8J4K-524	2. The reason for answer "C" are as follows: 2.1 The signature in question marked as "Q1" is a letter-based signature which consists of cursive letters, however the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b" consists of mainly a combination of connected capital and lowercase printscript letters. Subsequently, the specimen handwriting ("K2a" and "K2b") contains a very limited amount of corresponding letters which are comparable to the letters as contained in the signature in question (different writing styles). 2.2 Different writing styles consists of different forms or patterns to produce letters, two sets of handwriting samples produced in different writing styles are therefore not comparable. 2.3 It should also be noted that certain elements of execution which could be considered as 'obvious indicators of forgery' such as poor line quality, pen stops etc. were also observed in respect of the signature in question. However, as the signature in question ("Q1") was eliminated as the known genuine signature of specimen material marked "K1a" to "K1c", the presence of these elements could be attributed to the possibility that the signature in question is a fictitious signature. In this case the writer of the question signature will attempt to hide his/her own writing habits, whilst attempting to imitate or replicate the writing habits of another writer. Subsequently complicating the task of identifying the writer.
HXVTF7-524	4.1 The disputed signature "Q1" is a forgery (The signature was simulated, as also indicated by the lack of free flow of signature; together with the signs of the hesitations that occurred during the construction of the signature). 4.2 The specimen signatures on the documents marked "K1a" and "K1b" display differences with the disputed signature on the document marked "Q1" in respect of slant, signature design and construction. Therefore questioned signature "Q1" is not authentic. 4.3 Proper examination and comparison could not be conducted between the disputed signature on document marked "Q1" and the specimen signature on document marked "K2b" due to the fact that these signatures are not compatible, they are different in respect of the design and construction.
J7J9D9-524	The final conclusion regarding the signature Bobbi Meeks is caused by the construction of the signature and the manner in which was outlined. Signature is masked, unnatural, there are observable abnormal course of the graphic lines. Non categorical opinion is also the results of lack of adequate comparative material taken on the command and because it does not contain similar graphic signature forms as evidence and not prepared for an adequate background.
JAYG29-524	Regarding the author of the parent signature on Q1 (the early dismissal form): The parent signature on Q1 was seemed to be a slowly written signature. It is also a mixed based signature containing legible and illegible parts. Since a very few letters are available to compare, it was impossible to make an opinion with Hank Cooper's (K2a & K2b) handwriting.
JFQLWX-524	There is a limited amount of comparable signature or cursive samples from the writer of K1. However, there are some differences between the questioned signature and the K1 samples indicating that this writer may not have signed Q1. The response which most closely fits with an indications opinion is a no opinion or response "C". There is a lack of comparable signature or

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	cursive samples from the writer of K2. Therefore, no opinion (or response "C") can be offered regarding this writer and the questioned signature.
JLVMWR-524	Not enough evidence. More handwritten items from Mr. Hank Cooper are needed to continue the analysis.
JUNW3G-523	The signature) is totally different, there is no similar characteristic between questioned signature (Q1) with known signature (K2a and K2b). This is look like to compare apple with orange.
JXLDGW-524	A limiting factor in this examination was the lack of comparable cursive writing submitted of Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper. The submission of additional known writing of both Meeks and Cooper may result in a more definitive conclusion. This should include multiple samples of the signature "Bobbi Meeks." Several non-request signatures from Bobbi Meeks, K1, would also prove beneficial. Additional repetitions of the questioned hand printing appearing on Q1, along with additional non-request hand printing, should also be submitted for comparison.
JZBK2T-524	If additional signature exemplars and standards are obtained from Cooper and Meeks, more definitive findings may result.
K6KF39-524	4.1 The handwriting examination was limited by the relatively simplistic style of the questioned writing, and the non-original nature of the items for examination which affected the ability to observe some fine features. 4.2 Dissimilarities were observed between the K1 (Bobbi MEEKS) and Q1 writings in slope, proportions and formation of characters e.g. a, d, k, m, n and u. 4.3 Similarities were observed between the K2 (Hank COOPER) and Q1 handwritings in proportions and features of formation e.g. d, k, m and n; however, dissimilarities were observed in size and some fine/subtle features of formation including the curve of the letter c, straightness of the f cross stroke and angularity of the number 4. This combination of similarities and dissimilarities may be due to one of the following: a. Q1 was written by someone other than K2, with very similar handwriting features b. The collected comparison material of K2 is not fully representative of the writer's natural range of variation, and the K2 writer wrote Q1. c. Someone other than the K2 writer wrote Q1, simulating the handwriting features of the K2 writer, with no gross evidence of the simulation process. d. The K2 writer wrote Q1, disguising their normal handwriting. 4.4 The signature depicted on Q1 is in the name Bobbi MEEKS. 4.4.1 The Q1 signature does not resemble the requested comparison Bobbi MEEKS signatures (K1). This may be due to one of the following: a. Q1 was written/'simulated' by someone other than the K1 writer, without a model signature. b. Q1 was written by the K1 writer using a disguise in either the Q1 or K1 signatures. c. The K1 writer has more than one signature style, not represented in the comparison material and Q1 was written by the K1 writer. 4.4.2 No 'signatures' in the name Bobbi MEEKS were received from the K2 writer, Hank COOPER, nor handwriting in a cursive style to compare with the Q1 signature, so no meaningful examination of Q1 and K2 writings could be undertaken.
KKU9M6-524	The ovals of letters and numbers, apparently, are clockwise in the Hank Cooper K2 manuscripts as well in the full manuscripts of Q1, a singularity that if confirmed in the originals, can serve to affirm with certainty the equality between these graphisms.
KLNUFV-523	More definitive conclusions may be possible with the submission of additional known writing of Bobbi Meeks, Hank Cooper, or any other individuals of interest to the investigation. Please contact the Forensic Document Unit (FDU) prior to the collection and submission of additional known writing. Copies of the images submitted for examination in Q1, K1, and K2 are being retained by the FDU.
KRBPB9-524	The conclusion as abovementioned in sub-paragraph 1.2 was reached due to: 1.1 The signature in question was written as a legible name signature, formed by two (2) graphic sets and written in a cursive writing style. 1.2 The specimen on the documents marked as "K2a" and "K2b" contained only handwriting in a print script style. 1.3 The difference in writing styles between the questioned signature on the document marked as "Q1" (cursive) and specimen handwriting on the documents

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	marked "K2a" and "K2b" (print script) makes them not comparable. 1.4 As the rightfull signatory(the "mother") was elimanated as the writer of the questioned signature(as mentioned in sub-paragraph 1.1) and observations made that corresponds with elements of forgery(bad line quality, irregular pen stops and pen lifts),it is highly probable that the questioned signature is a similated product where the writer tried to hide his real writing habits,making identifying him very difficult. 1.5 The amount of corresponding letters identified, was too limited and conducting a feasible examination linking the writer ("uncle") to the questioned signature was not possible.
L2HNNF-524	If I had to give a strength for the writing and another for the signature (but given the case circumstances I would not) then I would conclude: Very strong - body of writing by Hank Cooper Limited - signature by Hank Cooper
L2ZVM7-523	1. With respect to the suruey comparative grafoscopy of the signature that is in the document Q1 with respect to the handwriting described in the points K2a and K2b are not possible emit expert opinion in virtue that we don't count with signatures to serve us as bases of partial comparison.
L4QU4P-524	Examination of the originals and cursive writing by M. Hank Cooper are requested to complete the examination.
L887Z7-524	The questioned Q1 signature cant not be identified or removed from Mr. Hank Cooper. We must insist on the location of Mr. Hank Cooper to receive samples of his writing and obtain more documents that have samples of his writing that are close to the date of the questioned document.
LDU9PN-524	We only have collected standards for Hank Cooper, and no request standards(dismissal form). There are not enough discriminating elements to study.
LNR347-523	While the Q1 signature is not genuine when compared to the K1 specimen signatures, no opinion can be given regarding authorship.
LRXBR6-524	The questioned signature is a forgery. As a result, it cannot be concluded as to who forged it between Bobbi and Hank as either of them could have or could have not.
LX3CMT-524	The inconclusive opinion rendered regarding the known writing of Hank Cooper (K2) and the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature is due to the fact that the questioned material is cursive and not comparable to the hand printed known material submitted. It would be of value in this case to obtain additional specimen writing from Hank Cooper (K2) repeating the questioned signature numerous times.
MKP92V-523	Need known normal course of business signatures from writer of K1a thru K1c to eliminate as signer of Q1. Q1 is handprinted. Need more handprinted samples from writer of K1a thru K1c (samples submitted are mixed cursive and handprinting). Need writer of K2a and K2b to submit dictated handprinted and signature samples to render stronger opinion.
MT2KW8-523	The writing characteristics found in the signature of the document identified as Q1, are not enough to identify or eliminate as the writer of the documents identified as K2a and K2b.
MWJPPB-523	Submission of additional writing exemplars from the K1 and K2 writers could assist a subsequent examination of this evidence. For the K1 writer, this should be in the form of collected signatures (20-30) encompassing the period of time of when Q1 was signed. For the K2 writer, requested exemplars (20-30) on the same form, signing the name "Bobbi Meeks" in cursive writing.
MWKMY7-524	It is noteworthy that the questioned signature on the handprinted and signed early dismissal form is in cursive or palmer letter, and Hank Cooper's original signatures are in printed letter. Both of them present a different design and process; therefore, they cannot be compared.
NCQ7B4-524	Even tough there is no cursive handwriting samples of Hank Cooper, there are similarities between the suspected signature and the letters of "B", "M", "K" in the samples of K2

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
NGQCVZ-524	During examination and comparison of the disputed material with specimen material, I observed the following: 6.1 There are strong similarities in terms of the specimen writing on the documents marked "K2a-b" and the questioned document marked "Q1". 6.2 The writing on the specimen documents marked "K1a-c" differ from the writing on the Questioned document marked "Q1" in terms of construction and design. 6.3 The signatures on the specimen documents mark "K1a-c" and "K2a-b" differ from the signature on the questioned document marked "Q1" in terms of poor line quality or structural features.
NQQ6ZL-524	The formation and direction of stroke of many of the characters was difficult to discern from the photographs.
P32YTP-524	Response C "CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED" was chosen concerning the K2 writer and the Q1 signature because there were no standards provided of the K2 writer signing the name of the questioned signature. Response C "CANNOT be IDENTIFIED or ELIMINATED" was chosen concerning the K1 writer and the Q1 signature because of the limited amount of signature standards and the lack of non request signature standards which in this case prevent the examination of the K1 writer's range of variation and the possibility of an alternate style.
PBDZ9Y-524	It is a kind of simulated signature. But there are some characteristic similarities with (K2) handwriting of Hank Cooper.
PDMW34-524	Notwithstanding that I have been instructed to treat the photographic reproductions as originals for the purpose of the test, the photographic reproductions do not provide the level of detail that would be obtained from original documents. Therefore, examination of the original documents may result in changes to the conclusions given above. Examination of additional specimen signatures and cursive specimen handwriting attributed to Bobbi Meeks may result in a change to the conclusion given above with regard to the questioned signature when compared with the K1 specimens. Examination of cursive specimen handwriting (including the name "Bobbi Meeks") attributed to Hank Cooper may result in a change to the conclusion given above with regard to the questioned signature when compared with the K2 specimens. With the benefit of the original of document Q1 in our laboratory, other examinations that would be undertaken include oblique light and ESDA examinations for the presence of visible and latent writing impressions, as well as microscope, VSC and dichroic filter examinations to detect any use of optically distinguishable writing inks. Consideration could also be given to examination of the questioned document for the presence of latent fingerprints. In the normal course of this being a real case, our laboratory would have contacted the instructing person with a request for additional specimen signatures of K1 and for cursive specimen handwriting of K2 for comparison with the questioned signature. Furthermore, in the normal course of this being a real case, we would have separated the instructing person from the examiner conducting the examination with the use of a second examiner as "case manager". This would allow the "sanitising" of the case file to remove the potentially biasing information in the written correspondence received from the instructing person, for the purpose of managing exposure of the examiner to unnecessary context information. [NOTE TO CTS: It should be noted that there are several pieces of extraneous information in the scenario for this test, which are not necessary in order for the examiner to conduct the examination and which could be claimed to have biased the examiners' interpretation of their observations. Given that context information is a hot topic in forensic science, has CTS given consideration to changing this aspect of the test set-up? There are two considerations. Firstly, future tests could be formulated in such a way that half the distributed test included such context information and half did not, in order to consider whether there is any influence from the extraneous information. Secondly, it could simply be that such extraneous information is not included in future tests. We would be very keen to discuss this further with CTS if the opportunity arises.]
PRKCJP-524	In regards to the questioned signature, I responded with answer "C" due to the lack of available standards for comparison. The K-1 writings consisted of only two (2) signatures, which were request standards, and no non-request standards. The K-2 writings consisted of no request standards,

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	specifically none signing the questioned signature.
Q6L7N7-524	1. I am of the opinion that Bobbi Meeks did not write the questioned signature. 2. It was indeterminate if Hank Cooper was the writer of the questioned signature as there are no similar allograph in the specimen signature.
QAF3DX-523	Due to a lack of comparable cursive writing, the writer of Exhibit K2a-b (Hank Cooper) could neither be identified, nor eliminated as the writer of the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature on Exhibit Q1. The submission of contemporaneous known writings of Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper may provide the basis for additional conclusions. The known writing of Bobbi Meeks should consist of hand printed normal-course-of-business writings and signatures that include similar word, letter and numeral combinations as depicted in the questioned document. The known writing of Hank Cooper should consist of hand printed and cursive normal-course-of-business writings that include similar word and letter combinations, as well as exemplars of the exact text depicted in the questioned document.
R94NM3-524	The specimen signatures ("K2") were executed in print script and the questioned signature marked "Q1" was executive in cursive writing. As a result, the signatures are incomparable.
RVCYQH-524	The photographs that sent for the examination are assumed to be true and accurate reproductions of the original documents.
RX6UCQ-524	No opinion was reached on questioned signature/K2 writer (Hank Cooper) due to the lack of cursive writing in the known sample submitted for K2 writer. Conclusion for questioned signature/K1 writer was indications not written by; however, this opinion was far from conclusive and I felt this was more in-line with a no opinion than the strength of a probably not written by on the provided scale. This opinion was reached as only 2 signature samples were provided and no cursive sample.
TGPBTP-523	We never reach definite conclusions as in "was written by ...".
THH92V-523	Some similarities have been observed between the questioned signature of "K2" and Hank Cooper's manuscript writing: Execution of the capital letters "B" y "M". Execution of the minuscule leteer "E". Nevertheless, also we have found differences in the execution of the letters "O", "B", "L", "K" and "S". Even this way, it is not possible to reject the authorship of this person. This conclusion could be change if we would arrange of text and signatures with the complete name "Bobbi Meeks" realized by Hank Cooper.
TJCVW9-523	The Q1 signiture is totally different, there is no similar characteristic between Q1 signiture and K2a and K2b signature. This is look like to compare apple with orange.
UCPGBE-524	The examinations requested have been restricted by the lack of specimen writings. This restriction has precluded the expression of more definitive opinions. In particular, the are no "Bobbi Meeks" specimen signature for the K2 writer to compare.
UJBCCH-524	No conclusion could be determined regarding common authorship of the signature on the early dismissal form in comparison with the exemplars of Contributor #2 (the author of Items 1e-1f, course of business exemplars attributed to Hank COOPER). No comparable cursive style handwriting was included with the handwriting exemplars attributed to Contributor #2. It is recommended that comparable cursive style handwriting exemplars (including handwriting representing "Bobbi Meeks" signatures) be submitted for examination and comparison with the questioned early dismissal form. Without comparable exemplars of sufficient quantity, comparison and determination of common authorship of the authorizing signature of the early dismissal form ("Bobbi Meeks") cannot be determined based on the exemplars of Contributor #2.
UVKV77-523	The submission of fifteen or more comparably executed, exact-text exemplars written by Hank Cooper may provide the basis for additional conclusions. These exemplars should contain samples

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	of Hand Cooper signing, in cursive, the name of Bobbi Meeks.
VKMC9C-523	Submission of two types of additional known writing samples by Bobbi Meeks and Hank Cooper 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) to thirty (30) sheets of paper, duplicating the questioned document in size, shape, and format. The text of the questioned document 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. In the event of a refusal to provide writing exemplars, the investigating officer should contact the Questioned Document Unit for information on how to obtain compelled writing exemplars. The questioned signature is in cursive and not comparable to the manuscript printed writing submitted for comparison.
VKY7NC-524	The signature in the name of Bobbi Meeks on the questioned document, Q1, appears to exhibit unnatural pen lifts, hesitation, slow speed, and lack of fluidity. This could be evidence of deliberation or simulation; however the evidence submitted does not support a more definite determination. Handwriting exemplars attributed to Hank Cooper that are verbatim the questioned handwriting should be submitted for comparison. Additional handwriting exemplars and normal course of business handwriting in the same handwriting style as the questioned should be obtained from Bobbi Meeks and submitted for comparison. A proper handwriting comparison requires, from any and all subjects, an extensive and contemporaneous representation of the same characters and words in the same style present in the questioned handwriting. Many of the letters and letter combinations in the questioned writing were not submitted in the known writing.
VWFXB2-523	The identification or elimination of the author of the Known document K2 a-b is not possible, due to the lack of comparison elements or signatures, according to the Laboratory's Signature and Handwriting Analysis Methodology.
W3Z94W-524	There is an absence of any handwriting in the name of "Bobbi Meeks" from Hank Cooper for comparison purposes. There is a limited amount of known signatures of Bobbi Meeks for comparison purposes.
W94EET-524	THE SIGNS "B" "M" AND "ee" OF THE SIGNATURE QUESTIONED (Q1) PRESENT SIMILAR MORPHOLOGICAL WITH THEM SAMPLES PATTERNS K2 HOWEVER, WITH THEM NOT IS CAN ESTABLISH IDENTITY GRAPHIC, DUE TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THEM SIGNS AND TO THE STYLE OF LETTER ITALIC OR LINKED THAT PRESENTS IT SIGNS Q1, THAT NOT IS LOCATES IN THEM SAMPLES PATTERNS OF HANK COOPER (K2A AND K2B) WHY ARE YOU CANNOT IDENTIFY OR ELIMINATED.
WETU87-524	8.1 In respect of the questioned handwriting and signature marked as "Q1": 8.1.1 The handwriting in question is observed as consisting primarily of print script lower case letter with connections present between certain characters. 8.1.2 Discriminating elements of style were identified indicating that it was written by one person. 8.1.3 The disputed signature Q1 is letter based with cursive writing present. 8.2 In respect of the specimen handwriting and signatures marked as "K1a" to "K1c": 8.2.1 The handwriting in question is observed as consisting primarily of print script lower case letter with connections present between certain characters. 8.2.2 Discriminating elements of style were identified indicating that it was written by one person. 8.2.3 The specimen signatures (known signatures) are signatures which consist of a combination of mainly connected print script letters, with embellishments present at the start of the first letters of both words. 8.3 In respect of the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" to "K2b": 8.3.1 The handwriting in question is observed as consisting primarily of print script lower case letter with connections present between certain characters. 8.3.2 Discriminating elements of style were identified indicating that it was written by one

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	<p>person. 9. 9.1 A comparison of the respective material (referred to in subparagraphs 8.1 to 8.3 supra) revealed the following: 9.1.1 Significant differences were identified in respect of the elements of style between the writing and signature of the disputed document "Q1" and the Specimen writing and signatures present on the specimen documents marked "K1a" to "K1c". 9.1.2 Similarities in respect of elements of style were identified between the handwriting in question marked as "Q1" and the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" to "K2b". 9.1.3 The disputed signature marked as "Q1" is a letter based signature consisting of cursive letters. The specimen writing marked "K2a" and "K2b" consist primarily of upper and lower case print script letters with connection present between some of the letters. Examination of the disputed signature revealed a level of similarity to specimens "K2a" to "K2b" when the embellishments are ignored. No similarities are present on specimens "K1a" to "K1c".</p>
WML887-524	<p>The questioned signature on the dismissal form marked "Q1" is forged and therefore the disputed signature on early dismissal form document marked "Q1" and specimen signatures on documents marked "K1a" to "K1c" and "K2a" to "K2b" could not be identified or eliminated.</p>
WTBNJW-524	<p>1. Identification of the hand printed notes in relation to the writer K2 is made possible as there were similarities found between K2 and Q1. Some being, a) the special and habitual way K2 wrote the capital 'K' in the middle of a word b) the sometimes missed-out 'i-dot', c) the structure and formation of letter 'C', 'B' and 'M' d) where there is a 'guided line', the whole writing conforms or stays on strictly to the guided line e) the way K2 wrote the numeral '2' and '3' when compared to Q1. 2. The identity of the signatory cannot be identified as K2. The signature of 'Bobbi Meeks' in Q1 was executed in cursive / connected letter. However, the written notes provided in K2a and K2b were all written in printed form. Therefore, the comparison of letters in similar allograph cannot be performed.</p>
X2GQJM-523	<p>The questioned signature on the early dismissal form was written in cursive style while the samples collected from Hank Cooper (K2) were written in block style. The comparison result was unable to provide any conclusion to support either if Hank Cooper (K2) was or was not the writer of the questioned signature on the early dismissal form.</p>
XACTLY-523	<p>The examination of the questioned signature on Q-1 was limited due to the fact that there was no comparison cursive handwriting of Hank Cooper (the writer of K-2a, b & c).</p>
XE8H7C-523	<p>The results of the questioned signature examinations are not conclusive, because there are some limitations within the questioned signature and known handwriting. The limitation within the questioned signature is the style of writing, which is similar to a particular copybook writing, that one learns in childhood. This stylization of the signature may cause lack of individualizing, intrinsic features of the handwriting. Therefore in most comparisons of this type of writings, no definite opinion could be expressed. The samples of handwriting of Hank Cooper (K2) didn't contain dictated exemplars adequate in form and type to the questioned signature. Therefore the limitations imposed by the type of writing of the questioned signature and also lack of the accurate specimen of writer, have caused indeterminable conclusion. There is some evidence to suggest that Bobbi Meeks (K1) didn't sign the Dismissal Form (Q1). However the known samples of signatures of Bobbi Meeks are simplified, particularly illegible. Therefore, inadequate amount of accurate specimen of writer and also the limitations imposed by the type of writing of the questioned signature, have caused the indefinite conclusion.</p>
XKBLWB-524	<p>The examination was hindered by the small amount of known exemplars for Bobbi Meeks and the lack of more comparable known exemplars for Hank Cooper.</p>
XM2QPH-524	<p>Answer "C" was chosen for each writer in comparison to the Q-1 signature for the following reasons: For the K-1 writer, only 2 known signature exemplars were submitted, and that is insufficient for this comparison. For the K-2 writer, no comparable writing/signature standards were available to evaluate this writer's capability to execute the Q-1 signature.</p>
XQ2UJP-524	<p>The writer of specimen material "K2a" to "K2b" could not be eliminated or identified as the one who</p>

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	signed. Because the two signatures in questioned document marked "Q1" and specimen material "K2b" are incomparable.
XUEYT6-524	Reasons for response "C": In respect of the signature in question contained in the document marked as "Q1": 1. The signature in question marked as "Q1" is a letter-based signature (i.e.name-signature) which consists of cursive allographs (letters), however the specimen handwriting marked as "K2a" and "K2b" consists of mainly a combination of connected capital and lowercase printscript allographs. Subsequently, the specimen handwriting ("K2a" and "K2b") contains a very limited amount of corresponding allographs which are comparable to the allographs as contained in the signature in question. 2. As different writing styles consists of different forms or patterns to produce allographs, two sets of handwriting samples produced in different writing styles are subsequently not comparable. 3. Further it should also be noted that certain elements of execution which could be considered as 'obvious indicators of forgery' such as poor line quality, absolute point load and pen stops etc. were also observed in respect of the signature in question. The presence of these elements in respect of the signature in question could be attributed to the possibility that the signature in question is a simulated or fictitious signature (i.e. forgery), in which case the writer of the question signature will suppress (i.e. attempt to hide)his/her own writing habits, whilst attempting to imitate or replicate the writing habits of another writer. Subsequently, further complicating the task of identifying the writer thereof.
XYDBQP-524	The signature analysis and comparison of the questioned signature on item(Q1) with both the suspects signature on item(K2b) and the complainants signature on items(K1a-b), gave a conclusion that the questioned signature on item(Q1) is not authentic so both the suspect and the complainant could not have been identified or eliminated as the signatories of the questioned signature on item(Q1).
XYU923-523	In order to determine, if possible, whether Mr. Cooper signed the "Bobbi Meeks" signature on item Q1, extended cursive writing of his should have been submitted for comparison. It is not possible to compare printed writing to a cursive signature.
Y4H9YU-524	The questioned signature on "Q1" is written in cursive. The specimen signatures on "K2" are written in print script, therefore the signatures "Q1" and "K2" are thus incomparable.
YBLDPT-524	The questioned signature can not be identified or eliminated by Hank Cooper,because there is no basis for comparison.
YD7A8R-524	If additional samples of known, cursive handwriting of Hank Cooper are submitted, further comparisons may be conducted.
YQHEMZ-523	According to the known signatures of Hank Cooper (K2) were incomparable to the questioned signature on the early dismissal form (Q1) ,therefore I could not identify or eliminate Hank Cooper (K2) as the writer of the questioned signature (Q1).
YRQMPT-523	Re: Conclusion (3) above - Although the submitted known signatures of Bobbi Meeks appearing throughout the K1 documents bear no similarities whatsoever to the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on the Q1 document; it is not possible to determine whether or not the questioned signature is intentionally disguised. Furthermore, the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appears to be carefully executed containing various portions of, what appear to be, nu-natural writing movements. Re: Conclusion (4) above - Due to the lack of any comparable writings, a complete and proper analysis cannot be completed between the author of the K2 documents, Hank Cooper, and the questioned "Bobbi Meeks" signature appearing on the Q1 document.
YYPAJD-523	The limitations in rendering a conclusive or qualified opinion are mentioned in my conclusion. When comparing the questioned signature with the "Bobbi Meeks" exemplars, the signatures were pictorially different but the following were limitations to this examination: There were only requested exemplar signatures provided for comparison. Such after-the-fact writing has the potential to be

TABLE 3

WebCode-Test	Additional Comments
	self-serving. The exemplar signatures' last name is stylized while the questioned last name is legible. The questioned signature appears slowly executed and awkward. Regarding the "Hank Cooper" exemplar writer: There were no "Bobbi Meeks" exemplar signatures available for comparison.
Z4YRFL-524	The 'Questioned' signature has some features similar to the writings of Hank Cooper such as the formation of the block letters 'B' and 'M' with the addition of the lead in strokes. The remaining writings are in lower case cursive writing of which we have no samples material for comparison. Therefore insufficient evidence to uniquely connect OR rule out this author.
ZEXMBV-523	This proficiency test was performed by [Laboratory].
ZQDCCL-523	Submission of comparable exemplar writing and signatures from the K2 writer repeating the questioned material on Q1 may allow for more definitive conclusions.
ZR6DAW-524	As limitations in the specimen material, particularly of that of "Hank Cooper" were experienced, the examiner would request additional applicable specimen material from said writer. In the event that no request samples can be obtained, then more course of business writing covering a greater expanse of writing should be sought. A larger sample may present the examiner with a greater variety of writing possibly containing more letter combinations similar to that featured in the writing in question.

Appendix: Data Sheet

Collaborative Testing Services ~ Forensic Testing Program
Test No. 16-523: Handwriting Examination

DATA MUST BE RECEIVED BY November 28, 2016 TO BE INCLUDED IN THE REPORT

Participant Code:

WebCode:

Accreditation Release Statement

CTS submits external proficiency test data directly to ASCLD/LAB, ANAB, and A2LA. Please select one of the following statements to ensure your data is handled appropriately.

- This participant's data is intended for submission to ASCLD/LAB, ANAB, and/or A2LA. (Accreditation Release section on the last page must be completed and submitted.)
- This participant's data is NOT intended for submission to ASCLD/LAB, ANAB, or A2LA.

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:

Bobbi Meeks has contacted police because she believes her ex-husband's brother, Hank Cooper, has kidnapped her daughter from her elementary school. The child was released to a man's custody following the submission of an early dismissal form in mid-September, purported to be written by the child's mother and releasing the child to her father. Ms. Meeks states that the child's father lives in another state and has not been in contact with them for several months. Due to an oversight at the school's main office, the man's identification was not verified. According to school records, the form was turned in to the school by the child following a weekend visit with Mr. Cooper.

Investigators have submitted the handprinted form and signature (Q1) to determine whether or not Mr. Cooper could be responsible for the authorship of the document. Known course of business writing and dictated exemplars of the form have been collected from Ms. Meeks. As Mr. Cooper cannot be located at this time, only course of business writing from approximately six weeks prior to the incident is available for comparison. Please examine the questioned form to determine which, if either, of the individuals is the source of the handprinting and signature in the 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 mother, Bobbi Meeks.

Item K2a-b: Known writings of uncle, Hank Cooper.

Item Q1: The handprinted and signed early dismissal form.

Please return all pages of this data sheet.

Page 1 of 4

Participant Code:

WebCode:

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 the early dismissal form?

	Bobbi Meeks (K1)	Hank Cooper (K2)
Q1 (Dismissal Form)		

(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 the early dismissal form?

	Bobbi Meeks (K1)	Hank Cooper (K2)
Q1 (Dismissal Form)		

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

Please return all pages of this data sheet.

Participant Code:

WebCode:

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

4.) Additional Comments

Return Instructions: Data must be received via online data entry, fax (please include a cover sheet), or mail by *November 28, 2016* to be included in the report. Emailed data sheets are not accepted.

QUESTIONS?

TEL: +1-571-434-1925 (8 am - 4:30 pm EST)
 EMAIL: forensics@cts-interlab.com
www.ctsforensics.com

Participant Code:

ONLINE DATA ENTRY: www.cts-portal.com

FAX: +1-571-434-1937

MAIL: Collaborative Testing Services, Inc.
 P.O. Box 650820
 Sterling, VA 20165-0820 USA

Please return all pages of this data sheet.

Collaborative Testing Services ~ Forensic Testing Program

RELEASE OF DATA TO ACCREDITATION BODIES

The following Accreditation Releases will apply only to:

Participant Code:

WebCode:

for Test No. **16-523: Handwriting Examination**

This release page must be completed and received by **November 28, 2016** to have this participant's submitted data included in the reports forwarded to the respective Accreditation Bodies.

Have the laboratory's designated individual complete the following steps only if your laboratory is accredited in this testing/calibration discipline by one or more of the following Accreditation Bodies.

Step 1: Provide the applicable Accreditation Certificate Number(s) for your laboratory

ASCLD/LAB Certificate No. _____

ANAB Certificate No. _____

A2LA Certificate No. _____

Step 2: Complete the Laboratory Identifying Information in its entirety

Signature and Title _____

Laboratory Name _____

Location (City/State) _____

Return Instructions**Accreditation Release**

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