

State of New Hampshire Department of Safety  
 Division of State Police  
 Forensic Laboratory

<b>Protocol Title</b>	Latent Print Examination		
<b>Method Title</b>	Background		
<b>Reviewed and Approved By (signature/date)</b>	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Marc E. Dupre	Criminalist II	
<b>Authorized By (signature/date)</b>	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Lise A. Swacha	QA/QC Criminalist II	
<b>Effective Date:</b>	01/03/05	<b>Date Due for Revision:</b>	12/31/05

<b>Reviewed and Re-App. By</b>		<b>Next Due for Revision:</b>
<b>Re-Authorized By</b>		12/31/07

<b>Reviewed and Re-App. By</b>		<b>Next Due for Revision:</b>
<b>Re-Authorized By</b>		12/31/09

**OBJECTIVE**

To describe the general theories involved in latent print identification

**SCOPE**

This protocol applies to any evidence submitted to the identification unit of the NHSP Forensic Laboratory, and to any personnel who will routinely perform latent print examinations.

**PRECAUTIONS (IDU-300)**

N/A

**REAGENTS and EQUIPMENT**

N/A

**PROCEDURE**

1. General description
  - 1.1. Latent print examinations involve the discovery, development, enhancement, documentation and preservation of residue impressions deposited by contact of friction ridge skin with an object and the comparison of such impressions to the recorded reproduction of friction ridge skin known to belong to a specific individual.
  - 1.2. Latent prints is a generic term of general acceptance but may be called any of the following:
    - 1.2.1. latent impressions
    - 1.2.2. fingerprints
    - 1.2.3. chance impressions
  - 1.3. The function of latent print examination is to determine the single origin of the preserved impression, a procedure that is accomplished with the highest possible certainty and scientific validity.
2. Fundamental principles for friction ridge examinations
  - 2.1. The morphology of friction ridge skin is unique.
  - 2.2. The arrangement of friction ridges is permanent barring trauma to the basal layer of the epidermis.

<i>Protocol:</i> Latent Print Examinations	<i>Original Date:</i> 02/02	print date
<i>Method:</i> Background	IDU-001-01, Revision #3	05/16/05
	Page 1	

State of New Hampshire Department of Safety  
Division of State Police  
Forensic Laboratory

- 2.3. An impression of the unique details of friction ridge skin can be transferred during contact with a surface.
  - 2.4. An impression that contains sufficient quality and quantity of friction ridge detail can be individualized to, or excluded from, a source.
    - 2.4.1. Cumulative friction ridge detail can be used to individualize or exclude non-continuous impressions, such as, simultaneous and fragmented palm impressions or when using duplicate known impressions for examination.
  - 2.5. Sufficiency is the examiner's determination that adequate unique details of the friction skin source area are revealed in the impression.
3. Levels and uses of friction ridge skin detail for examinations
- 3.1. Level one detail
    - 3.1.1. Overall ridge flow
    - 3.1.2. General morphology (e.g., presence of incipient ridges, overall size)
    - 3.1.3. Can be used for pattern interpretation
    - 3.1.4. Can be used to determine anatomical source (i.e., finger, palm, foot, toe) and orientation
    - 3.1.5. Cannot be used alone to individualize
    - 3.1.6. Can be used to exclude under certain circumstances
  - 3.2. Level two detail
    - 3.2.1. Individual ridge path
      - Presence of ridge path deviation (e.g., ridge ending, bifurcation and dot)
      - Absence of ridge path deviation (e.g., continuous ridge)
      - Ridge path morphology (e.g., size and shape)
    - 3.2.2. Used in conjunction with level one detail to individualize
    - 3.2.3. Used in conjunction with level one detail to exclude
  - 3.3. Level three detail
    - 3.3.1. Structure of individual ridges
      - Shape of the ridge
      - Relative pore position
    - 3.3.2. Other specific friction skin morphology (i.e., secondary creases, ridge breaks, etc.)
    - 3.3.3. Used in conjunction with level one and level two detail to individualize
    - 3.3.4. Used in conjunction with level one and level two detail to exclude
  - 3.4. Other features associated with friction ridge skin (e.g., creases, scars, warts, paper cuts, blisters)
    - 3.4.1. May be permanent or temporary
    - 3.4.2. May exist as level one, two and three detail
    - 3.4.3. May be used in conjunction with friction ridge detail to individualize or exclude

**DISPOSAL (SA-090)**

There is no special disposal for this procedure.

END

<b>Protocol Title</b>	Latent Print Examination		
<b>Method Title</b>	General Procedure		
<b>Reviewed and Approved By (signature/date)</b>	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Marc E. Dupre	Criminalist II	
<b>Authorized By (signature/date)</b>	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Lise A. Swacha	QA/QC Criminalist II	
<b>Effective Date:</b>		01/03/05	<b>Date Due for Revision:</b> 12/31/05

<b>Reviewed and Re-App. By</b>		<b>Next Due for Revision:</b>
<b>Re-Authorized By</b>		12/31/07

<b>Reviewed and Re-App. By</b>		<b>Next Due for Revision:</b>
<b>Re-Authorized By</b>		12/31/09

**OBJECTIVE**

To outline a procedure for general steps taken during latent print identification

**SCOPE**

This protocol applies to any evidence submitted to the identification unit of the NHSP Forensic Laboratory, and to any personnel who will routinely perform latent print examinations.

**PRECAUTIONS (IDU-300)**

Any processing technique is destructive or potentially destructive to varying degrees. The scope of destruction to the article, to other latent prints not revealed by a particular technique and to other latent print residue which may be of evidentiary value is dependent upon the solvents, chemical fumes and even the heat from photographic lighting or alternate light source output utilized. Generally the least destructive is photography while most destructive are chemical processes using solvents. Consult individual SOP's and protocols for details.

**REAGENTS and EQUIPMENT**

N/A

**PROCEDURE**

1. Assessment of appropriate protocol
  - 1.1. Items examined for the presence of latent prints may require a variety of processing stages.
  - 1.2. They can range from visual inspection to sequential physical, chemical or electronic techniques.
  - 1.3. Factors which indicate approach include the following:
    - 1.3.1. type of surface
    - 1.3.2. transfer medium
    - 1.3.3. physical condition of the surface at time of contact
    - 1.3.4. environmental conditions at the time of contact
    - 1.3.5. sequential environmental changes since the time of contact
    - 1.3.6. evidence collection methods
    - 1.3.7. packaging

- 1.3.8. elapsed time since contact
  - 1.3.9. conflict in examinations required
  - 1.3.10. destructive consequences of techniques
  - 1.3.11. additional techniques available.
  - 1.4. Not all factors will be known, yet analysis of the recognizable conditions combined with the experience of the examiner with similar evidence will provide information on processing selections.
2. Method of friction ridge examinations.
- 2.1. Analysis
    - 2.1.1. Analysis is the assessment of a friction ridge impression to determine suitability for comparison. Factors considered include the following:
      - Quality (clarity) and Quantity of detail
        - ✓ Level one detail
        - ✓ Level two detail
        - ✓ Level three detail
      - Anatomical source
        - ✓ Finger
        - ✓ Palm
        - ✓ Foot
        - ✓ Toe
      - Factors influencing quality include:
        - ✓ Residue/matrix
        - ✓ Deposition
        - ✓ Surface/substrate
        - ✓ Environment
        - ✓ Development medium
        - ✓ Preservation method
        - ✓ Condition of the friction skin
  - 2.2. Comparison
    - 2.2.1. Comparison is the direct or side-by-side observation of friction ridge detail to determine whether the detail in two impressions is in agreement based upon similarity, sequence and spatial relationship.
  - 2.3. Evaluation
    - 2.3.1. Evaluation is the formulation of a conclusion based upon analysis and comparison of friction ridge impressions. Conclusions that can be reached are:
      - Individualization (Identification)
        - ✓ Individualization is the result of the comparison of two friction ridge impressions containing sufficient quality (clarity) and quantity of friction ridge detail in agreement. Individualization occurs when a latent print examiner determines that two friction ridge impressions originated from the same source, to the exclusion of all others.
      - Exclusion
        - ✓ Exclusion is the result of the comparison of two friction ridge impressions containing sufficient quality (clarity) and quantity of friction ridge detail which is not in agreement. Exclusion occurs when a latent print examiner determines that two friction ridge impressions originated from different sources.

- Inconclusive
  - ✓ Inconclusive evaluation results when a latent print examiner is unable to individualize or exclude the source of an impression due to poor quality or incomplete known exemplars. Inconclusive evaluation results must not be construed as a statement of probability. Probable, possible or likely individualization (identification) conclusions are outside the acceptable limits of the friction ridge identification science.

2.4. Verification

- 2.4.1. Verification is the independent examination by another qualified examiner resulting in the same conclusion.
- 2.4.2. All individualizations (identifications) must be verified.
- 2.4.3. Exclusion or inconclusive results may be verified.

**DISPOSAL (SA-090)**

There is no special disposal for this procedure.

END

Protocol Title	Latent Print Examination		
Method Title	Interpretation and Reporting of Conclusions		
Reviewed and Approved By (signature/date)	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Marc E. Dupre	Criminalist II	
Authorized By (signature/date)	safety review N/A	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>	
		Lise A. Swacha	QA/QC Criminalist II
Effective Date:	01/03/05	Date Due for Revision:	12/31/05

Reviewed and Re-App. By		Next Due for Revision:
Re-Authorized By		12/31/07

Reviewed and Re-App. By		Next Due for Revision:
Re-Authorized By		12/31/09

**OBJECTIVE**

To outline the conclusions and wording expressed in case reports for latent print examinations

**SCOPE**

This protocol applies to any evidence submitted to the Identification Unit of the NHSP Forensic Laboratory, which has been subjected to any or all of the protocols for various types of latent fingerprint processing and examination and to any personnel who will routinely perform latent print examinations.

**PRECAUTIONS (IDU-300)**

The report wording (section 4) indicated is **only meant as a guide** and only with proper training and/or experience can a latent print examiner utilize the processing results to accurately express the conclusions that may be drawn.

**REAGENTS and EQUIPMENT**

N/A

**PROCEDURE**

1. Latent finger and palm print suitability for identification
  - 1.1. There is no minimum number of matching points to effect a positive identification.
  - 1.2. The following evaluation for suitability criteria is to ensure high quality casework results.
  - 1.3. Any latent finger or palm print with **at least eight** clear ridge endings, bifurcations or dots in continuous ridge detail shall be considered suitable for identification in casework, compared with appropriate record prints and appropriately reported casework findings.
  - 1.4. **Seven** is the **maximum** number of clear points in continuous ridge detail that may be ignored as unsuitable for identification.
  - 1.5. Though not required, some latent finger or palm prints with **less than eight** clear points in continuous ridge detail may be considered suitable for identification, compared with appropriate record prints and reported in casework findings.
  - 1.6. When an examiner is satisfied that a latent print matches a record print and could NOT have been made by any other person, he/she will record the following on Latent Print Worksheet II (attachment II to IDU-001) and/or adjacent to the finger or palm print positively identified:
    - 1.6.1. write the finger number or left/right palm,

- 1.6.2. the person's name from the record prints
  - 1.6.3. analysts personal mark (e.g. initials)
  - 1.7. At this point in time a positive identification has been made.
  - 1.8. All latent print identifications are to be verified by another qualified print examiner.
    - 1.8.1. This verification will be documented with the date and verifier's initials on Latent Print Worksheet II (attachment II to IDU-001).
    - 1.8.2. If a worksheet cannot be generated at the time a verification is needed, the lift or photograph will be appropriately marked by the *identifying* and *verifying* examiners.
    - 1.8.3. A simultaneous impression must be documented as such in the examiners case notes.
2. Accuracy standards for erroneous latent print identifications
- 2.1. The classic or typical erroneous latent print identification includes the following components:
    - 2.1.1. A latent print examiner compares a set of record prints with an identifiable latent print on a photograph.
    - 2.1.2. The latent print examiner then writes the name from the record prints and the finger number or left/right palm, on the worksheet photograph or lift adjacent to the latent print and initials the positive identification.
    - 2.1.3. The latent print examiner then gives the worksheet, photograph or lift and record prints to a second latent print examiner for verification.
    - 2.1.4. The second latent print examiner determines the latent and record prints were definitely **NOT** made by the same person.
    - 2.1.5. The first latent print examiner does **NOT** have another set of record prints under a different name they can furnish for a "true" verification of the latent print they claimed to have identified.
  - 2.2. It is possible to effect an erroneous finger or palm print identification without meeting all of the above criteria.
  - 2.3. The important factors being that a positive identification is written down and initialed, the worksheet, photograph or lift is given to a second latent print examiner specifically for verification, and there is no truly matching finger or palm print existing among the record prints in the case.
  - 2.4. The things that are **NOT** erroneous latent print identifications are:
    - 2.4.1. Writing the wrong finger number, but having a valid identification with a different finger.
    - 2.4.2. Writing the wrong palm, but having a valid identification with a different palm.
    - 2.4.3. Writing the wrong name, but having a valid identification with a different name.
    - 2.4.4. Marking a valid name and finger or palm adjacent to the wrong latent print, but having a valid identification with a different latent print in the photograph or lift.
    - 2.4.5. Failing to make an identification when in fact the latent and record prints were made by the same person and should have been "matched" is a missed latent print identification (see below).
  - 2.5. Latent print identifications effected alone or under crime scene pressure conditions carry all the same consequences as identifications made in the laboratory under normal conditions.
  - 2.6. Verification of an erroneous identification is equal to having effected the original erroneous identification.
  - 2.7. A latent print identification, or a verification, is never to be taken lightly as a responsibility.

2.7.1. There is **NEVER** a valid reason for an erroneous latent print identification, however, all mitigating and aggravating circumstances will be taken into account in determining appropriate corrective action (see QA-200, Corrective/Preventative Action for details).

3. Accuracy standards for latent print missed identifications and eliminations

- 3.1. The classic or typical missed latent print identification includes the following components:
- 3.1.1. A latent print examiner compares a set of record prints with a latent print they have marked as identifiable on a photograph or lift.
  - 3.1.2. The latent print examiner makes no identification or elimination with record prints.
  - 3.1.3. During review of the casework (see QA-130, Case Documentation) or for some other reason, the same latent print examiner or a second latent print examiner discovers that in fact a positive identification or elimination could be effected from the same record prints originally used to effect the comparison.
  - 3.1.4. Missed latent print identifications and eliminations are to some extent an inevitable part of latent print examination casework.
  - 3.1.5. Limiting such misses is the goal of the quality control and quality assurance methods in place.
  - 3.1.6. Accuracy of 100% in identifying or eliminating latent prints is the ideal quality control standard for comparing latent prints to record prints.
- 3.2. Things that are **NOT** missed latent print identifications:
- 3.2.1. Failing to identify a latent print that was never marked as identifiable on a photograph
  - 3.2.2. Failing to identify a latent print when appropriate additional record prints have been requested in the report
  - 3.2.3. Not identifying a latent print when the report explains that comparisons involving the appropriate exhibit were limited
  - 3.2.4. Erroneous latent print identifications are not missed identifications (see above).

4. Reporting

- 4.1. A simultaneous impression identification will be reported as one impression.
- 4.2. Examiners must report the number of latent impressions of value examined or developed per exhibit.
- 4.3. A minimum of one verification is required to report either verbally or in writing on identifications.
- 4.4. Examination results in the latent print section are expressed as one of three possible conclusions:
  - 4.4.1. the latent impression is not identifiable
  - 4.4.2. the identifiable latent impression was compared without effecting an identification
  - 4.4.3. the latent impression has been identified
- 4.5. However, these are based upon the assumption that known impressions have provided full information to permit a thorough and complete comparison.
- 4.6. In reality, examinations or comparisons are equally dependent upon the quality of the latent and known impressions.
- 4.7. Within each category of known impressions is a full range of quality from clear, legible reproductions to smeared, indistinct or incomplete transfers of friction ridge formations.

- 4.8. Comparison results are directly proportional to the quality and completeness of the known impressions.
- 4.9. Due to these factors and the increased practice by contributors submitting photostatic and/or fax copies instead of original inked prints for comparison, a fourth category or conclusion must be added:
  - 4.9.1. Was compared insofar as possible with known impressions with a request for additional known impressions required for conclusive comparison results.
- 4.10. Examination results are limited to conclusions with scientific basis.
- 4.11. The absence of formations on any surface does not indicate lack of contact or deliberate destruction of transferred residues.
- 4.12. No current method exists which permits a determination of the time interval between deposit and development by examination of the impression.
- 4.13. Latent impressions cannot be analyzed to determine age, race or sex of the person or origin with any acceptable degree of scientific certainty.
- 4.14. While the experience of any examiner may provide an intuitive reaction which leads to an opinion about the above, unknown factors, the vast realm of exception, and the lack of scientific demonstration prohibit any reporting of such indications.

4.15. Report Wording

4.15.1. The following outlines report wording, which is to be used for fingerprint cases.

4.15.2. The wording provided is to be used whenever possible in all cases.

4.15.3. As not every scenario can be accounted for, any deviation from the wording must be approved by a senior criminalist in the identification unit.

- An identifiable latent impression was developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_.*
- The latent impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ has been identified as the fingerprint impression of \_\_\_\_\_.*
- A latent impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ has been identified as the fingerprint impression of \_\_\_\_\_. The remaining identifiable latent impressions developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ were not compared to this individual per instructions received from the submitting agency.*
- The identifiable latent fingerprint impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ was compared with the inked fingerprint impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ without effecting an identification.*
- The identifiable latent fingerprint (e.g. tip, side, and lower joint) impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ was compared with the inked fingerprint impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ without effecting an identification.*
- The identifiable latent palm print impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ was compared with the inked palm print impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ without effecting an identification.*
- The identifiable latent partial (finger or palm) impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ was compared with the inked finger and/or palm print impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ without effecting an identification.*
- The identifiable latent fingerprint impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_ was compared with the inked fingerprint impressions of \_\_\_\_\_, insofar as possible, without effecting an identification. The submission of clear and complete inked fingerprint impressions of the above individual(s) is necessary in order that additional comparisons can be conducted.*

- The identifiable latent fingerprint impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ was compared with the inked fingerprint impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ without effecting an identification. These impressions were also compared with the inked fingerprint impressions of \_\_\_\_\_, insofar as possible, without effecting an identification. The submission of clear and complete inked fingerprint impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ is necessary in order that additional comparisons can be conducted.
- The suitable latent fingerprint impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ was searched through the Tri-State (NH, ME & VT) and the Integrated (FBI) Automated Fingerprint Identification System databases without effecting an identification. This impression has been entered into the respective unsolved latent databases for comparisons with new ten print entries.
- The unidentified latent fingerprint impression developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ is not suitable for search through the Automated Fingerprint Identification Systems.
- There are no inked impressions of \_\_\_\_\_ on file with the New Hampshire State Police Criminal Records Repository.
- Automated Fingerprint Identification System searches will be conducted following the receipt of clear and complete inked elimination impressions.
- The submission of inked elimination impressions is necessary in order that comprehensive comparisons can be conducted.
- In the event that future comparisons are requested, exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ must be resubmitted.
- Examination of exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ revealed no identifiable latent impressions.
- Images of the unidentified latent impressions developed on exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ have been retained in our files in the event that future comparisons are requested.
- Images of the unidentified latent impressions present in exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ have been retained in our files in the event that future comparisons are requested.
- The inked fingerprint impressions on exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ and those on exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ are the impressions of the same individual.
- Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ was processed for indented writing. Photographs of the developed impressions are enclosed.
- Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_ was examined for indented writing with no impressions of apparent evidentiary value being developed. A lift has been retained in our files.

**DISPOSAL (SA-090)**

There is no special disposal for this procedure

END

State of New Hampshire Department of Safety  
 Division of State Police  
 Forensic Laboratory

<b>Standard Operating Procedure Title</b>	Identification Unit Evidence Special Instructions		
<b>Reviewed and Approved By (signature/date)</b>	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Marc E. Dupre	Criminalist II	
<b>Authorized By (signature/date)</b>	<b>UNCONTROLLED COPY</b>		
	Lise A. Swacha	QA/QC Criminalist II	
<b>Effective Date:</b>	01/03/05	<b>Date Due for Revision:</b>	12/31/05

<b>Reviewed and Re-App. By</b>		<b>Next Due for Revision:</b>
<b>Re-Authorized By</b>		12/31/07

<b>Reviewed and Re-App. By</b>		<b>Next Due for Revision:</b>
<b>Re-Authorized By</b>		12/31/09

**OBJECTIVE**

To establish a standard operation procedure which identifies the special instructions and precautions necessary for evidence taken into the Identification Unit.

**SCOPE**

This SOP applies to any personnel who will receive identification evidence, carry out identification evidence examination procedures, return any identification evidence and any analyst properly trained for this method.

**PRECAUTIONS (IDU-300)**

There are no special precautions for this SOP.

**REAGENTS and EQUIPMENT**

N/A

**PROCEDURE**

1. See section QA-120 of the Quality Assurance manual for general details, forms and procedures.
2. *Collection*
  - 2.1. Crime scene evidence will be collected and handled according to QA-120 and the laboratory's evidence booklet.
  - 2.2. Attachments III, attachment IV and attachment V are available for crime scene documentation purposes.
3. *Receipt*
  - 3.1. Every effort should be made to have one examiner sign in the evidence for a particular case.
  - 3.2. Known impressions of a deceased individual submitted for identification purposes will be accepted, however, general "Questioned Identity" cases will not, unless authorized by the Laboratory Director.
    - 3.2.1. These cases will be forwarded to the New Hampshire State Police Criminal Records Unit.

State of New Hampshire Department of Safety  
 Division of State Police  
 Forensic Laboratory

4. *Storage*

- 4.1. Fill out Attachment I completely listing each exhibit, packaging and location.  
 4.1.1. The attachment must be amended when the evidence is moved  
 4.2. All unpackaged evidence will be secured in the vault or sealed in temporary packaging if the examiner will be out of the lab for an extended period of time.

5. *Examination*

- 5.1. Follow the proper protocol in the Identification Unit Procedures Manual and examine the item of evidence utilizing the Latent Print Worksheet I (Attachment I, IDU-001).
- 5.2. The following is a list of specialized acronyms and shorthand designations that are frequently used in case notes in the ID unit:

Acronym / Shorthand	Meaning	Acronym / Shorthand	Meaning
-	no identifiable latents present	SOL	see other lift
+	identifiable latents present	pic	picture(s) taken
neg.	no identifiable latents present	PD	physical developer
pos.	identifiable latents present	phys. dev.	physical developer
vis.	visualization	cp bag	clear plastic bag
(-) rxn.	negative reaction	ACE-V	analysis comparison evaluation verification
neg. rxn.	negative reaction	SID	state identification number
(+) rxn.	positive reaction	by40	basic yellow 40
pos. rxn.	positive reaction	plas.	plastic
nin.	ninhydrin	SPR	small particle reagent
R6G	rhodamine 6G	HCl	hydrochloric Acid
RH6	rhodamine 6G	FP	fingerprint
ALS	alternate light source	PP	palm print
CAE	cyanoacrylate fume (superglue fume)	LP	latent print
SG	superglue fume	ID	identification
hum	humidity	ident	identification
h/h	heat and humidity	elim.	elimination
nm	nanometers	NHSPCRR	NHSP Criminal Records Repository
NI	not identifiable	org. fil.	orange filter
NV	no value (not identifiable)	yel. fil.	yellow filter
blk.	black	pkg.	packaging
pdr.	powder	pkg.	packaging
pwdr.	powder	flopdr.	fluorescent powder
mag	magnetic	fl. Pdr.	fluorescent powder
SOP	see other photo		

- 5.3. The location of latent impressions of value should be documented in the examiners' notes when of potential evidentiary value (e.g., interior/exterior).
- 5.4. In a multiple item exhibit, the item(s) bearing latent impressions of value should be reflected in the notes as well as in the report.
- 5.5. *Photographing/Scanning*
- 5.5.1. The lab #, exhibit # and examiner's initials should be marked on the exhibit inside the capture area, placed near impression on a tag or entered into "Image Description" field in MoreHits.
- Use a pencil to mark areas on porous evidence (this facilitates later erasing if further processing or development reveals ridge detail under the marking).
  - Attempt not to draw markings through identifiable ridge detail.
  - Do not draw markings through evidence such as tool marks or blood.

State of New Hampshire Department of Safety  
Division of State Police  
Forensic Laboratory

- 5.5.2. Include ruler in capture area if a scaled photo is needed.
- 5.5.3. All images should be stored utilizing the MoreHits software.
- 5.6. Marking latent impressions of value
  - 5.6.1. Identifiable latent prints will be marked on photographs and lifts using permanent marker.
  - 5.6.2. If the exact number of latent prints in a case is being reported, then all identifiable latent prints must be marked, regardless of whether there are record prints for comparison.
  - 5.6.3. Use a horseshoe shaped marking to surround the fingernail end of a latent finger or thumb print.
    - When uncertain of the print's orientation, write "UP?" adjacent to the marking to indicate that all other possible orientations were searched.
  - 5.6.4. Use a straight line marking on the edge of a latent palm print nearest the carpal delta, running parallel to the bracelet creases sometimes present at the top of the wrists.
    - When uncertain of the print's orientation, write "UP?" adjacent to the marking to indicate that all other possible orientations were searched.
  - 5.6.5. Use a circle or oval to surround latent partial (finger or palm) prints.
    - It is not necessary to mark an "up" direction for these prints.
  - 5.6.6. Use one set of parallel lines on both sides of the length of the latent lower joint areas.
    - It is not necessary to mark an "up" direction for these prints.
  - 5.6.7. Use a series of connected horseshoe shaped markings to surround the fingernail ends of a simultaneous impression.
- 5.7. Lifts generated by the examiner will be marked with the lab no., exhibit no. and examiner's initials, scanned into MoreHits and repackaged with evidence.
- 5.8. Submitted lifts with identifiable impressions should be scanned into MoreHits.
- 5.9. Submitted inked impressions used in comparisons should be photocopied or scanned into MoreHits for documentation purposes.
- 5.10. Cards retrieved from the NHSP Criminal Records Unit must be documented in the notes and photocopied.
- 5.11. A NHSP Criminal Records Unit search should be conducted prior to requesting known impressions.
- 5.12. All identifications will be documented prior to verification (see IDU-001-03, Latent Print Examination, Interpretation and Reporting of Conclusions for further reporting details).
- 5.13. The Identification Unit will assist the NHSP Criminal Records Unit by verifying ten print cards submitted for determination of common identity.
  - 5.13.1. A lab number will not be assigned for these submissions.
  - 5.13.2. An examiner will conduct a comparison of the submitted cards.
  - 5.13.3. The accompanying *NHSP Criminal Records Section Fingerprint Card Comparison Report* will then be reviewed, signed and dated.
  - 5.13.4. Another examiner must verify that the fingerprints are from the same individual and initial the comparison report.
  - 5.13.5. The comparison report and fingerprint cards will be photocopied and filed in the identification Unit.
- 5.14. Authorized inked print to inked print comparisons (e.g., INS) cases will be documented and verified on attachment II.
- 5.15. Missed Identifications

- 5.15.1. For each incident wherein a latent print was completely missed during comparisons (identification or elimination), barring extenuating circumstances, an incident/corrective action report will be generated to or by the senior criminalist and/or the laboratory director (see QA-200).
- The corrective action for this incident will be a technical review of the examiner's next thirty cases completed from the date of incident.
- 5.15.2. Twelve incidents in one year of not claiming a latent print having between eight and eleven individual points in clear, continuous ridge detail will, barring extenuating circumstances, result in an incident/corrective action report generated by the senior criminalist and/or laboratory director.
- The corrective action for these incidents will be a technical review of the examiner's next thirty cases completed from the date of incident.
- 5.15.3. For each incident of not claiming a latent print having between twelve and fifteen individual points in clear, continuous ridge detail will result in an incident/corrective action report generated by the senior criminalist and/or laboratory director.
- The corrective action for this incident will be a technical review of the examiner's next thirty cases completed from the date of the report.
- 5.15.4. For each incident of not claiming a latent print having at least sixteen individual points in clear, continuous ridge detail will result in an incident/corrective action report generated by the senior criminalist and/or laboratory director.
- This incident will require the examiner to be removed from independent casework until the following is completed:
  - The examiner must complete sixty cases under the supervision of the senior criminalist and/or laboratory director and pass a latent evaluation proficiency test prior to returning to independent casework.
- 5.15.5. One incident of effecting an erroneous identification will result in a corrective report generated by the verifying examiner.
- If the identifying examiner is certified by the International Association for Identification (IAI), he/she will notify the association of the incident.
  - This incident will require, at minimum, the examiner to be removed from independent casework for one year while the following is completed:
    - ✓ Acquire training in latent print identification.
    - ✓ Successfully complete latent print identification testing.
    - ✓ Pass the IAI's Latent Print Certification exam.
  - It is at the discretion of the Laboratory Director as to when the examiner will conduct independent casework after the above training and testing has been completed

6. *Returning*

- 6.1. Prior to returning or storing deceased inked impressions they should be documented via photocopy and/or scanned into MoreHits.
- 6.1.1. The photocopy will be stored in the case folder.

7. *Transportation to Court*

- 7.1. When evidence is needed for court, the submitting agency must pick up the evidence, and the appropriate information should be logged into the DSSP-20.
- 7.2. Departments should not depend upon the forensic laboratory to transport evidence to court.

8. *Destruction*

8.1. Evidence will be destroyed according to QA-120.

**DISPOSAL (SA-090)**

There is no disposal associated with this SOP.

END