

Streamlined Forensic Report (SFR1)		MG 22 B	
FORENSIC RESULT REPORT – FOOTWEAR			
Relates to (person):	<b>A. Suspect</b>	Crime/Occ. No:	<b>Crime No</b>
Location:	<b>An address, England and Wales</b>	Forensic Case Ref:	<b>SSD No</b>
Date of Offence:	<b>01/08/2020</b>	Forensic Lab Ref:	<b>FSP No</b>
Seizing Officer:	<b>Can be left blank if not known</b>	Other Ref 1:	<b>Use as and if required</b>
		Other Ref 2:	<b>Use as and if required</b>
Report provided by:	<b>A. Scientist</b>	Organisation:	<b>FSP/Force</b>
Date of report:	<b>09/02/2021</b>		
<b>Examined</b>	<b>Results / Findings</b>		
JAW 4168/01 & 02  QWE/1&2	<p>1 x pair of black Nike training shoes, size UK 8.5, recovered from A.SUSPECT .            2 x Black gel lifts bearing footwear marks from the above address</p> <p>The marks have been compared in detail with the submitted footwear and correspond with the Nike training shoes in terms of pattern, size, pattern configuration and the degree and distribution of wear.</p> <p>In addition, there are features present in the marks that correspond with random damage features present on the soles of the submitted Nike training shoes.</p> <p>Therefore, in my opinion the findings provide conclusive evidence that the considered footwear marks recovered from The Address have been made by the submitted training shoes of A.SUSPECT.</p>		
<p><b>Evidence Type Supporting / Technical Information</b></p> <p><b>Range of Opinion Declaration</b></p> <p>The findings expressed in this Streamlined Forensic Report are matters of opinion, not statements of fact. However, evaluation of forensic evidence such as this is supported by study, experience and applying specialist knowledge and skills to forge reliable opinions and interpretations, which are subjected to peer review (as defined within the organisation's Quality Management System) before final reporting. The decision-making process may be supported and evidenced through the use of working notes.</p> <p>If the recovered training shoes were not responsible for producing the marks, the likelihood of these findings occurring by coincidence is so remote it can be discounted as a practical possibility. As such, the only reasonable explanation for the observed correspondence is that the recovered training shoes have made the considered footwear marks.</p> <p>Reference has been made to the National Footwear Reference Collection (NFRC) to identify the manufacturer and pattern type of the submitted footwear and recovered crime scene marks. The (FSP/Force) footwear collection has also been used to support the evaluation of the significance of the findings.</p> <p><b>Accreditation Declaration</b></p> <p>[Insert your accredited entity] is a UKAS accredited [testing laboratory/inspection body] No #####.</p> <p>Opinions and interpretations expressed herein are outside the scope of our UKAS Accreditation <b>(Delete if this is within scope for your organisation)</b></p>			
<p><b>Case management – To the court and to the defence</b></p> <p>The prosecution propose to rely on the forensic evidence contained in this SFR and if there is a trial, to adduce it by way of a s10 CJA 1967 admission to the general effect that the exhibit(s) listed were forensically examined and the examination produced the result(s) described. Therefore should there be a real issue in relation to this forensic evidence, such that the admission cannot be made, the prosecution ask that the defence identify the issue (Crim.PR.3.3 and Crim.PR 19.3(2)).</p>			

OFFICIAL (SENSITIVE)  
**This is not a witness statement**

**Relates to:** A. Suspect  
**Forensic Lab Ref:** FSP No  
**Forensic Case Ref:** SSD No

If this report contains expert evidence, then, in accordance with CPR 19.3(2), the defence is required to serve a response to this report as soon as practicable, and in any event not more than 14 days after service of the report setting out which, if any of the conclusions in this report are admitted as fact, and where a conclusion is not admitted what are the disputed issues concerning that conclusion.

**This SFR is not a witness statement** to which the provisions of s9 CJA 1967 and Crim.PR 16 apply, nor is it an expert's report to which the provisions of Crim. PR 19.4 apply, its purpose being to introduce any expert evidence contained therein as admitted fact. If this SFR contains expert opinion, it is a summary of that opinion served pursuant to Crim. PR 19.3(1).

SFRs assist courts to fulfil their duty to actively manage the case (Crim.PR 3.1) by ensuring that evidence is presented in the shortest and clearest way and by facilitating the early identification of the real issues. (Crim.PR 3.2). Each party must actively assist the court in fulfilling its duty (Crim.PR 3.3).

<b>Streamlined Forensic Report (SFR1)</b>		<b>MG 22 B</b>	
<b>STATUS OF FOOTWEAR RELATED EXHIBITS</b>			
Relates to (person):	<b>A. Suspect</b>	Crime/Occ. No:	<b>Crime No</b>
Location:	<b>An address, England and Wales</b>	Forensic Case Ref:	<b>SSD No</b>
Date of Offence:	<b>01/08/2020</b>	Forensic Lab Ref:	<b>FSP No</b>
Seizing Officer:	<b>Can be left blank if not known</b>	Other Ref:	<b>Use as and if required</b>
		Other Ref 2:	<b>Use as and if required</b>
Report provided by:	<b>A. Scientist</b>	Organisation:	<b>FSP/Force</b>
Date of report:	<b>09/02/2021</b>		
<b>Exhibits</b>	<b>Status</b>		
QWE/3 – black gel lift bearing footwear mark from the above address	Not compared (no further comparison work will be undertaken unless instructed by OIC)		
<b>NB - A. Scientist does not accept responsibility for the sensitivity or otherwise of this material.</b>			
<b>Additional information / Evidence Type Technical Information</b>			
Please note the above list of exhibits relates only to exhibits submitted for examination and are relevant to my area of expertise and / or to the findings set out in the Results/Findings section of this report. The list was accurate at the time this report was generated. All exhibits will not necessarily be listed here. Should a comprehensive list of exhibits be required, please contact the Investigating Officer.			
The prosecution will not ordinarily undertake further forensic analysis unless and until the exact issue that such analysis needs to address has been identified; and only if, in light of that issue, it is appropriate that the next stage of analysis should be undertaken by an expert instructed by the prosecution rather than an expert instructed by the defence. If appropriate a direction under Crim.PR 3.5(2)(h) as to the order in which the expert issues should be determined may be sought.			
<b><u>Important:</u></b>	<b>Where real issue(s) are identified and if additional forensic work is necessary, please notify the agreed Force contact in writing, listing the issue(s) to be further addressed. Delivery dates for additional forensic work to be agreed on a case by case basis.</b>	Forensic Contact Details:	eg via Force Submissions Unit