

Streamlined Forensic Report (SFR2)		MG 22 C	
EXPERT RESPONSE – QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS			
Relates to (person):	A. Suspect	Crime/Occ. No:	Crime Ref etc
Location:	An address, A Town	Forensic Case Ref:	SSU Ref
Date of Offence:	13/02/2021	Forensic Lab Ref:	FSP Ref
		Other Ref 1:	Use as/if required
		Other Ref 2:	Use as/if required
Statement provided by:	A. Scientist	Organisation:	Forensic Service Provider
Date of Statement:	11/01/2021		
1.	<p>I am informed that A. SUSPECT admits writing the signature in his name on item AW/1, but denies writing the signature in his name on item BD/1.</p> <p>I found that the signature in A. SUSPECT's name on item BD/1 is an original signature, which is fluently written, in black ballpoint pen ink. I found no evidence of any tracing guidelines. The signature is not readable as the name that it represents. On comparison with A. SUSPECT's reference signatures, that were written around the date of the questioned signature, I found many similarities in the fine details of the writing, although I was unable to match every feature. My findings are what I would expect if A. SUSPECT wrote this questioned signature. If the questioned signature on item BD/1 was an attempt by some other person to simulate (copy) A. SUSPECT's signature style, then I would expect to find some significant differences in the fluency and/or the fine details of the writing when compared with A. SUSPECT's reference signatures. I have not found this.</p> <p>Overall, in my opinion, my findings provide strong support for the proposition that A. SUSPECT wrote the signature in his name on item BD/1.</p> <p>I have produced as my exhibit AS/1 a chart showing images of the questioned signature from BD/1 side by side with reference signatures of A. SUSPECT. I can use this chart to explain some of the reasons for my findings and opinion.</p>		
Evidence Type Supporting / Technical Information			
Range of Opinion Declaration			
<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 and experience, 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>			
Opinion Scale			
<p>The opinions in this report (support for or against a particular proposition) are expressed using the following scale:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Extremely Strong, Very Strong, Strong, Moderately Strong, Moderate, Weak, Inconclusive</p>			
Accreditation Declaration			
<p>[Insert your accredited entity] is a UKAS accredited testing laboratory No #####.</p>			
Signature: A Scientist			Date: 11/01/2021

Relates to: A. Suspect
Forensic Case Ref: SSU Ref
Forensic Lab Ref: FSP Ref

Declaration of compliance with the Code of Conduct published by the Forensic Science Regulator

I confirm that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, I have acted in accordance with the Code of Conduct published by the Forensic Science Regulator [insert issue].

Qualifications and Experience

A. Scientist's qualifications and experience.

Criminal Procedure Rules, r 16. 2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9

Statement of: A. Scientist

This statement (consisting of 2 pages signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true. Where this statement contains expert opinion evidence, I believe that its contents also reflect my obligations to include any relevant matter required by Crim. PR 19.4. I understand and expect that Crim. PR 19.6 will apply, should another party disagree with my conclusions.

Signature: A Scientist

Date: 11/01/2021