

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 1 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

## 11.0 Worksheet and Reporting Requirements

### 11.1 Scope

This policy applies to personnel assigned to, or conducting work in, the FSD Latent Print Units. This policy describes the documentation requirements specific to latent print personnel creating worksheets, generating reports and completing case record reviews. These requirements are in addition to all requirements described in the Forensic Science Division laboratory operations and quality manuals.

#### 11.1.2 Responsibility

##### 11.1.2.1

All members of the latent print discipline are responsible for ensuring accurate, clear, concise, unambiguous and objective documentation and reporting. This responsibility includes the original analyst, the verifier(s), and the technical and administrative reviewers for each case.

##### 11.1.2.2

Unit Supervisors shall promote and ensure accurate documentation and reporting within their unit.

## 11.2 Terminology

### 11.2.1

Actions refers to the first section of the latent print discipline worksheet, titled "Actions" which lists the dates and activities taken during processing and analysis of the evidence on the case record.

### 11.2.2

"COC" refers to chain of custody.

### 11.2.3

Reverse search refers to a database tenprint to latent search return, also known as a registered latent print candidate.

### 11.2.4

Tenprint card is a recording of the ridge structure of the distal joints of the ten fingers of a person. Tenprint card is synonymous with inked impressions or known impressions.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	Document #: 16690	Page 2 of 13
	Revision #: 7	Issued Date: 08/05/2020
	Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh	Approved By: Ryan Larrison

## 11.3 Subsequent Submissions

### 11.3.1 Additional case record for subject comparison

#### 11.3.1.1

Entry in Forensic Advantage should follow the below listed guidelines:

- When entering a new submission under the existing laboratory number:
  - “AFIS” should be selected as the delivery method for latent registered database subjects
  - “removed from archive” should be selected for comparison supplemental requests.
    - If known impressions are submitted by the agency “personal delivery” should be selected.
- Select “returned to archive” as the return method for both registered latent and comparison subsequent submissions.

#### 11.3.1.2

The evidence item# assignment for subsequent case records should be:

- “Item #RV” or “Item #ULM” for registered latent database subjects.
  - If more than one latent registered subject has been compared on the case, a number may be added to the item # (RV-1, RV-2 and so on).
- “Item #Comparison” for additional subject comparison requests when no known impressions are submitted.
  - If more than one case record is added for comparison of submitted subjects, a number may be added to the item # (Comparison-1, Comparison-2 and so on).

#### 11.3.1.3

For the evidence description there are three options:

- If the latent prints on file are already in archive in Forensic Advantage (listed in the case evidence tab), the evidence description will be a list of the work to be conducted. For example: “Database generated request of Jane Doe” or “Comparison request of Jane Doe”.
  - The electronic COC shall be continued on the latent print evidence listed in the case from the previous submission.
  - The final disposition of entries described as a request for work (not actual evidence) in the electronic record should have a final disposition of “consumed” in the evidence list.
- If the previous submission was prior to the electronic documentation COC of latent prints in Forensic Advantage then the evidence description shall be a list of the number and type of latent prints (latent lifts, photographs, casts, and/or negatives) on file in order to complete an accurate COC in the electronic record using the naming convention of “LP” followed by the case record number.
- For additional comparison requests in which the agency submits a known fingerprint or palm print card, the evidence received shall be a description of the known impressions received and an

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 3 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

electronic COC will be maintained on both the submitted known impressions and the latent prints archived from the previous case record (or created as part of the current case record).

## **11.3.2 Additional case record for comparison of CODIS database subjects**

### **11.3.2.1**

Additional case records created to document the comparison of a CODIS database generated subject shall include a notation in the worksheet actions section indicating how the subject information originated. The email notification from CODIS shall be attached in the case record object repository.

### **11.3.2.2**

The item# assignment for subsequent case records should be Item# CODIS. If more than one case record is created due to more than one CODIS generated subject on a case then a number may be added to the item# (CODIS-1, CODIS-2 and so on).

### **11.3.2.3**

The item description may be "CODIS generated comparison request of Jane Doe". This non-evidence item entry should have a final disposition of "consumed". The electronic COC will be maintained on the evidence archived from the previous latent print case record.

#### **11.3.2.3.1**

If the previous submission was prior to the electronic documentation COC of latent prints in Forensic Advantage then the evidence description shall be a list of the number and type of latent prints (latent lifts, photographs, casts, and/or negatives) on file in order to complete an accurate COC in the electronic record using the naming convention "LP" followed by the case record number.

## **11.4 Worksheet Examination Documentation**

### **11.4.1**

Activities included in the actions block of the worksheet shall include the start and end dates of work on the case, all LEIN searching including who was searched and result of search, notation of all discrepancies in the case information received, communication with OIC/other analysts on the case, processing, ACE-V, verbal release of verified conclusions, and consults. The name of the verifier for full case verification should be listed if applicable.

### **11.4.2**

Notes of a consult shall include the print(s) consulted on, the name of analyst consulting, description/type of consult, and the outcome.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 4 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

### 11.4.3

If work of a similar nature is completed over a matter of days, a single entry may be made selecting the starting date and listing the ending date in the text box for that entry.

### 11.4.4

All subjects associated with the case record shall be listed in the known impressions block of the worksheet along with the existence and origin of all known impressions included on the case.

- Exception: If no known impressions are submitted or available for a subject, only the first field must be chosen with the other fields remaining blank.

### 11.4.5

Each item of evidence submitted on the latent print case record shall be listed in the items received block.

### 11.4.6

Each listed item shall include each processing step, the control test if applicable, and the results for the evidence processing at each step.

### 11.4.7

Only items that have the same results for each processing technique listed, and the same processing techniques applied, may be listed in the same processing block.

### 11.4.8

If more than one piece of equipment for processing exists within a unit, then the equipment that was used shall be specified in the actions section or processing block in the worksheet.

### 11.4.9

The condition of the evidence shall be evaluated and any conditions adverse to quality shall be recorded in the electronic case file (see QM 7.4.3). The text field at the bottom of the item block is available for these notes.

### 11.4.10

Examination notes shall be recorded at the time the observation was made or action was taken and correlate to the specific examination performed. (see QM 4.13.2.2)

## 11.5 Reporting

### 11.5.1

All laboratory reports shall be created in Forensic Advantage (see LOM 3.0 Forensic Advantage). The latent print discipline laboratory reports shall meet all of the criteria for reporting in the Laboratory

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 5 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

Operations and Quality Manuals (see QM 4.13 Control of Records and QM 5.10 Reporting the Results and LOM 3.3 Laboratory Reports).

## 11.5.2

All latent print laboratory reports shall follow the accepted discipline report format and headings as directed by the Technical Leader.

## 11.5.3

Latent print discipline reports shall use the report section headings and format generated in Forensic Advantage with the following exceptions:

- Re-order of AFIS section: When both comparisons to listed subjects are conducted and a database generated subject is compared, the database searching section of the report shall be moved to appear before the conclusion tables.
- The following results tables shall be used for all latent print comparison conclusions in the report.

### Identifications:

Subject	# Latent Prints	Description	Identified

### Exclusions:

Subject	# Latent Prints	Description

### Inconclusive:

Subject	# Latent Prints	Description	Inconclusive Reason

### 11.5.3.1

In instances where no case information is available under a formatted heading of the report, that heading and entire section shall be removed from the report.

## 11.5.4

Only outer-most containers with evidence items requested for latent print analysis will be listed in the latent print report.

NOTE: All containers and items inside the outer-most opened container shall be listed under the evidence received heading of the report.

	<b><i>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</i></b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 6 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

### **11.5.5**

The evidence submitted on a previous case record latent print report shall not be listed under evidence received on subsequent reports.

### **11.5.6**

For registered database hit reports and subsequent subject comparison requests from agencies (with no known impressions submitted) there is no actual evidence received. The evidence received section of the report shall be removed.

### **11.5.7**

Latent print discipline reporting shall use statements from the approved list. Statements may only be adjusted to add information that further details or clarifies the case information. The approved statements are available in the appendix of this document and by selection in the worksheet remarks section.

### **11.5.8**

The report shall differentiate between latent prints that were observed and those that were developed.

### **11.5.9**

The report shall differentiate between cases in which ridge structure of no comparison value and no ridge structure at all were developed or observed.

#### **11.5.9.1**

Scientists trained to competency only in processing shall only document and report collection value or no collection value.

### **11.5.10**

Latent prints of comparison value shall be listed in the report as to whether they are latent fingerprints, latent palm prints, or latent prints that may be made by the finger or palm (or any combination thereof).

### **11.5.11**

All subject names submitted by the agency shall be listed under the Subjects heading of the report. If known impressions were submitted or are available, that will be noted after the name of the subject.

### **11.5.12**

Reports shall clearly state which items listed on the report were processed. This can be accomplished by adding "(not processed)" after the evidence description in the evidence received section of the report for those items not processed.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 7 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

### **11.5.13**

The items that were processed shall be clearly described. If all of the evidence listed was processed then a statement of “the above listed evidence” is acceptable in lieu of a written list.

### **11.5.14**

The items upon which latent prints were developed shall be specified under the processing results heading in the report.

### **11.5.15**

Submitted latent prints shall be listed under the Evidence Received heading of the report and include the labeled naming convention for the lifts as well as whether they were labeled by agency or reporting analyst.

### **11.5.16**

The report shall be clear which persons/known impressions were compared to the latent prints.

### **11.5.17**

If the comparison results in an inconclusive conclusion due to the known impressions, the report shall request better known impressions for that subject. If a specific portion of friction ridges is needed to complete the comparison, then that clarification should be made part of the request in the report.

### **11.5.18**

If no comparisons were made, then the report shall clearly state that. For example, if there are latent palm prints and no known palm impressions were submitted or available then the report shall state that the latent palm impressions were not compared and a request for palm impressions for the subject(s) shall be made.

### **11.5.19**

The number of latent prints searched in the database(s) and the number of latent prints registered in each database shall be noted in the report.

### **11.5.20**

For subsequent reports: if identifications are made on a previously registered latent print then a statement clarifying how many prints remain registered in both databases shall be included in the report.

### **11.5.21**

Reporting statements for the remarks section are located in either the auto-generated list located at the bottom of the worksheet under the remarks heading or from the approved list of discipline reporting statements in the appendix of this document.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 8 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

### **11.5.22**

If LEIN searching was conducted with no known impressions being located, then the report shall indicate that and request submission of known impressions if available.

### **11.5.23**

All reports with comparison value latent prints shall include the reporting statement clarifying that there are remaining, or no remaining, latent prints that are unidentified in the case. This statement shall include the type of latent print (fingerprint, palm print, sole print) if known.

### **11.5.24**

All reports shall indicate the disposition of the latent prints and known impressions. The report shall indicate the disposition of all evidence unless the disposition is that it is stored for return to agency.

### **11.5.25**

If additional evidence (hairs, fibers,...) is collected from the parent item for a potential future examination while the evidence is in the custody of the latent print unit analyst, and it is being returned to the agency in the original packaging, this shall be stated in the report.

### **11.5.26**

Release of reports and information from reports shall follow the standards set in LOM 1.15, Release of information.

### **11.5.27**

Amended laboratory reports shall use the format and statement at the bottom of the report available in Forensic Advantage.

### **11.5.28**

The following section shall be included at the end of all latent print reports:

## **APPENDIX**

Latent print processing could result in laboratory generated latent lifts and/or photographs that are not of value for comparison. If generated, they will remain on file in the applicable case record.

### **Significance of Latent Print Unit results:**

The presence of a latent print on an item of evidence indicates contact was made between the source and the item. The presence of a latent print alone does not necessarily indicate the significance of the contact or the time frame during which the contact occurred.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 9 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

Due to a variety of factors, the recovery of latent prints on items of evidence is not always successful. A lack of latent prints on an item or the exclusion of a latent print from a given source does not necessarily mean that the given source did not come into contact with the item.

Comparison results are defined as:

- Identification is the opinion that the compared impressions originated from the same source because there is sufficient quality and quantity of corresponding friction ridge detail. Identification does not mean to the exclusion of all others. Studies have shown that as more reliable features are found in agreement it becomes less likely to find that same arrangement of features in a print from another source.
- Exclusion is the opinion that the compared impressions did not originate from the same source because there is sufficient quality and quantity of friction ridge detail in disagreement.
- Inconclusive due to the known impressions is the opinion that an identification or exclusion result cannot be reached because there is insufficient friction ridge detail in the known print. Additional known impressions from the compared individual may allow for a result of identification or exclusion.
- Inconclusive due to the latent print is the opinion that an identification or exclusion result cannot be reached because there is insufficient friction ridge detail in the latent print. Additional known impressions from the compared individual are not expected to allow for a result of identification or exclusion.

**Retention of Latent Prints in the AFIS/NGI registered database(s):**

Latent prints added to Michigan’s AFIS (Automated Fingerprint Identification System) and FBI’s NGI (Next Generation Identification) registered database(s) will remain in the database until identified, removed per agency request, or when the entry meets the following criteria:

1. Indefinitely on the following file classes: Homicide (0900), Abduction/kidnapping (1000), Criminal Sexual Conduct (CSC) (1100), Felonious Assault (1300-2)
2. Ten years from the date of entry for all other file classes.

## 11.10 Quality Assurance

### 11.10.1

Every case record shall have completed Technical and Administrative reviews prior to release. (see LOM 2.6, Case Review)

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 10 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

## 11.10.2

All data files contained in the Forensic Advantage Object Repository shall be approved by the case record examiner prior to sending the case for review. Approving the files in the object repository signifies that the data is complete and accurate to the best of the case record examiners knowledge. (see QM 2.6.1.1).

### 11.10.2.1

The data file name in the object repository shall contain the laboratory number.

## 11.10.3

All media containing collected latent prints shall be submitted along with the report for technical and administrative review. Once all reviews have been completed, the latent evidence envelope(s) shall be sealed and placed in archive storage. Data files in ADAMS may be reviewed within the digital case file. The reporting analyst is responsible for the contents of the sealed archived latent evidence envelope.

## 11.11 Technical Review

### 11.11.1

Technical reviews shall include, but are not limited to, ensuring:

- review of the work requested on the FSD-007.
- conformance with proper technical procedures (test method).
- conformance with all applicable laboratory policies and procedures.
- all required verifications of results had been completed and documented.
- accuracy of the test report and that the case record documentation supports the results in the test report.
- review that all ridge structure is annotated.
- the associations in the test report are properly qualified.
- the test report contains all required information.

### 11.11.2

The release of verbal results ahead of the report is permitted in narrow circumstances:

- verifications of the results must be completed prior to a verbal reported result.
- verbal results may only be given to the submitting agency or the prosecutor.
- release of verbal results shall be documented in the actions block of the latent print worksheet.

### 11.11.3

A periodic review of latent prints to determine accurate examination documentation and reporting shall be conducted for all examiners by the supervisor and/or another competent examiner.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	<i>Document #: 16690</i>	<i>Page 11 of 13</i>
	<i>Revision #: 7</i>	<i>Issued Date: 08/05/2020</i>
	<i>Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh</i>	<i>Approved By: Ryan Larrison</i>

## 11.12 Administrative Reviews

### 11.12.1

Administrative Reviews shall include, but are not limited to, ensuring:

- all documented conclusions in the case are clearly and concisely reported.
- the test report follows the prescribed format and uses the approved reporting statements.
- the test report contains all key information.
- accuracy of the test report for spelling and grammar.
- review of the records for conformance with chain of custody requirements.

## 11.13 Appendix – Reporting Statements

### Evidence Processing

No ridge structure: The evidence was processed with no latent prints being developed.

RS-No Comparison Value: The evidence was processed with no latent prints of comparison value being developed.

RS-Comparison Value: “The evidence was processed with latent prints of comparison value being developed on (description and/or item#). The latent prints may have been made by a finger or palm.”

RS- Comparison Value FP: “The evidence was processed with latent fingerprints of comparison value being developed on (description and/or item#).

RS- Comparison Value PP: “The evidence was processed with latent palm prints of comparison value being developed on (description and/or item#).

RS- Comparison Value FP and PP: “The evidence was processed with latent fingerprints and palm prints of comparison value being developed on (description and/or item#).

### Latent Prints

No ridge structure: The latent lifts/photographs were examined with no latent prints being observed.

RS-No Comparison Value: The submitted latent lifts/photographs were examined no latent prints of comparison value being observed.

RS-Comparison Value: The submitted latent lifts/photographs were examined with latent prints of comparison value being observed. The latent prints may have been made by a finger or palm.

RS- Comparison Value FP: The submitted latent lifts/photographs were examined with latent fingerprints of comparison value being observed.

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	Document #: 16690	Page 12 of 13
	Revision #: 7	Issued Date: 08/05/2020
	Document Manager: Tracee Mcintosh	Approved By: Ryan Larrison

RS- Comparison Value PP: The submitted latent lifts/photographs were examined with latent palm prints of comparison value being observed.

RS- Comparison Value FP and PP : The submitted latent lifts/photographs were examined with latent fingerprints and palm prints of comparison value being observed.

### AFIS

NSA = The latent prints are not of suitable quality for entry into Michigan's AFIS and the FBI's NGI.

Reverse -Michigan = Michigan's AFIS unsolved latent database generated the following candidate:

Reverse -FBI = The FBI's NGI unsolved latent database generated the following candidate:

NO hit : **(number (word))** latent **(finger/palm/impression)** prints were searched in Michigan's AFIS and the FBI's NGI with no suitable candidate being generated.

HIT: **"(number (word))** latent **(finger/palm/impression)** prints were searched in Michigan's AFIS and the FBI's NGI with the following suitable candidate being generated:

Registered: **(number (word))** or **The** (if no hits) latent **(finger/palm/impression)** prints are registered in both unsolved databases.

The latent prints will remain registered until identified or ten years from the date of registration, whichever occurs first. (optional)

The latent prints will remain registered until identified or removed at the request of the submitting agency. (optional)

Latent to Latent: Michigan's AFIS provided the following case association:

- Note:** The report for latent to latent AFIS hits must include this statement in the Remarks section:
- This report provides possible case association information only. The latent prints have not been identified to an individual. Comparisons will be conducted if known impressions are submitted if suspect information becomes available.

### CODIS

CODIS = The Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) database generated the following subject on this case:

### Results

The latent prints were compared to known impressions of the above listed subjects with the following results: (INSERT tables)

	<b>LPU-PM 11.0 Worksheets Reporting and Reviews</b>	
	Document #: 16690	Page 13 of 13
	Revision #: 7	Issued Date: 08/05/2020
	Document Manager: Tracee McIntosh	Approved By: Ryan Larrison

**Inconclusive Table Reasons:**

- Lack of sufficient quality and quantity of friction ridge detail in the latent print.
- Lack of sufficient quality and quantity of the friction ridge detail in the known impressions.
- Lack of sufficient quality and quantity of friction ridge detail in the latent print and known impressions.

**Ten Print Comparisons**

The known impressions/postmortem impressions listed above were compared with known impressions bearing the name of \_\_\_\_\_ and were identified as having been made by the same individual.

**Remarks**

Michigan’s Criminal Justice Information Center reports no known (**finger, palm, finger or palm**) impressions available for (Subject(s) names).

***Notification was received from the (Prosecutor’s office, Fill in Police Department) on (date) that the request for analysis has been cancelled and is no longer necessary.***

The evidence is being returned without latent print analysis based on a court disposition notification.

**(Evidence description and Item number)** does not meet the Michigan State Police Forensic Science Division submission guidelines for latent print analysis.

The submitted request for verification of the above listed latent print comparisons was completed. There may be latent prints on this case that were not compared or examined as part of this request. The original latent prints are maintained by the submitting agency.

Personal Possession cases Only: There are latent prints that are of suitable quality for searching in the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (A.F.I.S.) on this case. AFIS searching may be conducted upon receipt of a separate request.

Deferred Exam cases with OIC or APA approval: There are unidentified latent prints remaining on this case that have not been compared to the above listed subjects. Additional comparisons will be completed upon request.

References:  
 ANAB 3125  
 ISO 17025/2018  
 MSP LOM  
 MSP QM