



Latent Print Section

Reviews

Comparative & Analytical Division



I. Purpose

- a. Establish the requirements necessary to conduct reviews on latent print comparison and latent print processing casework prior to publishing reports.

II. Roles & Responsibilities

- a. Verifier: A second latent print examiner authorized to conduct friction ridge examinations; responsible for re-examination and review of documented data by the primary examiner to ensure that conclusions or opinions conform to the procedures relating to the Analysis, Comparison, and Evaluation of friction ridge impressions, and is reproducible.
- b. Suitability Reviewer: A latent print processor or examiner, authorized to conduct latent print processing; responsible for re-examination or review of physical items of evidence to ensure that conclusions, processing methods, and opinions conform to the procedures relating to the processing of latent print evidence.
- c. Technical Reviewer: A latent print processor or examiner, authorized to perform technical reviews on latent print processing and/or latent print comparison casework; responsible for evaluating reports, notes, data, and other documentation to ensure there is appropriate and sufficient support for the processing methods, results, conclusions, opinions, and interpretations. Suitability review may be conducted concurrently with the technical review.
- d. Administrative Reviewer: A latent print staff member responsible for reviewing case documentation for grammatical and administrative accuracy.

III. Procedure

- a) Reviews are conducted on all case records. The following provides guidance on what reviews shall consist of.

- i) Latent print comparison:

Verifications:

- Were all requested items analyzed?
- Were all requested subjects compared?
- Does the worksheet contain all analysis and comparison documentation necessary?
- Do the images contain the required analysis and comparison documentation set forth in ACE-V SOP? (Example. Anatomical source, ID conclusion information).
- Do you agree with the primary examiner's sufficiency conclusions, including anatomical source and orientation?
- Do you agree with the primary examiner's comparative conclusions?
- Have cross-comparisons been conducted to link identifiers to one individual? Are there identifiers to link the AFIS Hits to the same individual?

Technical Reviews:

- Are the laboratory case number, item number, initials, and date on all items?
- Have all items been inventoried?
- Any items not analyzed documented?



- Have all appropriate examinations been conducted and verified?
- Have all appropriate AFIS searches and/or latent comparisons been conducted?
- Have all AFIS searches been registered to the ULF when appropriate?
- **Have all AFIS association screenshots been added to the case record?**
- Do file names for images retained within the digital image management system (e.g. Mideo) accurately reflect what is in the image?
- Are the conclusions consistent across the case record and within accepted practices?
- Have all appropriate verifications been conducted and documented?
- **Have all consultations been documented?**
- Are both primary and verifier signatures on worksheet and images as needed?
- **Is the chain of custody accurate?**

ii) Latent print processing:

Suitability Reviews:

- **Was Portal and/or JT request checked for requested items and possible MDRs?**
- **Were all requested items processed? If not, is it properly documented why?**
- **Do custom descriptions include the primary packaging? Has additional packaging been properly documented? Have any unusual packaging or damages to the packaging and/or evidence been documented in the case record?**
- **Does the physical item reflect the description on the labels and the custom item description?**
- **Have all the necessary processing techniques been conducted and in the proper sequence?**
- **Do all images meet image requirements?**
- **Do the images taken fully capture and accurately reflect the ridge detail on the item of evidence?**
- **Have all images been uploaded into the digital image management system? Are they clear?**

Technical Reviews:

- **Was Portal and/or JT request checked for requested items and possible MDRs?**
- **Have any MDRs prior to or after LPP been checked and worked, or documented in the case record?**
- **Is the chain of custody accurate?**
- **Have all appropriate communication logs been uploaded and/or checked?**
- **Was the firearm safety checked and documented, if applicable?**
- **For evidence containing currency or evidence in which there are 20 or more of the same item, was the amount/count verified and documented?**
- **Have all suitability determinations been checked on the physical evidence and has a Review DUI been created?**
- **Have all consultations been documented?**
- **Have all received items been processed and/or mentioned in the case record (notes and report)?**



- Have the reagents used in the case been quality checked and recorded accurately in the document management system?
- Have all the necessary processing techniques been conducted and in the proper sequence?
- Have all items been examined using the appropriate equipment?
- Is the equipment used in the case accurately recorded in JT worksheet?
- Are all the appropriate fields in the worksheet filled out completely and accurately?
- For examination quality photographs, are the laboratory case number, item number, psl designation, initials, date, and a scale captured within each photograph or scan of friction ridge detail?
- Have post overall images been captured for all PSLs?
- For post overall images, are the laboratory case number, item number, PSL designation, date, and initials in the file name?
- Are all conclusions on the final report consistent with the case record?

iii) Latent Print Comparison and Latent Print Processing

Administrative Review

- 1) Is all case documentation free from any spelling and grammatical errors?
 - 2) Does all documentation contain the laboratory case number and the examiner's initials?
 - 3) Has a verification (for LPC) or a suitability review (for LPP) been conducted and a Review DUI been created to document the review?
 - 4) Has a technical review been conducted?
 - 5) Is the chain of custody accurate?
 - 6) Have all the appropriate fields in the worksheet been filled out completely and accurately?
 - 7) Has appropriate division and/or requestor been added to the cc list?
- iv) A self-review will be documented in the case record after the technical and/or administrative review process has begun when the primary examiner/processor changes information that is not a part of the review process.

b) Documentation

- i) Any discrepancies will be annotated by the reviewer and communicated with the original processor/examiner for corrections utilizing a review DUI. Refer to the Quality Manual for further information regarding the review DUI. Once corrections have been made and the case is re-submitted for verification, suitability review, TR and/or AR, the reviewer will indicate the corrections have been made by digitally signing and/or creating a review DUI to complete the review.
- ii) Once the reviewers have completed the verification and TR/AR and the requirements set forth in this document have been met, the reviewer will digitally sign within the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS).

References



1. Organization of Scientific Area Committees for Forensic Science (OSAC), Best Practice Recommendation for *Technical Review in Friction Ridge Examination*, Ver. 1.0 September 2019
2. Review DUI Guide – 12.29.2020 Houston Forensic Science Center, Qualtrax, Corporate Policies and Procedures



Wording Removed from Previous Versions

Clause	Wording Removed
1.1.1	Personnel conducting Technical/Administrative reviews are responsible for reviewing casework for technical and administrative accuracy prior to the report being released. The reviewer is responsible for evaluating that the case record fully supports the reported conclusions. The case record may include notes, documents, images, and other supporting documentation.
1.2.1	technical review shall be conducted on all case records. A technical review is not synonymous with the verification phase of the ACE-V process nor does it necessarily include the re-examination of the images in the case. At a minimum, a technical review shall consist of the following:
3.1	A technical review is not synonymous with the verification phase of the ACE-V process, nor does it necessarily include the re-examination of the images in the case.
3.1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are there any additional packaging and are they documented?• Has the primary processor / examiner marked the external packaging with their initials and date?• Have all processing techniques been conducted in the proper sequence?• appropriate examinations been conducted?• Do file names for images retained within the digital image management system accurately reflect what is in the image?
1.2.2	An administrative review shall be conducted on all case records. At a minimum, an administrative review shall consist of the following:
1.2.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is the case record complete, accurate, and understandable?