



**Quality Division Use Only**

Quality Tracking #:	<input type="text" value="2017-025"/>	Date Quality Division Notified:	<input type="text" value="4/14/2017"/>
Non-Conformance Level:	<input type="text" value="Class I"/>	Date Submitted to Management for Review:	<input type="text" value="5/11/2017"/>
Date Submitted to Quality for Review:	<input type="text" value="5/30/2017"/>	Dated Closed:	<input type="text" value="5/30/2017"/>

Date of Discovery:	<input type="text" value="4/13/2017"/>	Division:	<input type="text" value="Comparative &amp; Analytical Division"/>
Date of Incident:	<input type="text" value="4/6/2017"/>	Section:	<input type="text" value="Latent Prints"/>

Forensic Case Number(s), if applicable:	Agency Case Number(s), if applicable:
2016-15971	101689216

**Description of Discrepancy/Non-conformance. Do not include analysts' names unless otherwise instructed by the Section Manager or Division Director(s):**

Two (2) inked fingerprint cards (Item 9) from the victim were shredded by the analyst upon completion of Technical and Administrative Review. These items should have been transferred to the custody of the HPD Property Room and retained with other physical evidence from this case.

**Actions Taken:**

Upon discovering the mistake, the analyst immediately reported the incident to the Section Manager. The Section Manager notified the Quality Division. Since the record prints cannot be recovered, immediate action focused on documenting this occurrence.

**Summary of Root Cause Analysis:**



After completing analysis and while preparing approximately 40 cases for final disposition, the analyst failed to realize he placed this original evidence with copies of record prints obtained from one or more databases waiting to be shredded. Copies of record finger and palm prints obtained from AFIS databases are considered CJIS information. A digital copy of the records is retained in the digital archive system and the physical copy is shredded once analysis is completed. This appears to be an isolated incident since this had not happened before and all the other 39 cases were handled per the SOP. Lack of attention to detail is the most likely cause. Another contributing factor is the common practice of the Latent Print section to have no more than ten cases in an analyst's custody at one time. Since the analyst had 40 cases in his custody, he was focused on closing out all the cases that could be closed. Based upon analyst interviews, the analyst understood the Latent Print SOPs and no revisions are needed.

**Additional Information/Follow-Up:**

Although the original inked prints cannot be recovered, the analyst scanned the prints into Mideo so digital copies have been retained. The LIMS chain of custody shows the original record prints were transferred to "Retained in Digital Archive" on 4/6/2017. The analyst involved in this corrective action is undergoing Progressive Corrective Action through HFSC's Human Resources Division.

**Section Manager:** Tim Schmahl

**Date:** 5/22/2017

**Division Director:** Peter Stout

**Date:** 5/30/2017

**Quality Director:** Lori Wilson

**Date:** 5/30/2017