



**Latent Print Section**  
**Technical-Administrative Review**  
Comparative & Analytical Division



## 1. Technical/Administrative Review (TR/AR)

### 1.1 Purpose

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. Refer to the HFSC Quality Manual for further details and guidance.

### 1.2 Authorizations

1.2.1 Personnel conducting a technical review of a completed latent print comparison case **must** be a Latent Print Examiner, trained to competency, and authorized by the Section Manager to conduct such reviews.

1.2.1.1 Under normal conditions, only latent print supervisory personnel will conduct technical/administrative reviews on completed latent print comparison request casework. In some instances, it may be necessary to have a non-supervisory latent print examiner conduct a technical review/ administrative review.

1.2.1.2 If a non-supervisory latent print examiner is required to perform a technical/administrative review of a completed latent print comparison request and they have not performed this duty in over 30 days, they will be required to review the Technical/Administrative Review SOP. This review will be documented as completed prior to performing any technical/administrative reviews.

1.2.2 Personnel conducting a technical review of a completed latent print processing case **must** be a Latent Print Examiner or a Latent Print Technician, trained to competency, and authorized by the Section Manager to conduct such reviews.

1.2.3 Any member of the Latent Print Section can administratively review a latent print comparison case or a latent print processing case. Administrative reviews can be conducted by other discipline staff employed by the Houston Forensic Science Center if needed.

### 1.3 Definitions

1.3.1 A 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.** The following items shall be verified when conducting a review:

1.3.1.1 For latent print comparisons:

- Are the laboratory case number, item number, initials, and date on the latent lift cards and/or photographs?
- Have all items been inventoried?
- Have all appropriate AFIS searches and/or latent comparisons been conducted?



- Do file names for images retained within Mideo accurately reflect what is in the image? (ex. Name of person on record prints embedded within the file name)
- If a preliminary AFIS association has been effected, does the latent in the ACCS documentation match the original latent **evidence**?
- When digital images are created are all, if any, original annotations captured? (i.e. Lab #, Item #, Initials, other)?
- Have all appropriate examinations been conducted?
- Are the conclusions consistent across the case record and within accepted practices?
- Are all conclusions on the final report consistent with the case record?
- Have all appropriate verifications been conducted and documented?

1.3.1.2 For latent print processing:

- Have all processing techniques been conducted in the proper sequence?
- Have all appropriate examinations been conducted?
- Are all conclusions on the final report consistent with the case record?
- Have overall photographs been captured prior to processing of the packaging and items of evidence?
- Have overall photographs been captured subsequent to processing if any possible suitable latent prints were developed?
- Are all printed photographs accurate representations of the digital image?
- Are the laboratory case number, item number, initials, date, and a scale captured within each photograph or scan of friction ridge detail?
- Do file names for images retained within Mideo accurately reflect what is in the image?

1.3.2 An administrative review shall be conducted on all case records. The following checklist shall be used when conducting a review:

1.3.2.1 For both latent print comparison and latent print processing:

- Are all notes complete and understandable?
- Is all documentation free from any spelling or grammatical errors?
- Does all documentation contain the laboratory case number and the examiners initials?
- Has a technical review been conducted?
- Is the chain of custody complete and accurate?
- If any paper notes exist, are they legible, recorded using ink, and paginated?

## 1.4 Documentation

1.4.1 Any discrepancies will be annotated by the reviewer in the Reviewer Comments/Corrections section and discussed with the original examiner for corrections. Once corrections have been made and the case re-submitted for either TR or AR, the reviewer will indicate the corrections have been made by placing his/her initials and date at the end of the reviewer's comments.



1.4.2 Once the reviewer(s) has completed the TR/AR and the requirements set forth in this document have been met, the reviewer(s) will indicate within the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS) the TR/AR has been conducted and is approved to move to the next phase.

### **1.5 References**

[1] SWGFAST, *Document #16 Standard for the Technical Review of Friction Ridge Examinations (Latent/Tenprint)* 11/16/12 Ver. 2.0