

# Lead Advocate

## McVie Case

R.P.F. has now seen the SCRO  
reports Head of Bureau who saw the  
McVie print at an early stage &  
asked with the 4 suspended officers.

As can be seen even when  
confronted with the other opinions

Mr. McVie still articulates  
a case for saying the disputed mark  
belongs to Shirley McVie.

RAF may be  
right that certainty is not possible here.  
what we have is a mark which  
apparently (according to SCRO) displays  
16 points of similarity & therefore must be  
Mrs McVie's whereas other experts  
perhaps using a wider non-numeric  
approach see differences & areas of  
incompatibility which lead them to

conclude the mark is not Miss McKie's.

Either way there is no basis for a prosecution. A camera decision should be taken now. A consideration given as to how to inform the SCRO & the McKie's the public.

I think we can only offer the other options to SCRO & leave them to sort out what they do with the suspended officers. If they were re-instated their evidence would always be subject/walk to challenge yet we know other SCRO officers of a similar vein continue to work in the organisation.

I still worry about the systems & our ability to deal with fingerprint identifications that are said to be difficult or problematic. None of this was alluded to at the outset &

I am concerned how a disputed mark might be dealt with in future.

I am happy to discuss further

DCA

29 07/01

Lead Advocates

I attach RPF Pardey's report on the fingerprint evidence in the McRie & Abney cases.

This exercise has taken a considerable time & the report is at times difficult to follow without all of the proclams to hand & a detailed explanation of them.

It seems clear that there is no basis for criminal proceedings. on the other hand  
we are dealing

with opinion evidence & for perjury or attempt perjury charges to be established we would have to show the SCRO evidence was unobtainable.

While on array of experts are of the view there have been mis-identifications there are other independent experts Swann & Graham will agree with SCRO.

There seems no basis for proceedings

sure a jury would be unlikely to be able to cope with being led through microscopic examination of the fingerprints that substantiates / differences.

I favour taking an early no pro decision & referring the matter back to Vole to discontinue the officer. While there remains a doubt about the mis-identification I can't see the officer ~~being~~ <sup>being</sup> accepted or credible interests in its future. That may be for SCRO to decide.

The matter does require further discussion of RPF's offer to see Mr. McKie is a sensible one.

I see no point in making the case no pro meantime since we are at present left with 2 district comp the SCRO suspended officers & colleagues + Swann & Graham v Weinheim, MMIC experts, the Hoes, the Durham experts & may others who viewed the prints on the internet & agreed with Weinheim.

I consider an early decision on the SCRO officer desirable or proceedings seem likely to be successful. Val .N.V.K  
9 / 07 / 01