

Q.12

I should reiterate that this is the first time that I have made any time-consuming study of the mark QI2 with the impression of the deceased, Marion ROSS. As with the material supplied for the Y7 comparison work, this material also falls well below that which I would have expected to receive when requested to undertake such a task as this. This said, provide the following information and comments to assist the Inquiry in its deliberations.

Mr P WERTHEIM:

Chart 2W:

Again, the image provided of QI2 is of a very poor quality lacking consistency in contrast and sharpness.

There are several features which WERTHEIM has failed to mark on his chart, particularly below Area 5 and a large percentage of other matching features seem to have been ignored.

When correctly compared and accurately marked-up, it can be shown that there are sufficient matching features to prove the provenance of this mark as being that of the deceased

Table 4W:

Feature 1 Disagree - Ridges *do* correspond.

Feature 2 Agree - that feature is in the correct position. Disagree with the comment. Natural differences are always likely to occur and be expected, but this should not detract from identification.

Feature 3 Disagree - Bifurcation appears to be clear, but wrongly marked by WERTHEIM, as it should be higher up.

Feature 4 Disagree - It appears to be more of a fragmentary subsidiary or incipient ridge, rather than a 'short ridge' but does appear where it's supposed to be. QI2 is so poor, such a difference is not so surprising.

Feature 5 Disagree - Clearly a bifurcation in *both* images. I cannot determine the ridge ending to which WERTHEIM refers.

Feature 6 *Totally disagree* - Appearance of ridge in QI2 is distorted by its poor quality. It is my opinion that no feature exists where marked and in *both* images ridges appear to flow without a break.

Feature 7 Disagree - Wrongly marked by WERTHEIM. Ridge tapers off in a classic series of dots, which, due to variation in pressure places the actual ridge ending in a different position to where WERTHEIM thinks it is.

Analysis 4W:

Q1. Agree.

Q2. Agree. I would dispute the assertion of 'multiple touches'. Clearly, there is movement of some kind affecting the mark, most obviously indicated by the line directly descending from the bottom of the core. 'Multiple touches' cannot be ruled out, but it should not be automatically assumed that it has occurred. It could well be that Q12 was deposited on the exhibit and then another digit (perhaps the same, perhaps not) was placed on top of it. (See area at 2o'clock, where this is a possibility). Doubtless some movement did occur when the mark was initially deposited.

I have seen nothing in this exhibit which leads me to believe that Q12 could not have been made by the right fore finger of the deceased, Marion ROSS.

Martin Leadbetter

MARTIN LEADBETTER

29.8.2009.

Mr A ZEELLENBERG:

Chart 2Z:

Very dark images, not ideal for comparison purposes. (See Table 4Z).

Table 4Z:

Feature 1 Agree - However, not very clear on QI2.

Feature 2 Agree - And in coincidental sequence with Feature 1.

Feature 3 Disagree - Mr ZEELLENBERG has failed to discover this feature on QI2, although it can be seen he has placed and removed a marker, which was erroneously positioned. Careful and skilful examination will show that this feature *is* present, but disguised as the bifurcation appears as a thickened ridge, possibly filled in by some foreign substrate of excessive pressure. When correctly position Feature 3 is in perfect coincidental sequence with Feature 2.

Feature 4 Agree - The overall difference in appearance is of no evidential relevance.

Feature 5 Agree - Lack of this feature's presence could be due to the movement present in this area of QI2.

Feature 6 Disagree – I'm not even sure that this is a feature in QI2.

Feature 7 Disagree - In an area of considerable movement. In my opinion, probably not a feature.

Feature 8 Disagree - Do not agree that this is a feature. The line indicating it terminates at a point of *very* obvious movement.

Feature 9 Disagree - Wrongly marked on QI2. The line points to the centre of a ridge where there is no feature present. Too much movement/disturbance for any certainty.

Feature 10 Agree - Placed correctly on both images.

Feature 11 Disagree - In my opinion this feature *does* appear on the print, but it takes a skilled, well-trained and objective eye to determine what has happened. In my opinion,

Feature 10 and 11 are formed by a break in a single ridge, which is clearer on Q12 than in the print, but for certain, Feature 11 is on the print.

Analysis 4Z:

Q1. Disagree – One finger, but with interrupted ridge flow.

Q2. Agree.

I have seen nothing in this chart which leads me to believe that Q12 could not have been made by the deceased, Marion ROSS.

Martin Leadbetter

MARTIN LEADBETTER

29.8.2009

Mr G GRIGG:

Chart 2G:

The poor quality of the QI2 image hinders my ability to see some of the features marked by Mr GRIGG. (Please refer to Table 4G).

Table 4G:

Feature 1 Agree - I do however dispute Mr GRIGG's assertion re the count difference. I consider that the lack of clarity inhibits an accurate count to be measured.

Feature 2 Disagree – I cannot see where the line ends which indicates the feature.

Feature 3 Agree - Correct in both images.

Feature 4 Disagree - This feature is wrongly placed. It should be positioned higher.

Feature 5 Disagree - This does not appear to be a true feature in QI2, so it's not so surprising that there isn't one in the corresponding place on the inked print.

Feature 6 Agree – This feature is common to both images.

Feature 7 Disagree - Cannot see where the line terminates.

Feature 8 Agree - Although only a tiny feature, its presence in both images is significant.

Analysis 4G:

1. Disagree
2. Disagree (See explanation in Analysis 4W).

I have seen nothing in this exhibit which leads me to believe that QI2 could not have been made by the right fore finger of the deceased, Marion ROSS. I believe that Mr GRIGG has accurately identified 4 matching features.

Martin Leadbetter

MARTIN LEADBETTER

29. 8. 2009

Mr J MacLEOD:

Chart 2M:

Once again, the image quality of QI2 leaves much to be desired. I'm not quite sure what Mr MacLEOD is trying to prove with this chart. He marked 11 features on the print and only 10 on QI2. Clearly those on the print from 1-6 are intended to show similarity although not agreement, but I am mystified by the logic employed in marking features 7-10 (11) so obviously not in agreement.

Table 4M:

1. Disagree - Cannot see what he's marked. Not, in my opinion a small lake on the print, but more likely an enlarged edge of a ridge and/or a small subsidiary (incipient) ridge, as might be used in Third Level Detail marking up.
2. Disagree - Cannot see this, as it would be related to Feature 1, which is indiscernible.
3. Agree – This appears to be the only correctly marked feature, which, not surprising forms the core.
4. Disagree – In my opinion, wrongly placed and should be positioned slightly lower.
5. Disagree – Placed on the wrong ridge.
6. Disagree - This should have been positioned where Feature 5 has been placed.
7. Disagree – Not placed correctly on QI2 and it's impossible to measure an accurate count between this feature and Feature 6.
8. Disagree - Cannot be certain of this feature as it's in an area where there's obvious movement.
- 9, 10 & 11 - Disagree and cannot understand the logic of marking these three features without reference to them on the print.

Analysis 4M:

Q1. Disagree.

Q2. No response from Mr MacLEOD.

I have seen nothing in this chart which leads me to believe that Q12 could not have been made by the deceased, Marion ROSS.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Martin Leadbetter". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent loop at the end of the last name.

MARTIN LEADBETTER

29.8.2009

SCRO:

Chart 2S:

The quality of this exhibit is again extremely poor and does not provide me with suitable material for me to reach a definitive conclusion. This said, being expected to comment on it by the Inquiry I have done my best.

Table 2S:

Feature 1 Agree - This feature, although technically can be described as a bifurcation is very small and could in fact be a small hook, or even an enlarged pore. That said, it is correctly positioned on both images.

Feature 2 Agree - Confirm feature type and position.

Feature 3 Disagree - May or may not be a feature, as it occurs at a point where there is superimposition by another ridge flow system.

Feature 4 Disagree - See explanation as for Feature 3.

Feature 5 Disagree - Due to poor quality of material I cannot see where line terminates.

Feature 6 Disagree - See explanation as for Feature 5.

Feature 7 Agree.

Feature 8 Agree.

Feature 9 Agree.

Feature 10 Agree.

Feature 11 Agree.

Feature 12 Agree.

Feature 13 Disagree – There appears to be an extra ridge count?

Feature 14 Agree.

Feature 15 Agree - Ridge count to next feature difficult to confirm due to poor quality.

Feature 16 Agree.

Analysis 3S:

Q1. Agree.

Q2. Disagree.

Final comment:

Whilst I can agree with eleven of the features marked in Chart 2S, it is quite obvious that do not form a coincident sequence. That said, there are *strong* influences which lead me to the conclusion, that whilst I cannot confirm this mark as having been made by Marion ROSS, *due to the appalling material provided*, I likewise cannot exclude the possibility, at this stage, that the mark *was* made by Marion ROSS.

Martin John LEADBETTER FFS RFP Dip.Eur.Hum. (Open) BA (Hons).

Independent Fingerprint Consultant

29th August 2009

Martin Leadbetter
MARTIN LEADBETTER
29.8.2009.

Table 3 (a) : For 'Principal Contradictors' and 'Other Contributors' to comment on Chart 2S, Table 3S and Analysis 3S produced by SCRO.

No. of Characteristic	Type of Characteristic	Does characteristic match in mark and print? (Yes or No)?	If no, why not?
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			

11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			

Signature:

Name:

Date: