Document F

Member:
American Society of Questioned Document Examiners

Thomas W. Vastrick

Forensic Document Examiner

American Academy of Forensic Sciences – QD Section

Southeastern Association of Forensic Document Examiners

Orlando, FL (Main) Office
522 S Hunt Club Blvd Suite 217
Apopka, FL 32703

Tallahassee, FL (Branch) Office
1400 Village Square Blvd #3-149
Tallahassee, FL 32312

(407) 234-3219

January 11, 2021

Ms. Lauren M Fuchs
Massey McClusky McClusky Fuchs
3074 East Road
Memphis TN 38128

File No. 214641

FORENSIC DOCUMENT EXAMINATION REPORT

Work Assignment

Determine whether the submitted documents are original ink or copies.

Determine whether common name signatures bear evidence of having been written by a common source.

The submitted document consists of the following:

Exhibit 1a One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Benjamin Thomas, identical to Exhibit 1b.
Exhibit 1b One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Benjamin Thomas, identical to Exhibit 1a.
Exhibit 1c One Affidavit for Benjamin Thomas dated September 14, 2020.
Exhibit 2a One undated notarized letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Darnell Gardner.
Exhibit 2b One undated letter (not notarized) to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Darnell Gardner.
Exhibit 2c One Affidavit for Darnell Gardner dated September 14, 2020.
Exhibit 3a One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Aubrey Burnett, identical to Exhibit 3b.
Exhibit 3b One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Aubrey Burnett, identical to Exhibit 3a.
Exhibit 3c One Affidavit for Aubrey Burnett dated September 14, 2020.
Exhibit 4a One letter addressed to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett dated May 2, 2005 in the name of Craig M. Cunningham, identical to Exhibit 4b.
Exhibit 4b One letter addressed to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett dated May 2, 2005 in the name of Craig M. Cunningham, identical to Exhibit 4a.
Exhibit 4c One Affidavit for Craig M. Cunningham dated October 9, 2020.
Exhibit 5 One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Sharon Weeks.
Exhibit 6 One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Brian K. James.
Exhibit 7 One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Freddie Hunt.
Exhibit 8 One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Chief Frank Cotton.

F

Exhibit 9 One undated letter to Honorable Judge Arthur Bennett signed in the name of Myles Wilson.

Conclusions

Exhibits 1a and 1b are both copies. Exhibit 1c contains original ink entries. The evidence supports that the Thomas signature entries on the submitted Exhibit 1 documents were written by a common source.

Exhibit 2a is a copy but the notary entries are original ink to include the stamp. Exhibits K-2b and K-2c contain original ink entries. The evidence supports that the Gardner signature entries on the submitted Exhibit 2 documents were written by a common source.

Exhibits 3a and 3b are both copies. Exhibit 3c contains original ink entries. The evidence supports that the Burnett signature entries on the submitted Exhibit 3 documents were written by a common source.

Exhibits 4a and 4b are both copies. Exhibit 4c contains original ink entries. The evidence supports that the Cunningham signature entries on the submitted Exhibit 4 documents were written by a common source.

Exhbits 5 through 7 contain original ink signatures.

Exhibits 8 and 9 contain signature entries that are copies and are not original ink signatures.

Reasons and Bases

This examination was conducted utilizing published industry standard examination methodologies as prescribed by The Scientific Working Group for Forensic Document Examination (SWGDOC).

The profession error rate has been tested and several peer-reviewed published research papers address profession error rate. These rates ranged from 3.4% to 6.5% for properly trained forensic document examiners and up to 40% for control groups. The specific percentages will vary as a factor of the individual test question(s) and the percentage can be considered at the extreme high end since testing was performed in a conference format without benefit of each examiner's equipment or lighting. The rate differential between the forensic document examiner and the control group is considered a tested constant and is noted as differing by approximately a factor of six.

Thomas W. Vastrick

Thomas W. Vastrick
Forensic Document Examiner