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THANK YOU!
My interest in the forensic sciences began with my fascination with crime. Like many other children, I was seduced by the movie industry's cop characters. I was inspired by the mastermind investigators who were one step ahead of the criminal, and the fact that they always came out a hero. Although these ornamented characters were creations of a money making industry, my desire to become a part of a criminal investigative team did not cease. In November of 1991, I began to design and organize an internship with the appropriate departments within Champaign County. I began creating contacts through the many referrals I received from Dr. Gene Giles, Dr. Linda Klepinger, Ron Eltzeroth, Captain Fitzpatrick and guest speakers of my forensic anthropology class in fall of 1991. With the help of the Champaign County Coroners Office, University of Illinois Police Department, Champaign City Police Department, Champaign County State's Attorney's Office and Champaign County Sheriff's Department, a network of teachers and guides volunteered to give me the exposure that was not available in a classroom.

In the field of criminal investigation and crime scene analysis, practical experience becomes the basic knowledge required for an occupation that is full of surprises. I accomplished several goals during my internship including learning how to react and cope with heinous crimes, looking beyond the obvious, and formulating an instinct from the evidence available. From the trust that was instilled in me, I have had the opportunity to go along on death and aggravated assault investigations, informant interviews, a drug raid and police meetings. I was also granted permission to conduct interviews with criminals (which are discussed in this paper),
attend firearm instruction, and a seminar at the Illinois State Forensic Laboratory, where discussions on new techniques in evidence collection were addressed and observe in-lab demonstrations of the tests used in evidence analysis.

My fascination with crime and its constituents has grown since the fall of 1991. In fact, I have done volunteer work at the University of Illinois Police Department and the Champaign County State's Attorney Office to gain exposure in the administration of a legal office and police department. Becoming educated in all domains of the criminal justice system has been the most beneficial aspect of my internship.

My senior thesis addresses many problems surrounding legal proceedings and the crime that supports criminal investigations and litigations. This paper is an accumulation of my research and the experience that I have gained over the past nine months. However, the purpose of this paper has not been geared toward solving the issues that are discussed, but to give illustrations of my personal experience with criminals, their crimes and the studies and tests that are conducted, which are aimed at interpreting the crime and their actions. Furthermore, this paper integrates issues concerning the criminal justice system and actual cases from Champaign County that I had the privilege of observing. Each case is dissected in a manner that permits the reader to grasp every technique used in a criminal investigation. Descriptions of interviewing tactics, evidence collection procedures and strategies, and forensic analysis techniques are all incorporated in each case that is addressed.
"Wherever he steps, whatever he touches, whatever he leaves, even unconsciously, will serve as silent witness against him. Not only his fingerprints or his footprints, but his hair, the fibers from his clothes, the glass he breaks, the tool mark he leaves, the paint he scratches, the blood or semen he deposits or collects -- all of these and more bear mute witness against him. This is evidence that does not forget. It is not confused by the excitement of the moment. It is not absent because human witnesses are. It is factual evidence. Physical evidence cannot be wrong; it cannot perjure itself; it cannot be wholly absent. Only its interpretation can err. Only human failure to find it, study and understand it, can diminish its value." (Harris v. United States, 331 U.S. 145, 1947; cited in Eltzeroth and Elzerman, 1981)
Forensics, according to Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary, means related to or used in legal proceedings. The question to ask now is: What is related to or used in legal proceedings? The answer is evidence. Evidence is everything around us. Its value to a criminal or death case is indescribable. The emphasis placed on physical evidence is due to the fact that the evidence does not lie, it cannot be impeached and it is not affected by the 'hype' that many cases receive. However, if misinterpreted, its value is diminished. In the forensic sciences and in forensic anthropology, the evidence's weight is substantial. Forensic science is composed of many disciplinary branches that aid in the medical-legal system. Forensic anthropology has become another part of this interdisciplinary field. Although the two fields intertwine, they are often practiced for different purposes, and require different educational backgrounds. The scientists of forensic anthropology are "physical anthropologists who specialize in applying reconstructive techniques in solving identification problems of public and legal concern." (Kerley, 1983; p.66) This field includes archeological excavation and overlaps with several other fields like, pathology, superimposition photography and entomology. Most of a forensic anthropologist's cases are concerned with mass disasters, political disasters involving mass execution, and highly decomposed victims of murder. The forensic anthropologist assists medical and legal specialists to identify known, unknown and suspected human remains.

The forensic sciences, excluding the anthropological aspects is geared toward solving criminal cases, from burglary, to a hit and run, to murder. Evidence that has been left behind at a crime
scene can be processed through a forensic lab, and then be used in a court of law for a conviction or an acquittal. Forensic serology, photography, fingerprint analysis, hair and fiber examination, firearm identification, bite mark analysis and controlled substance testing are all fields within the forensic sciences. Although there are many more fields, like tool mark examination, those listed above were the areas of specialties within forensics that I was exposed to during my internship.
The development of a more thorough judicial evaluation of evidence and scientific claims has become the backbone of many index one crime cases. In our court system today, the law often looks to the scientific community for the answers to the questions that lie beyond the knowledge and comprehension of all the nonscientists involved in a case. In other words, the lawyers, judges and jury rely on expert witnesses to clear up the technicalities and explain the evidence. The expert witnesses are usually forensic scientists, forensic anthropologists, doctors and even police officers. Due to their impact on the jury, the fields within forensic science have grown tremendously in the past decade.

In 1923, forensic science was first utilized by the courts. The case was Frye v. United States, a case decided by the United States court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The defendant Frye was convicted of a murder to which he claimed not guilty. During his trial he unsuccessfully introduced into the evidence, a systolic blood pressure deception test (similar to the polygraph examination test), which he passed. The Court of Appeals affirmed the original decision. However, the Frye Ruling was designed:

Just when a scientific principle or discovery crosses the line between the experimental and the demonstrable stages is difficult to define. Somewhere in this twilight zone the evidential force of the principle must be recognized, and while courts will go a long way in admitting expert testimony deduced from a well-recognized scientific principle or
discovery, the thing from which the deduction is made must be sufficiently established to have gained general acceptance in the particular field in which it belongs. (Black, u 239; p.1508)

The Frye Ruling has been manipulated since its founding. For example, the scientific communities' acceptance of a theory or test may depend on which side of the scientific community you ask. It is also important to clarify an expert witness' qualifications, this might prevent the evidence from being manipulated.

The issues raised above are illustrated in the three following cases. The Frye Ruling holds a different position in each case, and the outcomes are surprising, in light of the Frye Ruling. In People v. Buckely, 1985, the defendant, Buckely was on trial for the murder of a 10 year old Naperville, Illinois girl. Dr. Louise Robbins, a forensic anthropologist, testified against Buckley and was the prosecution's key witness. Although Brian Dugan, a previously convicted murderer admitted to committing the murder, Robbins claimed that a bloody bare footprint found at the crime scene belonged to Buckley. Despite the lack of support Robbins' footprint analysis techniques had, her testimony remained strong and became the determining piece of evidence that led to Buckley's conviction. Even J. Lawrence Angel, the curator of physical anthropology at the Smithsonian Institution, was quoted as saying, "the only real expert in the country and the creator of a new science (Mahany, August 18, 1986)." If Robbins was in fact the only true expert in footprint identification, then the Frye Ruling was ignored during the People v. Buckley trial. In fact, the only individuals to back up her scientific methods were an attorney that used her in a previous case, and a fellow anthropologist.
In *State v. Washington*, 1980, the defendant was convicted of a rape-murder. During the crime the murderer had cut himself. During the trial, evidence was submitted showing that the bloodstains found at the crime scene matched the defendant's. This piece of evidence had an overwhelming impact on the jury, and Washington was found guilty. The defendant appealed the court's decision, claiming that the method of analysis was not acceptable nor reliable, and that the state crime lab technician was not a qualified expert. However, the Supreme Court of Kansas affirmed Washington's original conviction. The court relied on the fact that the blood stain analysis was accepted by the law enforcement community as consistent, reliable and expedient. The conflict in the *State v. Washington* case involved differing views concerning the meaning of an unpublished study's ability to make an accurate finding of an absolute match between bloodstain samples.

In *People v. Young*, the court was faced with similar evidence and two of the same experts as the *State v. Washington* case. The Supreme Court of Michigan had considered all the same issues and reasoning that *State v. Washington* did. However, in *People v. Young*, the verdict was the opposite. The Young court recognized that an evaluation of scientific testimony should require explanations of the way the scientists determine if a theory or its technique is valid. "The scientific tradition expects independent verification of a new procedure... It is scientists not responsible for the original research that confirms its validity." (Black, 1988; p.238) The contrast between the decisions in *State v. Washington* and *People v. Young* illustrates that even though the traditional Frye Ruling allows thorough analysis of evidence, its use within the court questions the reasoning of, and the standards of scientific techniques within the forensic fields, and the validity of expert opinions.
THE EXPERT WITNESS: AN AID OR HINDERANCE TO THE LEGAL PROFESSION?

The cases explained above, exemplify the ways in which attorneys manipulate the testimony of expert witnesses, which influences the outcome of a case. It is rare that the testimony of a forensic expert witness in a court of law will be challenged, especially by a legal community that is naive to the scientific procedures, considering that many of them avoided science classes during their college career. The position of an expert witness is potentially helpful to a case, therefore it is important that the qualifications of an expert witness are clearly understood by the court.

To help us evaluate expert witnesses, Harry Hollien, Ph.D., designed a model that organizes "experts" (of all types) into categories, "technician, practitioner, and scientist - on one continuum and by level - technician, criminalist, and specialist on the other (Hollien; p.1418, 1990)."

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{diagram.png}
\caption{The horizontal category classifies individuals based on their level and category.}
\end{figure}
The diagram can distinguish between different types of experts, for example, technician is common to both the horizontal and vertical axis. This demonstrates that a technician/technician (A) is an expert such as a police officer who is capable of administering a breath analyzer test, but certainly not qualified to interpret an individual's behavior if the breath analyzer read 1.1 (which is known as intoxication). A specialist in the field of psychology would have that knowledge. A specialist usually achieves a high ranked education degree (preferably a doctorate), to separate him from practitioner, scientist, criminalist and technician. Even though the work of all these individuals commonly overlaps, the separations between their disciplines needs to be acknowledged. This diagram produces five professional levels. The validity may be argued by others, but nonetheless, it presents a rough estimate of how to begin organizing everyone who is labeled as an expert witness on the witness stand.

In the past decade or so, it has become clearer what is considered unethical testimony by an expert witness. When inquiring into the history of the expert witness, it may become apparent that he/she has exclusively been hired by prosecutors (this is where the term "hired gun" comes from) or defense attorneys. This fact may call into question the sincerity of the testimony. When an expert witness boastfully claims that he "could not be wrong," it should instigate an objection from the opposing attorney. A testimony based on a scientific evaluation that is not explained because it "is classified information" or is "too complex to understand," is only a tactic used to overwhelm the judge and jury. If an expert witness bases his opinion on previously conducted experiments or studies, then data and
results should be brought to the trial, and explained to the court. This may protect the case against irrelevancies. Lastly, the expert witness should never make vague statements that would personally attack witnesses of the opposing side. Recognizing inappropriate behavior of an expert witness by all attorneys should become manifest in their education.

Ideally, an expert witness, according to Hollien, (1990) should possess at least the following qualifications:

1. An undergraduate and graduate degree which are relevant to the field of expertise in question.
2. "Specialized training in the subject area as it relates to forensics (p.1417)."
3. Training in forensics.
4. Any professional licenses or certifications that are recognized by other professionals within the witness' discipline.
5. Evidence of experimentation, teaching or publication within the profession of the witness.
6. "Prior disciplinary experience that is direct and relevant to the issue or issues being considered (p.1417)."

Other prerequisites that are desirable include: postgraduate training, publications in scientific journals, development of tests or procedures that are currently accepted, and experience as an expert witness. This list does not include every extra disciplinary training that is acceptable, but gives an outline of the type of qualifications an attorney should investigate when choosing his expert witness. The criminal justice system acknowledges the need to train individuals who want to be hired as expert witnesses. Several courses, seminars, workshops, articles and books have been developed to properly train professionals, so when they testify, they do not take part in any unethical tactics.
or expose themselves to criticism from future challenging testimonies. Diagnosing the problems with expert witnesses is not aimed at eliminating their position, but protecting those witnesses who truly are competent, as well as designing objective validation procedures for testimonies that may need to be evaluated for elaboration or explanation for jurors and judges that lack a scientific background.
THE CRIME SCENE AND CRIME SCENE TECHNICIAN

When investigating a crime scene, it is essential that the proper procedures are followed. The evidence left behind in a crime scene is useless to a court of law if it is tampered with before the crime scene technician arrives or if it is improperly preserved. During a criminal investigation the theory of transfer or exchange needs to be assumed. The perpetrator will take away traces of the victim and the scene. The victim will retain traces of the perpetrator and might leave traces of himself/herself on the perpetrator. Also, the perpetrator will leave behind traces of himself/herself at the crime scene. Changes of the original scene, as well as, the transfers and exchanges that occur make up the physical evidence used to solve a case.

Much of the evidence left behind at a crime scene is subtle, for example, fingerprints or hair fibers. Due to this fact, a perpetrator trying to cover up his crime is usually unsuccessful. Even though the crime scene investigators have advanced technology to fall back on, many problems still arise which hinder a case from being solved. If the evidence collection process and preservation is done incorrectly, the crime may become unsolvable or the case may be closed without a conviction. Aside from the witness who brings a crime to the attention of the police, the first arriving officer, usually a patrol person is crucial to the outcome of a criminal case. It is his duty to record the time he arrives on scene, to clear and seal the scene off from public traffic. The first officer to arrive should also record the location of the victim(s), the names, phone numbers, statements and addresses of any perpetrators, witnesses, or vehicles in the area of the crime scene. His final duty is to protect the crime scene until the crime technician arrives.
Just as the theory of transfer and exchange applies to the perpetrator, it also applies to any individuals entering the scene, whether it be a police officer or medical examiner. The fewer people to invade a crime scene the better the outcome of a case may have. The crime scene technician can usually distinguish the real evidence from the traces brought in after the crime scene was found and after the perpetrator fled from the scene. However, the crime scene technician can not ignore any evidence, whether its importance is questionable or if it is post crime evidence. This is because it is better to have too much unimportant evidence than to not have enough.

The crime scene technician/investigator should continually take notes and photographs as he/she enters and continues to search the scene. Since the evidence collection process is the greatest determining factor in a court case, the crime scene technician controls any other personnel that can enter the scene. Throughout the investigation of the crime scene, measurements and sketches are taken to preserve the 'whole picture.' Sketches with accurate measurements are often used to help recreate the crime scene, solve the crime and explain the happenings that might have occurred during the crime to the jury (See Appendix C, for an example). One of the modern methods of recording a crime scene is the video camera. The camcorder is used in the same way as the notebook and camera. The crime scene technician/investigator will tape the scene of the crime which gives the best reconstruction possible for all later purposes. (The video camera is almost always used when police arrive on a riot scene to protect themselves from future lawsuits.)

Collecting the evidence can begin when the crime scene is secure. As stated before, how evidence is collected and
preserved can affect its admissibility in a court of law. Each piece of physical evidence needs to be handled and packaged so that it does not become destroyed while being transferred to the forensic state laboratory. Each type of evidence may require a different container; for example, bloodstains are submitted in a paper bag and porous items like paper, wood and cardboard are best protected in a plastic bag. Once the evidence bag is sealed, it should be labeled with the contents, case number, date, time, method of recovery, location it was found at, owners name, if any, and most importantly, the technician's or investigator's name and badge number, written across the label. This is done to assure that if it is opened before the laboratory receives it, the technicians know if it has been tampered with. Next the forensic scientist takes over, and conducts whatever tests may aid in solving the case.
Rape is the act of deviate sexual intercourse by force or imposition, and is therefore legally aggravated criminal sexual assault. This crime has proven to be one of society's most troubling problems. Considering that rape occurs on all levels in society, from adult to adult, adult to child, and child to child, it deserves as much attention as it can get. Rape awareness has been the focus of many television shows, news segments and police departments. Educating not only the young woman, but also every age group of both sexes on how to avoid potentially dangerous situations is society's only hope in decreasing the amount of rapes that occur. In 1991, in Champaign County, 105 rapes were reported, fortunately this figure has not dramatically increased in 1992. According to a study by Warr (1985; as cited in Sheley, 1991; p.6) rape is feared more than any other crime among younger women, it is considered to be viewed with equal seriousness as homicide by women. The high sensitivity level that is displayed by women when addressing rape is because they closely associate it with a variety of other offenses like, robbery, burglary and possibly a precursor for homicide. The high fear of rape perceived by females is because rape is not only viewed as serious, but likely. As Murphy's Law says, when you least expect it, expect it! This holds true for the many situational nightmares that life holds.

On May 10, 1992, Alias Jane Smith was driving home at about one thirty in the morning after taking her mother out for Mother's Day. As she was driving she noticed a young teenage boy lying in the middle of the street next to a bicycle. She slowed down as she drove around him to observe the boy in the street. Ms. Smith then noticed in her rear view mirror, that the boy had
stood up, waved to her, and then collapsed in the street. Ms. Smith stopped her vehicle to provide assistance to the young boy whom she thought might have been a victim of a hit and run. Unfortunately, Ms. Smith had no idea that her act of kindness was going to become an unexpected nightmare. The boy then got up and opened the passenger side door by reaching through the open window. As the boy entered the car he was acting as though he were hurt and asked if he could have a ride to an intersection which was only a few blocks down the road. Ms. Smith agreed to drive him to the street he requested since it was on the way to her destination. The boy then asked if Ms. Smith would turn down an alley which was located behind the business district. She refused to do as the boy asked because she realized that a dark alley might put her in a dangerous situation. After the boy insisted that she turn down the alley, Ms. Smith told him to get out of her car. The boy then became agitated and told her that he was going to rape her and then struck her in the face. Ms. Smith offered the boy money in exchange for not raping her. Because she only had thirteen dollars, the boy continued to strike Ms. Smith. He then grabbed her head forcing it toward the floor board of the vehicle. She pressed the gas pedal, accelerating the car. While he steered the car, the perpetrator then told Ms. Smith that he would kill her if she did not let go of the gas pedal. As she stopped the car, she managed to open her door and free herself from the perpetrator. Ms. Smith ran to the closest residence and knocked on the door. The perpetrator followed her and struck her repeatedly across her face. He then dragged her to the ground and began to conduct forcible intercourse with the victim. After the rape, which lasted a few minutes, the perpetrator told the victim he was going to get her license plate number, find out where she lived and kill her, if Ms. Smith went to the police. He forced the victim back into the driver’s seat while he walked to the rear of the car, pretending to copy down the plate number. The victim then attempted to start the car and
leave, but the perpetrator came over to the driver's side and repeatedly struck her while pushing her into the passenger's seat. The victim then began to strike the perpetrator while he was driving with the heel on her shoe. Her retaliation infuriated the perpetrator and he began to choke her. However, the victim was able to bite him on his left forearm. After the perpetrator received this injury he struck Ms. Smith in the face. She managed to push him out of her vehicle and get away. She could see the perpetrator walking down the street as she continued to drive home. She could hear him yelling at her with threats against her life. Shortly after the incident, Ms. Smith went to the hospital, where X-rays were taken and a sexual assault kit was administered.

It is crucial that a victim of sexual assault immediately go to the hospital. There, evidence can be collected and a medical examination can be documented. The purpose of this is to be able to obtain a sufficient amount of evidence based on any vaginal swabs, semen stains, bloodstains, hair samples (including pubic), saliva samples and bruise markings. All of which can be used for comparisons against suspects. This type of evidence if matched to a suspect is almost indisputable in court, leaving only the forensic technicians' and scientists' work reputation to be questioned. Public Act 86-881, section 5-4-3 (line 68-75) states that, "Any person convicted of, or who received a disposition of court supervision for, a sexual offense or attempt of a sexual offense... regardless of the sentence imposed be required to submit specimens of blood and saliva to the Illinois Department of State Police." This act protects the victim's rights.

Blood and body fluids are the most frequently found types of evidence. They do not always identify a perpetrator, or establish absolute proof of guilt, but they can be used for the
exclusion of suspects. When serological tests are run, several genetic markers are looked for, such as:

**ANTIGENS**
- ABO
- Gamma Chain Marker: Gm
- Kappa Chain Marker: Km
- Lewis: Le

**SERUM PROTEINS**
- Hemoglobin: Hb
- Group Specific Component: Gc
- Haptoglobin: Hp
- Transferrin: Tf

**RED CELL MARKERS**
- Erythrocyte Acid Phosphate: EAP
- Adenosine Deaminase: ADA
- Adenylate Kinase: AK
- Carbonic Anhydrase II: CA II
- Esterase D: ESD
- Glyoxylase I: GLO
- Hemoglobin: Hb
- Peptidase A: PEP A
- Phosphoglucomutase: PGM

Although there are many different markers that characterize one's blood, it is important to realize that the success behind serology testing is the combination of the results from all the different genetic markers (See Appendix A). For example, the conventional ABO blood test would be useless if the results from a blood test showed that both the victim and suspect had type O blood. Saliva also has many helpful characteristics. Everyone is divided into secretors and non-secretors. Secretors comprise the majority of the population. But there is a high concentration of
group specific substances in the saliva which are also present in semen and vaginal secretions, and most other body fluids. It can be clearly seen how much information can be collected from a victim’s body and how important the administration of a rape kit is to the victim immediately after the sexual assault.

Once the hospital has administered the appropriate tests, taken X-rays which document the physical abuse, and give a physical to the victim which will show the physical and mental inhibitions and damage that resulted from the sexual assault, the investigators can ask questions to the victim about the crime. Once enough questions are answered, revealing the pertinent information, the victim can go home until the following day when she is re-interviewed. The purpose of a second interview with the victim is to match the details of the crime with the victim’s original story, because she may be lying. This is customary with any type of victim because there is often foul play involved, especially in sexual assault cases where the victim is married and her lover ends up as the suspect.

After interviewing Ms. Smith, the investigators began their investigation. They returned to the scene of the crime and noticed that a black male in his teens, approximately 5'8-5'10, as the victim had described, was walking around in the same area that the sexual assault occurred. However, the suspect was acting as though he had lost something. The investigators stopped and questioned him, they asked if he had lost anything. The suspect responded that he lost part of his Walkman. The investigators continued to question the suspect, who became nervous. The suspect said he lived only a few blocks away and was going to return home soon. The investigators then noticed what appeared to be a human bitemark on his left forearm, just as the victim had described. At that point, the investigators felt that they had enough probable cause to arrest the suspect. They
read the suspect his rights, arrested him and transported him to the Champaign County Sheriff’s Department for further questioning.

At the police department Senter, the suspect, was interviewed by the criminal investigators assigned to the case. Senter explained to the investigators where he was on that early morning at about one thirty. He said that he was returning from a party and as he was walking home, he flagged down a vehicle which was driven by a black female. When the car stopped, the suspect asked if he could have a ride. The female driver agreed. While driving they engaged in idle conversation, until the driver stopped her car and walked up onto the porch of a residence. He then stated that he followed her to the residence, at which point she turned around and asked Senter if he “wanted any pussy.” At that point Senter agreed to engage in sexual intercourse with Ms. Smith, which took place for twenty minutes in the front yard of the residence. After the sexual encounter ended, Senter said that Ms. Smith began insulting him, and that Ms. Smith told him that he was not as good as she expected. She then proceeded to tell him that she was going to tell the police that he raped her. At that point, he struck Ms. Smith in the face, and in his own words, “just got a good shot in”. Senter went on to say that an argument followed, and Ms. Smith bit him on his arm.

Once the investigators heard Senter’s version of the happenings that occurred on the early morning of May 10, 1992, they sent him to the Champaign County Correctional Facilities. Considering that Senter admitted to engaging in sexual intercourse with Ms. Smith, a search warrant for his home was issued by the court. A few days later after Senter had been processed, a court order was approved to have saliva, blood and hair (including pubic) samples taken. This was done through the discovery process (when the defense receives the police reports
on the suspect). From the search through Senter's home, several pieces of evidence were revealed. The evidence found by the investigators included: bloody clothes that were described as the articles of clothing worn by the suspect, a pillow case with eye holes cut out of it, which was used in a robbery of a pizza delivery boy a few days earlier, the pizza delivery boy's checkbook, thirteen bloody dollar bills and a piece of paper with a list of words on them. Below is the list of words that appeared on the paper found in Senter's room. It is presumed that the list of words are initiation tasks required by a gang member (see below).

EDUCATION (JEWISH STAR)
ECONOMIC
POLITICAL
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
UNITY
ORGANIZATION
1. OK
2. OK
3. OK
4. OK
5. OK
6. OK
7. GUARD
8. OK
9. OK
10. INCIDENT
11. EXPLORATION
12. EXERCISE
13. AID AND ASSISTANCE
14. DUES
15. A. R. 804
16. RAPE
Since number sixteen had the word rape next to it, the investigators thought that this might be a useful piece of evidence to seize. The top seven words are believed to represent the benefits of the gang. The following words with numbers preceding them represent the initiation tasks of a gang member. Senter most likely completed one through six, eight and nine. The rest of the numbers can be interpreted as follows: number seven, guarding or protecting a fellow member or girlfriend; number ten to create an incident that would bring attention to the gang's unity, organization and power; number eleven, exploration of some type of gang ritual or possibly even drugs; number twelve, exercise to keep in shape for when (number thirteen) aid and assistance may be needed; number fourteen, pay dues which is self-explanatory, number fifteen, is not as clear, but it could possibly stand for committing arson; and number sixteen, rape.

Even though the evidence against Senter was substantial enough to get him a conviction, his lawyer saw that the Champaign County Sheriff's Department had enough evidence to try him on two accounts, robbery and rape. Because both are index one crimes, Senter plead guilty. Senter's admittance of having sexual intercourse with Ms. Smith, the identification of Senter in a line up, the thirteen bloody dollar bills, pieces of a broken walkman that were found in Ms. Smith's vehicle, Senter's bloody clothes, the pizza delivery boy's check book and the pillow case that was described as the mask used in the robbery, provided overwhelming evidence that made this sexual assault case come to a quick close (See Appendix B, for a copy of the actual evidence report). Although, the bitemark on Senter's left forearm could have been used as a key piece of evidence if his case went to trial, it was never submitted for analysis. This was because the investigators did not realize the significance of the bitemark at the time Senter was arrested. After the discovery
process, when serological tests were administered, the bitemark had gone through too much healing, and therefore a cast could not be made (considering that a cast should be made within twenty-four hours of the bite). Nonetheless, justice was served and Senter was convicted to twenty-two years in prison. Unfortunately, not all sexual assault cases are solved so quickly, and end up with a proper conviction.
ISSUES SURROUNDING DRUGS

There has always been a mystique about the so-called drug culture. People who consume some sort of narcotic causing out of body and world experiences, can be thought of as a victim of this culture or a perpetrator of its existence. I have even been told that a 'good high' is better than sex or food. A substance with that kind of power is capable of drawing many into its realm. The problem with narcotics in this country and the 'war on drugs' has been recognized since 1930. Here is an excerpt from a *Time* magazine article, "Manhattan police last week arrested nine men for selling narcotics... The arrests indicate that a 'dope ring' had parceled out the island... A few days before these arrests the police discovered the ring arsenal - guns and other murderous instruments... used to destroy poachers who sneaked into the allotted narcotics district (Vol. 28, 1930; as cited in Sheley, 1990; p. 422)." The drug industry has gone through several trends; each owning its own era, opium, morphine, marijuana, PCP, heroin, amphetamines, cocaine and crack (a crystalline form of cocaine base). The influence of these substances has hit every socio-economic level, and caused the deaths of many American heroes. The first federal legislation addressing narcotics was the Harrison Act, 1914. It focused on regulating and taxing opiates, and ultimately made the use of heroin and other opiate derivatives a criminal act. The Harrison Act continued to add other narcotic substances to its bylaws (i.e. cocaine in 1973) as their effects became known to our society.

Currently, America is fighting battles against crack cocaine. However, our war is not against the drugs as much as it is against the marketing strategy that caused crack cocaine to become a trend that has been felt for the last decade. "What turned crack into a craze was mass marketing that would have made
McDonalds proud. Crack was not invented; it was created by sinister geniuses who took a simple production technique to make a packaged ready-to-consume form of the product with a low unit price to entice massive numbers of consumers (Witkin, August 19, 1991; p. 45). Unlike crack, cocaine has a history that has been documented. It was initially considered to be a wonder drug by the medical profession, and by 1883 it was footnoted in many scientific papers. Sigmund Freud proscribed cocaine as a treatment for morphine addiction and alcoholism. In fact, cocaine was part of the original recipe for Coca-Cola (Sheley, 1991; p.433). Even though 180 years ago cocaine's power was misunderstood, its effects on our society today has been tied into our ever growing crime rate. A study done by Hunt et al. (1987; as cited in Sheley, 1991; p.435), showed that the cost of cocaine drives users to resort to illegal sources of income. Solving this cocaine-crime relationship is the antithesis of what was originally thought by authorities, and now their efforts are geared toward discouraging users. The reason for this is because a successful dealer can not be an addict, it would drive him/her out of business. So, in order to destroy a business, one needs to take its customers away, this has been done through education, advertisements and the frightening relationship drugs have with AIDS. This hypothesis is widely accepted by upper police force agencies and the "war on drugs" has been felt by some of the large dealers, especially for heroin distributors. For example, between 1975-1986, heroin use by young adult and college students has remained at 0.2 percent (Johnson et al., 1987; cited in Sheley, 1991; p. 424). However, heroin's popularity has been replaced by crack cocaine, a drug that gives its true high without injections, which for many addicts solves the AIDS threat. "The final and most important force behind the push for crack was the growing street demand for a simple form of a smokable cocaine (Witkin, August 19,1991; p.46)."
The crack epidemic is supported by three classes of criminals. The first is the chemists and drug traffickers who use the small time users/dealers to set-up the operations within the cities. The second is composed of the "indigenous crime organizations, common in most medium and large American cities, which began to seize local markets from the smaller operators (Witkin, August 19, 1991; p. 45)." The third includes the gangs, both the organized and unorganized (i.e. a family drug house where no real violence occurs) who sell the product to people inhabiting every corner of their city. Each class will continue to pose a threat to our society unless the demand for crack cocaine ceases. Many upstanding citizens may wonder how could someone become involved in such criminal infiltration, and why? There are two responses to this issue: if your environment breeds dispair and poverty, and if the abrasive neighborhood that an individual has grown up in offers nothing but a minimum wage job, the fast money from a drug operation becomes quite inviting. On the other hand, despite an individual's surroundings, right and wrong are the same on both sides of the tracks; dealers (and users) just make bad choices and should be held responsible for their mistakes, not society. Both arguments are logical. Anthropologist Philippe Bourgois, who studied crack dealers in East Harlem believes that "it is unrealistic to expect a youngster growing up in an environment of evil to develop a healthy concept of equal opportunity and personal responsibility... The common sense emerging among the newest generation is that 'The System' hates them (Witkin, August 19, 1991; p. 53)." This is why many blacks living on the lower socio-economic plateau become blinded with the idea that dealing is their only means to prosperity. Nonetheless, should society excuse the criminal infiltrators because they grew up on the wrong side of town, or should we stick to the same old maxims our grandparents did, when you choose to make a mistake, you also choose to pay for it? Over
the past nine months, I have had the opportunity to interview 27
four repeat offenders who have been involved with drugs. They
have dealt drugs as well as used them. Their views on the crime-
drug relationship cover both issues that I have raised above.

The first two interviews I had were with Alias Bob, a sixty-
nine year old black gentleman, and his wife, Alias Jane, who is
forty-four years old. They both grew up in Arkansas with a family
that enforced Baptist values. His education stopped at fourth
grade and hers at tenth grade. The reason for this was because
of the times; Bob's 'boss' needed him to work full-time in the
plantation fields and Jane's single mother needed her to start a
full-time job to help out with expenses. Bob's entire family
worked for a 'boss,' including his fourteen siblings. Despite their
deprived young adulthood, they never became involved with
drugs until they moved north. Eight of their eleven children
became involved with drug abuse and later dealt various drugs
with other established dealers in the Champaign County area. At
first, Bob and Jane only used marijuana, but in the mid 1980's,
Bob's son exposed them both to cocaine. Bob's son's plan was to
hook his step-mother and his father on cocaine so that they
would not forbid his dealing, which was based out of their home.
It is hard to believe that a grown child would go to such damaging
extremes to get what he wants. Once Bob and Jane became
addicted to cocaine, they decided that dealing was better money
than picking up cans and bringing them to a recycling plant. Both
Bob and Jane were controlled by a substance that was imposed
on them by their children. This relationship is difficult to
understand when most of us can relate to peer pressure, but not
child pressure. I asked Bob and Jane if they were scared of
trying drugs, as well as the effects they may have on their
health. Both replied with a clam 'no' as they chuckled, as if the
highs they experienced were risk free. Is it possible that certain
corners of our society today still do not know the circumstances
and dangers that drug use creates? Although, they admitted that they both know that it was wrong to allow their home to become a 'drug house,' their reflections on their lives while involved with drugs, brought about memories when they had more money than they ever had before. This is apparent when looking at their records. Bob and Jane are both repeat offenders, who returned to the exact same environment from which they came, a drug house! Why, I asked? They responded laxadascically, that they needed to earn money from somewhere, especially when you have eleven children and approximately thirty grandchildren. However, they both told me that this was their last time in jail, because drugs were "no good," as well as the fact that it is too expensive to keep getting caught!

It is hard to believe a repeat offender when he says he is going to stay out of trouble, because in reality, he is usually proven a liar. Despite their rooted dishonesty with the lawyers, judges and officers who gave them multiple chances, they are candid with questions concerning who they believe is to blame for their mistakes. As mentioned previously, a criminal can either blame himself/herself or society for his involvement with crime. According to Bob and Jane, no one can be held responsible for their mistakes except Bob and Jane, since they were the ones who made them. When I interviewed Bob and Jane they reflected this attitude. Their feelings toward the criminal justice system and their arresting officers was respectful. They understood that they were paying for the poor choices they made. In fact, they both told me that some of their best friends were police officers. I also asked Bob and Jane if they felt that blacks were subjected to a lifestyle of crime more than whites. Jane responded with a horizontal shake of her head and a smirk on her face, "now-a-days young black folks have more opportunities to keep themselves out of trouble!" She mentioned that there is no reason that a young black person cannot be as educated as a
young white person. The government is trying to make up for the mistakes it made with blacks, and that all of the new education programs that have been established since her time gives young black individuals several opportunities to succeed beyond their parents. Both Bob and Jane believe that if an individual blames society for the mistakes that he/she has made, then repeating those mistakes is inevitable.

"All (the "brothers") had dreams - variants, usually, on the American Dream of home, family and material well-being. Some became outlaws. Some zigzagged between the margins of the economy and the street. A few succeeded in the mainstream. The majority would not; the world they were born to, like the projects they lived in, was too heavy with the expectation of their defeat ("Brothers," Newsweek, March 23, 1987; Shley, 1990; p.114)." This quotation describes the attitude and views of Alias Mike, a white twenty-two year old male and Alias John, a black, thirty-two year old male. Mike has been a criminal most of his life, with his first offense at age fifteen. With trips in and out of juvenile correctional facilities, Mike's tendencies continued to include criminal patterns throughout his young adulthood. When I asked him why he would even risk experimenting with cocaine (and other drugs) he responded, "it isn't as serious as people say... it's all in your mind." I call his attitude plain denial, considering he admitted to smoking marijuana laced with cocaine. Mike's involvement with crime includes motor vehicle theft, possession of illegal substances, probation violation and aggravated battery (which was against a seventeen year old girl who is carrying his child). When I asked Mike why he continues to break the law, he responded that "when you see dealers so often and then see people who work at McDonalds for minimum wage and don't have nothing ... they could work for forty hours and not even make two hundred dollars," you choose not to work at McDonalds. He feels that society has placed him in a position
where the only legitimate job he is capable of holding is one at a fast food joint. He continued to explain that, "crime is caused by the environment and society an individual grows up in," so to paraphrase his opinion, if you only see bad, then bad becomes what is only right. "Once you commit a crime, there really isn't no other route to go, jobs aren't available", and when you return to the streets, "you lose your will to say 'no'" to the influences that put you in jail to begin with. Mike's continuous denial of his addiction to the fast money that a "chop shop" (where you sell a stolen car) and a drug deal may provide and manifested laziness to work hard, possibly finish high school and obtain an honest job are the reasons why Mike has been sentenced to prison for ten years. Considering that Mike's conviction was decided during his trial for one of his least serious offenses illustrates that this community saw that Mike is only capable of adding new offenses to his record. Obviously, Mike has not learned from his mistakes.

Unlike Mike, John began experimenting with drugs when he was a young man (approximately twenty years old). He held a secure job as a painter and had benefits through his union that allowed him to live a "normal" life as a member of the working middle class. John's involvement with drugs compounded with his alcoholism turned him into a criminal. John was a victim of peer pressure. His friends introduced him to "toot" (cocaine) and he immediately became addicted. He blames his willingness to give into the pressure on his lack of education. He feels that if society had given him a proper education, then he would not have lost his wife, children and capacity to succeed. I believe that John's attitude toward his demise and his mistakes is going to continue to be his downfall, especially since he continues to return to the same group of friends that introduced him to drugs. John may understand that an education is crucial to succeed in today's society, but it is certainly not the only way to stay out of trouble. John's criminal record is an array of violent activity that
could have been prevented if he would have re evaluated why he should not continue involving himself with such an offending group of people. His record includes substance abuse, armed robbery, aggravated battery and drug conspiracy. These offenses all occurred while he was under the influence of drugs (including alcohol). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, (1983a), alcohol plays a significant part in the number of offenses that occur. A census of state prisons showed that half of the inmates admitted to drinking prior to their offense, and a third of them were drinking heavily (Sheley, 1991; p.431). Also, it has been found that the amount of criminal activity increases with the frequency of cocaine use (Hunt et al.,1987; as cited in Sheley, 1991; p. 434). I do not mention these trends to excuse the actions of Bob, Jane, Mike or John, but to illustrate how important it is to rid our society of its poisons, even though there are some users who have not turned to a lifestyle of crime, but, even trying one marijuana joint is against the LAW!
The admissibility of scientific evidence to a court of law usually makes up the most impressionable part of a case. With all drug cases, the substances recovered are submitted for drug test analysis. This procedure is to verify that the presumed drugs are indeed controlled-illegal substances. In the case of Bob and Jane, the drugs collected were by means of a drug raid, or search warrant execution, whereas Mike and John were set-up by an undercover police officer who had reason to believe that they were involved in the use and distribution of drugs. A drug raid is a much more complicated, intricate and lengthy procedure, than an undercover set-up. Therefore, the procedures for a proper seizure of a 'drug house' should be followed as accurately as possible. If any of the procedures are not followed, the admissibility of the evidence in the case may not be allowed and the results of the tests may be considered invalid.

The planning of a search warrant execution begins with obtaining the floor diagram of the 'drug house'. It is crucial that the drug task force knows the set-up of the house or apartment for several reasons. The bathroom has to be searched first because drugs are strategically hidden close to the toilet for quick disposal. The officer with this responsibility needs to be prepared to face any physical situations that may arise because if the suspect is in the process of flushing the drugs, the officer may have to restrain him/her in a physical manner. This is critical, because the case depends on this evidence. All exits and windows need to be covered so no one escapes. The placement of rooms needs to be known so officers can immediately search for suspects that may hide themselves and prevent any attempted attacks against a task force officer. The location of the rooms plays an important role in the design of the entrance strategy.
Every officer is assigned to a room and is responsible for securing its surrounding area. Once assignments are planned, the raid kit is assembled. This includes paper bags for evidence collection, light bulbs (which are commonly missing), drug testing kits (for field testing), a scale and camera equipment. Then, the battering ram and the Chicago rake tool (which is a pole with a rake-like end used to open screen doors) are assigned to specific individuals. The entrance of the task force or drug team is quick. Before entering, they knock, announce "POLICE" and ram through the door. This all happens under a minute’s time. Several people wonder why the suspects are not given the opportunity to open the door. Firstly, it is for safety purposes. There is a high risk of injury if the suspects are given the opportunity to open the door.

For example, if one-and-half minutes were allotted to the suspects to open the door before the battering ram would be used, and the suspect took one-minute thirty-two seconds, then the suspect could be severely injured from the force that is created by the battering ram opening the door. Also, giving the suspect(s) more than a few seconds to react to the drug raid may endanger the lives of the drug force team members, if a suspect(s) were to obtain a weapon. A "surprise attack" also eliminates the opportunity for escape, or disposal of the drugs.

Once the drug team has entered the home of the suspects, all individuals are secured on the floor (including older children). They are hand-cuffed and searched (by an officer of the same gender) for weapons, drugs or cash rolls (which would indicate that a drug sale occurred). Once the search warrant is read to the suspects and a copy is given to them, the task force team begins to search each room. The strategy used is very thorough. They start at one corner of the room and search from the floor to the ceiling until they reach the opposite corner. Then, the contents of the room are investigated; with dressers, desks, and beds, etc. dismantled. Every article of clothing is completely searched,
socks, pockets and linings most importantly. If any evidence is found, the evidence collector and photographer record its position in the room (i.e. northeast corner of bedroom), time at which it was found, type of evidence (i.e. cocaine ball), who found it and where it was found (i.e. in a sock under a drawer). Then photographs are taken. All of this is done before the evidence is collected and placed in the appropriate container for shipment to the forensic lab. Both the officer who found the evidence and the evidence collector who records the evidence, write reports describing what the other did. This is for the protection of the case. It prevents any future disputes that may arise over the validity of the evidence. I had the privilege of attending a drug raid and witnessing the procedures described above, as well as the horror that is instilled in the suspect(s).

The search warrant execution I attended was based on informant information and the suspect's known record. Alias Raymond was the dealer on which the drug team was focusing their efforts. The most interesting fact in this particular case is the criminal record of Raymond. The drug raid was on December 9, 1991, and Raymond had already been arrested three times in the month of December for drug possession. In cases like this one, it is easy to become discouraged because the efforts of the officers seem wasted when the offender can repeat the same crime four times in two weeks. Despite the frustration, the evidence found at Raymond's 'drug house' put him in jail for two months. The evidence consisted of a one-ounce cocaine ball that was found in the pocket of a work smock, six dime bags of marijuana and cocaine, three which were found on the suspect and the other three bags were packaged for distribution. Aside from drugs, and a .38-revolver, several bags of shoplifted items were found. Shoplifted items are very commonly found when drug raids are conducted. This is because dealers often take food and clothes in exchange for drugs if their clients have no money.
Dealers who are users also shoplift because they use their money to support their habits.

Every task force team has its own style of conducting a search warrant execution. The attitude of the officers is usually set by the suspect's behavior. If the suspect(s) should attempt resistance, the drug team may become extra aggressive. On the other hand, as in the case of Jane and Bob, their cooperation with the drug team can display their respect for the system and their willingness to pay for their mistakes. When there are no physical disputes between the officers and suspects the case may run smoother and the intensity level will be lower. When Raymond's home was raided, there were two other individuals, a woman and her child (2-3 years old). Although Raymond did not try to forcibly resist arrest, the child's insistent and confused screams of horror were powerful enough to keep any physical actions to a minimum. The drug team officers that I met have warm hearts and truly pity the children that get dragged into the crime culture. One officer told me that this particular drug house was probably one of the cleanest they had ever seen. Also, more often than not, they will raid a home and the children will be involved in the assembly line for the packaging or making of the drugs. This is one of the saddest images they see on a search warrant execution. In general, these officers try to eliminate their aggressions when young children are involved. This is because they do not want to make the experience more traumatic. It makes me proud when I hear the considerations that the drug team tries to follow.

As mentioned before, each drug team or task force approaches the searching process differently. Some of the techniques that I noticed being used during the raid on Raymond's home were interesting. But as they told me, most of the techniques are based on experience, because mistakes have been
made due to details being overlooked. As the officers searched the clothing, including laundry, they crushed each article, rolling it between their two hands, this protects them from needles pricking through the clothes, and it increases their chances of finding drugs that are often hidden within the lining of the clothes. When moving objects within the rooms, the officers look for unbalanced items which indicate that something is hidden within (i.e. lamp). It was interesting to find several tennis balls that were cut open. It is common for drugs to be hidden inside balls and then passed on to other individuals in a casual engagement. Considering that this drug raid was conducted a few weeks before Christmas, Raymond’s home was full of Christmas presents. Unfortunately, the little 3-year old boy had to witness several strangers (the officers) opening his gifts. What was probably going to be the biggest day of his life was being unraveled before his teary eyes. The officers, however, were not filled with a childhood glow when they searched this child’s Christmas gifts for drugs. They lacked a smile and the spirit of Christmas. There is a lot of horror that becomes instilled in one’s mind when he sees his own home trashed and turned upside down. The woman certainly was not an innocent bystander. She too was a drug user and held knowledge of drugs being stored in her home. However, she was not the perpetrator the drug team set out after. In fact, no charges were brought up against this woman.

Although I was a privileged observer, I was invited to ask questions about anything that caught my attention. Even though I inquired about procedures, other cases and tactics, I could not help but be paralyzed by the terrifying screams of a child. I found myself confused, considering I did not have an authoritative attitude toward Raymond and the woman, but rather pity for what was happening to their home. On the other hand, I wanted both of them to pay for the unnecessary terror that the small
child was forced to face. Despite my conflicting feelings during the entire search warrant execution, the experience was truly a test of will. Searching for evidence during a drug raid is a tiring and lengthy process. I observed until the early morning of the next day and exhausted because I could not participate in any of the action. I was also paranoid that I would bring cockroaches home when my legs gave out and I seeked the comfort of the walls and floor.

Although this search warrant execution left impressions on my mind and taught me lessons of good and evil, for Raymond it was just another day. Raymond was hardly affected by his arrest on December 9, 1991. In fact, he posted bond to his charge of unlawful possession of a controlled substance. And on February 1, 1992, he was arrested again for selling drugs; possession of cannabis with intent to deliver. On February 28, 1992, he was charged with unlawful possession of a controlled substance and on March 21, 1992, he was again arrested for the exact same charge. The only difference this time was his lawyer, who made Raymond plead guilty to possession with intent to deliver a look alike substance. He was sentenced to three years in prison. The Criminal Justice System's efforts to rid the streets of people like Raymond is consistent, but sometimes thought of as a waste of time. However, we (as a nation) have to keep trying. We need to follow the wise words of Thomas Edison, "There is no substitute for hard work, especially when it benefits others (Life; 1932)." Hopefully, the hard work of all drug enforcement teams will be felt in years to come, because their efforts are certainly benefiting all of us.
ISSUES SURROUNDING MURDER

"It's time for this country to face up to the fact that we are a violent society (Hackett, 1990)." The United States is the murder capital of the world. Why? This is the question everyone is asking. There are several different reasons given for this; the immaturity of this country, the breakdown of the American family, the overwhelming drug problem, the easy access to guns, or maybe because America was founded on violence. All of these opinions validate that there are many factors that influence our ever-growing homicide rate. Unfortunately, the United States had 25,800 murders in 1991, compared to 23,448 in 1990. This averages to ten killings for every 100,000 citizens. This is a horrifying figure, when you compare it to 1.3 in Japan and 5.5 in Britain (Shannon, 1992). According to Shannon (1992), every twenty-two minutes, another American is shot, stabbed, beaten or strangled to death. It is truly an unimaginable statistic to comprehend.

Every time Americans hear a new statistic about the ever-growing crime rates, we helplessly keep asking questions. Where is this problem beginning? How has it continued to evolve? Why can't we control it? Several studies have been done to help answer these questions. According to Loftin and Parker (1985; as cited in Sheley, 1990; p.152), poverty is a consistent and positive factor influencing the various types of homicides, granted this is independent of racial composition, region the city is located and the population size. Another interesting study inquires into the effects of routine activity on homicide. Messner and Tardiff (1985; as cited in Sheley, 1990; p.153), gathered data on this subject, which was based on New York City's homicide statistics.
They came up with several hypotheses. For example, their data showed that males are more likely to be victims of homicide away from their home than females. Whites are more often victims of homicide by strangers than any other race. People who are employed are more often victims of homicide away from home than individuals who are unemployed. Each of these cases suggests that the lifestyle or routine an individual chooses may subject him to greater or lesser exposure to potential homicide (Sheley, 1998; p. 154). When America hears the results of a study like the routine/lifestyle activity theory, it is hard to believe that to decrease our chances of being murdered, we need to stay unemployed, become ‘home bodies’ and never talk to strangers. However, this theory provides an empirically important relationship that homicide has with the daily routines of victims of homicide in New York City. Unfortunately, all the studies done on homicide have not had an overwhelming effect on the number of attempted and completed murders. In fact, New York City has had a thirty percent increase in murders since the 1980’s (Hackett, 1990). Apparently there is no single primary influence for this increase in homicide.

Murder is no longer just a result of the mob, robbery or clinically insane individuals. Today, murder is more often a result of trivial arguments, people who seek revenge or a thrill kill, as well as by mobsters/gangsters, robbers and mentally disturbed individuals. Here are some examples of murder that demonstrate how unpredictable murder is today. In Houston, on September 29, 1990, Alfred Rodgers killed his brother over the last piece of holiday ham (Hackett, 1990). In January of 1992 a fourteen year old girl stabbed her thirteen year old boyfriend to death because he wanted to break up with her (Shannon, 1992). In December of 1991 a murder case here in Champaign County involved two homosexuals. The situation resulted in the stabbing of one of the
men by his acquaintance. Both men had engaged in intercourse; however, the acquaintance found out that his partner had AIDS, so he stabbed him out of revenge. In Chicago, a twenty-three year old woman pulled the trigger in a drive-by shooting, because the victims were wearing colors of a rival gang. The most shocking fact is that her two month old twin daughters were in the car with her during the incident (Shannon, 1992). Each of these excerpts from homicide cases displays how random and hostile murder can be. Although, these are extreme cases, it is important to realize that there are more of these bizarre, extraordinary situations arising each day, where people feel that murder is the solution to their problems. Although I do not know if these offenders won on appeal or their justifications, their excuses cannot refute that a murder was committed under the described circumstances and the outcome for the victims involved cannot be reversed. The Federal Center for Disease Control, now considers murder an epidemic (Shannon, 1992). Edward Loughran, Commissioner of the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, says that, "We're seeing more and more kids growing up in hopeless situations choosing violence (Hackett, 1990)." The largest common denominator in all cities is guns. Two-thirds of all murders are committed with firearms, compared to a generation ago, when only one quarter of all crimes were firearm related (Hackett, 1990). So, in general, we can attribute drugs, easy access to guns, alcohol and substance abuse, poverty, racial discrimination, predictable daily routines and cultural acceptance of violent behavior as the contributing factors to America's shameful title of "The Murder Capital of the World."

Considering that there are so many influences affecting America's crime rate, solving the problem is difficult. We are continuously being compared to other countries. Canada, for example, our closest neighbor, whose mannerisms and style are unmistakably similar to America's has a murder rate which is
approximately one third less than ours. This graph quantitatively illustrates the murder rate in both Canada and the United States. (See graph below, Taken from Mclean's; November 11, 1991)

The extreme differences in murder rates is misleading because there are many more factors influencing America’s potential criminals. For example, Canada does not have the vast racial composition of America, therefore less racial tension exists. Also,
American cities are closer together and more populated. To bring up these points is not to justify America's increasing crime rate, or to discourage efforts to solve the problems, but to remind us that we, as a nation, can do better. My intentions are not to over-analyze the murder rate of the United States by comparing us to Canada, but to raise issues and expose the reader to problems that surround us. Murder is a threat that we all live with. Its aftermath is irreversible and its victims are silenced, never taking part in their revenge. The responsibility of the investigators entails finding the offender so justice can be served, and preventing any procedural mishaps from occurring so the proper punishment is mandated and enforced.
PROCEDURE FOR A HOMICIDE INVESTIGATION BASED ON A CASE FROM CHAMPAIGN COUNTY

It has been previously mentioned that guns have been the leading weapon in murder cases today. However, the case that I will be describing (it will be referred to as the Smith case) did not involve any firearm use, but a much more cruel and grotesque method. Unlike most murder cases, Mr. Smith, the offender was not a graduate of our penal system. His actions were unexpected and irrational.

On the early evening of a humid July day, a witness, Alias Scott, was jogging down a country road. As he was jogging, he noticed a station wagon parked on the side of the road. He slowed his pace and peeked inside the vehicle. He noticed that a female was lying down on her side in the back of the car with a plastic bag over her head. Scott immediately notified the police. When the police arrived they noticed that the victim did indeed have a large plastic garbage bag over her head and was wearing nothing but underpants, a tee-shirt and tennis shoes. When the investigators arrived on the scene, they wanted to know if this was a suicide or murder. Before they removed the victim’s body from the vehicle, they wrapped her hands and forearms in paper bags. This procedure protects the hands from picking up any of the surrounding debris and prevents the hands from releasing any powder residue, hair or cloth fibers, blood, body fluids or skin that may have gotten trapped under the fingernails. The investigators originally thought that the victim was shot, but her head was too bloody to clearly tell. An autopsy was going to be performed since it can unmistakably verify the cause of death. Since it is common for victims to attempt blocking their face from a bullet or perpetrator’s fists, the investigators proceeded to cover the victim’s hands. Once the investigators looked at the
head of the victim and searched the scene where she was found. They deduced that it was not a suicide. With the presumption that the death of Mrs. Smith (her identification was made based on several factors, license plate, vehicle papers, drivers license etc.) involved foul play, the investigators approached the case with procedures used for a homicide investigation (dental records were used the next day to verify that the victim was Mrs. Smith). After the police looked into the record of the victim, (for home address, family members etc.) they noticed that Mr. Smith reported Mrs. Smith missing at six o'clock that morning. Instinctively, the investigators went to Mrs. Smith’s home to interview her husband.

When they arrived at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Smith, they explained to Mr. Smith that they were following up on the missing person call he had made that morning. It is procedure for an investigator not to inform the interviewees that a body was found (as well as the vehicle in this case). There are several reasons why this information is withheld when interviewing suspects. Firstly, if the person you are interviewing is the murderer, it is important to lock him/her in on a story, on a friendly basis. This will allow the interviewees to place trust in what ever the investigators decide to say, whether it is true or not. Also, delivering news of a death creates an emotional scene which only delays the investigation. When Mr. Smith answered the door, the investigators explained that they wanted to interview him, so that they could find his wife. The story Mr. Smith told the investigator matched the story he gave the police operator at six o'clock in the morning. He claimed that at ten thirty at night, he and his wife had an argument. At six o'clock the next morning he awoke and discovered that the car was missing, and therefore she had not returned home after she left the house the night before. However, Mr. Smith was not answering the questions like a concerned husband, as well as the
fact that he did not know the answers to questions that every husband would know. This is typical of someone who knows about a crime and is scared to reveal too much information, therefore, they act as if they do not know anything. Since the investigators held suspicions (which is normal) about the validity of Mr. Smith's story, they asked him to sign a search warrant. He signed it without any forceful coercion (which is usually successful when it is asked while the investigator and suspect are still on friendly terms).

The investigator began searching the Smith residence. He noticed while he was interviewing Mr. Smith that the washer and dryer were both on. So he opened the dryer and found a comforter, which slightly concerned him. This seemed odd to Investigator Daniels because Mr. Smith's wife was missing and he had doubts that Mr. Smith found time to do the laundry in-between working, and worrying about his wife. When he searched the washer, he found two soaked pillows, which he thought was also unusual, because he had never heard of anyone ever putting the entire pillow in the washer. Although these findings seemed suspicious, the investigator did not question Mr. Smith about it because he thought that maybe his children had gone to the bathroom in their bed during the night and therefore, he would have to wash the comforter and pillows. Then he decided to dig through a pile of dirty laundry which was on the floor next to the washer. In the pile, Investigator Daniels found one pair of shorts that had a substance that appeared to be dried blood. In the next room, where the interview was conducted, the investigator noticed that there was a piece of cardboard covering the opening of a garbage can. When he looked inside, he found a drenched pillow stuffed into the bottom of the can, with what also appeared to be blood stains. At this point his suspicion grew, the investigator called his boss, reported his findings and requested back-up investigators, as well as a crime scene
technician. Requesting back-up was a safety precaution, considering that Mr. Smith was acting nervous and jumpy. It is important to realize when investigating a criminal case, that the evidence should never be jeopardized, or the lives of any of the officers. When Investigator Daniels made the decision to stop the investigation and wait for other investigators, he was securing the evidence, as well as eliminating any opportunities where he might have his back turned to the suspect, which might endanger his life. According to Investigator Daniels, "he knew I found stuff... I knew, he knew, that I knew, and he knew, that I knew, that he knew, but we were both acting as if everything was fine; we were both dancing around each other." This type of situation could have pushed Mr. Smith to engage in desperate behavior, therefore the investigators kept their eyes on him and awaited their back-up.

When the crime scene technician arrived, as well as the Captain and other members of the investigative team, the search for more evidence began. When they went to the bedroom, they decided to flip the mattress over. They saw a large blotch of presumed blood covering the upper portion of the mattress. Since the bloody mattress gave them an idea of how the victim died, the investigators had a better idea of how to continue searching. It was apparent that Mrs. Smith was killed in a way which caused excessive bleeding. Therefore, they looked for bone fragments and blood spatters. On the ceiling, plants and bed frame the crime scene technician found blood. Bone fragments were also discovered when a formal and thorough investigation was conducted by the crime scene technician. The technician collected all the evidence in the appropriate containers, photographed the scene, and measured the crime scene (See Appendix C).

While the technician was investigating, Investigator Daniels interviewed Mr. Smith on the front porch of his home.
Investigator Daniels kept in mind that the suspicions he had were only based on instinct and presumptions, he did not accuse Mr. Smith of murdering his wife. Instead, he explained that he felt that more had happened to his wife than what was previously assumed. At that point the investigators revealed to Mr. Smith that his wife had been found dead. Mr. Smith broke down emotionally. The investigators tried to use Mr. Smith's emotional state of mind as a tool to get the truth about the happenings from the night before. Both investigators began drawing upon their relationships with their wives. The purpose of this was to make Mr. Smith feel as if they could all relate to one another, as husbands, establishing a common ground. They spoke of the hardships of marriage, and the frustration wives create for their husbands. Although this may seem sexist, the technique is extremely helpful. In essence, you minimize what happened, this relieves pressure and guilt that the suspect is feeling. Identifying with the feelings that you believe the suspect feels, creates an idea in the suspect's mind that you, the investigator are justifying his actions. If the investigator can relate to the suspect, and make him believe everyone, including law abiding police officers, feel the same things, then the suspect may confess.

After the investigators spoke to Mr. Smith for about a half of an hour, they decided to put more pressure on him, because he still denied that he knew what had truly happened to Mrs. Smith. The investigator decided to tell Mr. Smith that they had found the blood stained mattress in the master bedroom. Mr. Smith replied that, his wife had her menstrual cycle recently and that she was a heavy bleeder. The investigators responded by telling Mr. Smith that the crime scene technician could tell where the blood came from by performing a simple test. Investigator Daniels continued to tell him that the test showed that the blood came from Mrs. Smith's head. Although this is not true, investigators are allowed
to lie if it does not place the suspect in a position where his rights are violated. Also, investigators may not tell a lie consisting of a promise or deal that is not within their power. For example, Investigator Daniels could not promise Mr. Smith a three year sentence if he cooperated and confessed. However, an investigator can manipulate, withhold or make up evidence in order to put 'the squeeze' on a suspect, and provoke a reaction. It is important to remember that the more an investigator wrongfully lies to a suspect, the more likely a jury will feel compassion for the suspect and resentment toward the police force. However, if a police officer justifies his dishonesty with probable cause, then it is considered procedure instead of entrapment. But if someone is innocent, then lying to them will not make them confess!

Mr. Smith did not confess. However, Investigator Daniels could feel that Mr. Smith's collapse was very close. He remembered that during their original interview, when Investigator Daniels was inquiring about their marriage, hobbies, routines etc., Mr. Smith mentioned that he was a God-fearing man. That his wife sang for their church and that he played the piano. Investigator Daniels then began a different manipulation approach. He told Mr. Smith that he could feel that he was a good Christian, and that he was a loyal son of Jesus Christ. He continued to speak about how making amends with your sins on earth was the most important thing to do before one dies. He reminded Mr. Smith that God's forgiveness was the most important thing a man should seek. However, the only way God can forgive a person is if they confess their sins. Then in a very soft voice, Investigator Daniels said "Mr. Smith, you didn't mean to kill her, did you?" At that moment, when Mr. Smith's defenses were down and guilt succumbed his body, he replied, "No."
After Mr. Smith realized that he confessed in front of the investigators, he began justifying why he killed his wife. He rambled on about how she yelled at him all the time, harassed him every day, and that she never stopped nagging him when they were together. Once Mr. Smith took the first step toward cleaning his soul, Investigator Daniels was able to get the real details of the case. Mr. Smith began by telling the investigators that on the previous day, he watched the movie "The Untouchables." After he finished the movie, he went to a store to buy a Louisville Slugger baseball bat. This weapon was used by one of the mobsters in the movie to beat another mobster to death. Mr. Smith hid the bat under the bed. He told the investigators that when his wife had gone to sleep, and started to snore, he retrieved the bat and repeatedly beat her. Mr. Smith went on to describe how much blood there was, the walls were covered, and the room was splattered everywhere with blood. He openly continued and recapitulated how he moved his wife's body out into the country. He wrapped her head in a large plastic garbage bag because the blood was spilling everywhere. He took comforters to cover the body in, and so he could transport her body more easily. He then dragged her down the stairs and into the trunk space in their station-wagon. He drove her body out into the country, abandoned his vehicle and walked home (approximately one mile away).

When Mr. Smith returned home, he began cleaning the walls and the entire surrounding area where his wife's blood splattered. In the early morning, he called his wife's employer to ask if she had come into work. He called there several times, acting concerned about her whereabouts. Then, Mr. Smith placed a call to the Champaign County Sheriff's Department to inform the police that his wife was missing. Fortunately, the Champaign County Sheriff's Department's investigative team recognized all of the loose ends that Mr. Smith had left. Mr. Smith was read his
rights, arrested, and taken to the county jail to begin the
discovery process.

With a taped confession, the investigators decided to go
with a hunch, that Mr. Smith had a mistress. When they went to
his place of employment, all of his fellow employees were
questioned. They openly spoke of Mr. Smith's adultery. And,
according to his co-workers, even Mrs. Smith knew about her
husband's affairs. The mistress was a woman who Mr. Smith
worked with. When they interviewed her, she gave the
investigators all of the letters, cards, candy, stuffed toys, and
balloons Mr. Smith had given her. When she found out that Mr.
Smith had murdered his wife, she became hysterical and fully
cooperated with the investigators. She explained to the
investigators that she did not know anything about Mr. Smith's
intentions to kill his wife, and she was told by Mr. Smith that he
was going to leave his wife soon (all of which was documented in
the letters and cards she was given by Mr. Smith). The
investigators also revealed that Mr. Smith, a few days before had
talked to some co-workers about the perfect murder, and what
one would have to do to get away with murdering your wife. This
case touches on many different procedures that an investigative
team must go through when investigating a murder. Once the
facts of the case were assembled in the reports, the
investigators pursued an immediate trial that would withdraw all
of Mr. Smith's parental rights.

When Mr. Smith was formally arrested, the children were
put in the custody of Mrs. Smith's parents. There were several
facts from the case that lead the investigators' efforts for an
immediate custody trial. When Mr. Smith beat his wife to death,
both of his children were home, supposedly asleep in their beds.
Also, Mr. Smith left his three year old and eight year old children
home alone while he drove his wife's body into the country. It is
very likely that the children woke up while their father was gone and saw the blood covered walls, bed, sheets etc., during Mr. Smith's gruesome beating of their mother. It is very unlikely that Mrs. Smith silently took the repeated hammering of her head by a baseball bat. There were other instances where the children could have awakened, for example while he dragged Mrs. Smith's one hundred and sixty pound body (approximately) down the stairs, which would have certainly caused noise. There are many situations that could have provoked the Smith children to awaken. However, we will not know until the children are analyzed by psychiatrists. The county feels that the rights of the children are the most important. They hold a firm position on the issue of who deserves all parental rights. They support the parents of the victim as full-time parental guardians. If Mr. Smith's parents were to own custody, the county feels that they would not be capable of denying Mr. Smith his children. Once again, as in the case of Raymond, the children are the true victims. Deprived of a mother and a father, the Smith children are convicted to a life of confusion and insecurity. Images full of blood could also fill their minds which could result in scars that depict terror and fear. Unfortunately these children may never understand why both their parents had to be taken from them.

This case involved many interesting facts. For example, since the offender and victim were married, forensic comparisons of their fingerprints, blood, semen, cloth, hair and carpet fibers would not be useful in a court of law as to Mr. Smith's whereabouts. Also, this type of evidence is not valid as proof of contact, because contact is expected between married couples. However, there is a tremendous amount of evidence that will be used to support Mr. Smith's confession. (see below)

1. A blue and white comforter that was found on top of the victim's body (this was the blanket the victim was
wrapped in when Mr. Smith dragged her to the station wagon).

2. The plastic bags used to wrap the victim's head.
3. A pair of blue-jean shorts found in the laundry pile with bloodstains.
4. A bloody Louisville Slugger baseball bat which was found in the garage.
5. Pieces of wood that came from the Louisville Slugger baseball bat that had bloodstains.
6. Two white pillows found in the washing machine.
7. A green and white comforter that was found in the dryer (this was the bedspread from the master bedroom).
8. One white, soaked pillow with blood stains.
9. Pieces of chipped bone that were found in the master bedroom.
10. A cut out piece of bloody mattress.
11. A bloody, green bath towel that was found in-between the mattress and box spring.
12. Palm and fingerprints on the victim.
13. Several plastic garbage bags from the downstairs hallway closet.
14. A Rape Kit was administered during the autopsy, this is standard procedure.

The most crucial analysis that was conducted was blood and hair comparisons from the victim, to the blood and hair that was found on the baseball bat. This would prove that the baseball bat was indeed the murder weapon. There are several things that can be told from analyzing a few strands of hair (or fiber) (Eltzeroth and Elzerman, 1981).

1. Whether the hair is human or non-human.
2. If the hair originated from a certain individual.
3. The probable racial origin of the hair fiber.
4. Where the hair came from on the body, pubic region, head, torso, face or extremities.
5. Whether the hair was removed by force.
6. Descriptive characteristics like, color, length, dyed, recently cut, damaged, burned etc..
7. If it is natural or synthetic.
8. If the fiber originated from a certain type of fabric (i.e. cotton).
9. Or, if there are any foreign substances on the fiber.

For this particular case, these examinations will be done to thoroughly analyze the hair fibers from the victim, so that when this case comes to trial, the defense attorney cannot dispute the validity of a perfect match. The victim's blood will also be submitted for analysis but it is separately tested from the blood on the baseball bat. Separate tests keep fewer mistakes from arising and fewer accusations of confused blood samples from being made. Then once there are results, the two reports are compared. The blood tests that are run are routine, as in the Senter case (aggravated sexual assault). Blood tests were done on all the bloody articles of clothing and the mattress, pillows and comforter. The master roll of garbage bags was taken from the hallway closet because, if there were no confession, or if Mr. Smith's attorney made him recant his confession, then the garbage bags could be submitted for analysis. Although this would involve more than the state forensic lab, it has been done before. When garbage bags are cut off a master plastic roll at the manufacturer, different striation patterns are created that make each roll unique. Therefore, if you have one garbage bag, you can match it to its appropriate roll, which would lead you to the household where the perpetrator lived.

Fortunately, Mr. Smith's confession is still a strong factor in his case. Although his case is still pending, it exemplifies the skill,
patience and strategy needed when investigating a murder. However, it is important to realize that not all murder investigations probe an investigator's instincts. There are times when a perpetrator is devious enough to lengthen an investigation. When this occurs, investigators persist searching the crime scene because evidence left behind may be hiding!
The forensic sciences have modernized the entire criminal justice system. The capability to analyze a single hair fiber or a drop of semen is a priceless power that criminal investigators have access to. The absolute identifications and assumptions that can be made have eliminated many wrongful arrests as well as convictions. The role of the expert witness, who is the individual who explains evidence to a court of law, is invaluable like the evidence that supports a criminal case. The expert witness is the judge and jury's liaison between the physical evidence and the scientific technique used to analyze it. However, the underlying scientific theory should be considered valid by the scientific community; the technique used should be known to be reliable; and the technique should be shown to have been properly applied in the respective case. Even though the expert witness plays a crucial part in a criminal case, it is important that a court of law prevent testimony from unqualified witnesses. Higher standards should be enforced and obeyed when expert witnesses are admitted as interpreters of evidence. This would not hinder the legal process but prevent attorneys from manipulating the physical evidence.

The evidence collection process is equally as important as the evidence itself. Preventing interferences with the crime scene is the responsibility of the first police officer to arrive to the scene. His primary duty, after sealing the scene and documenting the crime and its witnesses, is to deter transfer and exchange of evidence from the victim(s), from outside police force members and the from the public. Once the crime scene is secure, a crime scene technician begins preserving the evidence and its surrounding area. He must follow proper procedures so the evidence is admissible and not disputable in a court of law.
All violent crimes are highly feared and unfortunately highly likely. Women are doubtlessly victimized more often by rapists than men. However, all levels, sexes and ages of society can become the prey of a rapist. Aggravated criminal sexual assault (or rape), is very common today. It occurs between strangers, friends and family members. In the case of *State of Illinois v. Senter, (1992)* a generous, concerned gesture was transformed into a devious, premeditated and brutal violation of human demeanor and dignity. The offender, Senter, was a guiltless child and was only tried as an adult because his sixteenth birthday was two days after his crime. Senter had been through ‘the system’ several times, and when he was arrested all he could say was “When’s my father go’in to come get me?”

The drug industry has poisoned society for over fifty years. Drug addicts/dealers are repeat offenders who gain not only self-satisfaction from their high, but a profit at the expense of others. Several convicted drug dealers have squirmed their way through their sentences, which has lead to disrespect and lack of fear in America’s criminal punishment/rehabilitation system. Crack cocaine is America’s new vice. It is an addiction that does not require needles, and provides a quick, cheap high. The battle against crack is a tough one, because “to solve crack, you had to first solve the overall cocaine problem, because crack was just a marketing technique (Witkin, 1991; p.50).” Crack cocaine is truly worrying the upper police drug enforcement agencies. Its power entices too many Americans and its aftermath destroys too many lives.

Murder, the most serious crime, is another offense which leaves permanent scars. The statistics surrounding homicide are horrifying. They have lead to a label that America is not proud of, “The Murder Capital of the World.” The cause of America’s high
homicide rate can be attributed to several factors; access to guns and drugs, predictable routines and overall embedded violence. Murder's most horrible consequence is the victims' irreversible position; never partaking in their justice or revenge. However, there are less unsolved murder cases than any other offense. America's police enforcement agencies have devoted a lot of their efforts to retaliating against murderers. In the Smith case, Mr. Smith treated his wife as an obstacle in his path to happiness. Her vows to him were forgotten by his selfish, despicable desires to be with his mistress. Nonetheless, Mr. Smith will not escape his deserved punishment. The investigators on his case were careful to follow procedures accurately. They do not want the evidence or Mr. Smith's confession to be disputed during the trial.

My internship with several of Champaign County's police agencies has truly enhanced my knowledge, confidence and capabilities as a hopeful crime scene investigator/technician. I have thoroughly enjoyed every case and issue that I have been exposed to. My feeling have been stirred by many of the sad images that I have seen. However, in this line of work, sensitivity is an emotion that often interferes with objectivity; therefore, experience is the only coach that can control it. My teachers throughout this internship have prepared me for a field that is full of surprises. I have learned that surprises are not always fun, especially when they are accompanied by shock. My most shocking revelation is that the children of the offenders and the offended suffer as much as the victims. I know that my dedication in this field will be virtuous, because victims, whether they are the children who are helplessly dragged into the crime, or the individuals who are violated, drive my desires to help them and pursue their revenge, so justice will be served!
Here is an example of an actual report from the Illinois State Forensic Laboratory. This report has a detailed table which shows the blood genetic marker analysis that was conducted on Senter (the offender) and the victim Jane Smith.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>ABO</th>
<th>Lewis</th>
<th>PGH</th>
<th>ESD</th>
<th>CLO</th>
<th>EAP</th>
<th>ADA</th>
<th>AK</th>
<th>Gc</th>
<th>Tt</th>
<th>Hp</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>FEPA</th>
<th>Combined U.S. Population Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>WD</td>
<td>WAD</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14A</td>
<td>Prentice Senter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A-B+</td>
<td>WAD</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloodstains:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bag, Victim's Car, Area 1</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>2-1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shirt, Bloodstain, Area 1</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Shirt, Senter, Area 1</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shorts, Senter</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dollar bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>WAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shorts, Senter, Area 1</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>ABO</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>FOK</td>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>GLO</td>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Hp</td>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>PEP</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Seminal Stains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vaginal swab</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vaginal swab</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Inc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAD = No Activity Detected

Inc = Inconclusive

Combined U.S. Population Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combined U.S. Population Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a copy of the evidence report. It gives a detailed list of the evidence. It also has a description of the conclusions made which were based on the evidence found at Senter's home, in the Jane Smith's car and on her body.
The following evidence was removed from Evidence Locker 030 at the Springfield Forensic Science Laboratory on May 13, 1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Plastic bag and paper bag</td>
<td>Human blood identified. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Hairs from front seat</td>
<td>Not examined at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Shirt -</td>
<td>Human blood identified. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis. Hairs collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Pants -</td>
<td>No blood found. Hair collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Bra -</td>
<td>Two animal hairs identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Panties -</td>
<td>Negative for seminal material. Hairs and plant material collected. Damage to construction. Red, blood-like staining noted in crotch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>T-shirt - Senter</td>
<td>Human blood identified in two areas. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis. Area 02 consumed in analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Shorts - Senta</td>
<td>Human blood identified. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis. One hair collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shoe box containing currency</td>
<td>Exhibit contains one ten dollar bill and three one dollar bills. Human blood identified on one dollar bill, serial #1789642323N. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis. Sample consumed in analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Underwear - Senta</td>
<td>Human blood identified in two areas. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis. Damage to construction noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ponytail holder</td>
<td>Hairs collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Underwear - Senta</td>
<td>Negative for blood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following evidence was removed from Evidence Locker 032 at the Springfield Forensic Science Laboratory on May 13, 1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Illinois State Police Sexual Assault Evidence Collection Kit from ×××××××××, containing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07A</td>
<td>Blood samples</td>
<td>See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07B</td>
<td>Vaginal swabs</td>
<td>Seminal material identified. See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis. Preliminary examination indicates blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXHIBIT</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07C</td>
<td>Oral swabs</td>
<td>Preliminary tests for seminal material were negative on these two exhibits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07D</td>
<td>Rectal swabs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07E</td>
<td>Dried saliva sample</td>
<td>Consistent with an ABO type O secretor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07F</td>
<td>Head hair combings</td>
<td>Hairs and particulate debris recovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07G</td>
<td>Pubic hair combings</td>
<td>Hairs recovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07H</td>
<td>Pulled pubic hair</td>
<td>Hairs recovered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07I</td>
<td>Pulled head hair</td>
<td>Insufficient number of hairs in these two exhibits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07J</td>
<td>Comb - head hair</td>
<td>Debris noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07K</td>
<td>Comb - pubic hair</td>
<td>Hairs recovered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following evidence was received from O. L. Boise at the Springfield Forensic Science Laboratory on June 9, 1992:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Illinois State Police Sexual Assault Evidence Collection Kit from Prentice Center, containing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014A</td>
<td>Blood sample</td>
<td>See attached Table of Results, Blood Genetic Marker Analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014B</td>
<td>Dried saliva sample</td>
<td>Consistent with an ABO type O secretor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT | DESCRIPTION | FINDINGS
--- | --- | ---
#14 continued:
#14C | Pulled head hair | These two exhibits were standards for comparison.
#14D | Pulled pubic hair |

CONCLUSIONS:

The bloodstain(s) analyzed on Exhibit #1 (Areas 1 and 2) and Exhibit #8 (Area 2) could have originated from [redacted] and did not originate from Prentice Center.

Since the typing results of the seminal material identified on Exhibit #7B are consistent with the victim's known blood types, no males can be excluded as possible donors.

REQUESTS:

As soon as 30 known pulled head and 28 known pulled pubic hair samples from the victim(s) are submitted, comparisons with the questioned hair(s) may be conducted.

EVIDENCE DISPOSITION:

The above evidence will be retained in the laboratory evidence vault and should be picked up within thirty days.

Please feel free to call if you have any questions.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

[Signature]  
Philip J. Salles  
Forensic Scientist

PJS:  
CS: Field Supervisor Tom H. Martin
APPENDIX C

(NEXT PAGE)

This is a sketched diagram of the master bedroom of the Smith residence. It is procedure to have a diagram of the crime scene.
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