SECU0039: Practices of Crime Scene Investigation and Expert Testimony

View Online

1.

Guide to Coroner Services.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/363879/guide-to-coroner-service.pdf

2.

College of Policing: Managing Investigations.
https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/investigations/managing-investigations/

3.

Forensic Science Regulator Annual Report 2015.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/482248/2015_FSR_Annual_Report_v1_0_final.pdf

4.

Forensic Science Regulator Annual Report 2016.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/581653/FSR_Annual_Report_v1.0.pdf

5.

Forensic Science Regulator Guidance: The Control and Avoidance of Contamination In Crime Scene Examination involving DNA Evidence Recovery.
https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/393866/206_FSR_SOC_contamination_consultation.pdf

6.

Processing a Crime Scene. Published online 25 AD. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ur1GxXZGnNI

7.

Baber C, Butler M. Expertise in crime scene examination: Comparing search strategies of expert and novice crime scene examiners in simulated crime scenes. Human Factors. 2012;54(3):413-424. doi:10.1177/0018720812440577

8.

van den Eeden CAJ, de Poot CJ, van Koppen PJ. Forensic expectations: Investigating a crime scene with prior information. Science & Justice. 2016;56(6):475-481. doi:10.1016/j.scijus.2016.08.003

9.

Forensic Science Regulator Guidance: Cognitive Bias Effects Relevant to Forensic Science Examinations. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/510147/217_FSR-G-217_Cognitive_bias_appendix.pdf

10.

Poy A, van Oorschot RAH. Beware; gloves and equipment used during the examination of exhibits are potential vectors for transfer of DNA-containing material. International Congress Series. 2006;1288:556-558. doi:10.1016/j.ics.2005.09.126

11.

Proff C, Schmitt C, Schneider PM, Foerster G, Rothschild MA. Experiments on the DNA contamination risk via latent fingerprint brushes. International Congress Series. 2006;1288:601-603. doi:10.1016/j.ics.2005.10.053

12.

van Oorschot R, Treadwell S, Beaurepaire J, Holding N, Mitchell R. Beware of the Possibility of Fingerprinting Techniques Transferring DNA. Journal of Forensic Sciences. 2005;50:1417-1422. https://compass.astm.org/DIGITAL_LIBRARY/JOURNALS/JFS/PAGES/JFS2004430.htm

13.

O'Sullivan S, Geddes T, Lovelock TJ. The migration of fragments of glass from the pockets to the surfaces of clothing. Forensic Science International. 2011;208(1-3):149-155. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2010.11.020

14.

Morgan RM, French JC, O'Donnell L, Bull PA. The reincorporation and redistribution of trace geoforensic particulates on clothing: An introductory study. Science & Justice. 2010;50(4):195-199. doi:10.1016/j.scijus.2010.04.002

15.

Goray M, van Oorschot RAH, Mitchell JR. DNA transfer within forensic exhibit packaging: Potential for DNA loss and relocation. Forensic Science International: Genetics. 2012;6(2):158-166. doi:10.1016/j.fsigen.2011.03.013

16.

ENFSI Scenes of Crime Examination Best Practice Manual. http://library.college.police.uk/docs/appref/ENFSI-BPM-v1_0.pdf

17.

Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2KoLnIwoZKU&feature=youtu.be

18.

G. N. Rutty. The effectiveness of protective clothing in the reduction of potential DNA contamination of the scene of crime. International Journal of Legal Medicine. 2003;117(3):170-174. doi:10.1007/s00414-002-0348-1

19.

Margiotta G, Tasselli G, Tommolini F, Lancia M, Massetti S, Carnevali E. Risk of DNA transfer by gloves in forensic casework. Forensic Science International: Genetics Supplement Series. 2015;5:e527-e529. doi:10.1016/j.fsigss.2015.09.208

20.

Harbison S, Fleming R. Forensic body fluid identification: state of the art. Research and Reports in Forensic Medical Science. Published online February 2016. doi:10.2147/RRFMS.S57994

21.

Kanokwongnuwut P, Kirkbride KP, Linacre A. Detection of latent DNA. Forensic Science International: Genetics. 2018;37:95-101. doi:10.1016/j.fsigen.2018.08.004

22.

Tobias SHA, Jacques GS, Morgan RM, Meakin GE. The effect of pressure on DNA deposition by touch. Forensic Science International: Genetics Supplement Series. 2017;6:e12-e14. doi:10.1016/j.fsigss.2017.09.020

23.

Brayley-Morris H, Sorrell A, Revoir AP, Meakin GE, Court DS, Morgan RM. Persistence of DNA from laundered semen stains: Implications for child sex trafficking cases. Forensic Science International: Genetics. 2015;19:165-171. doi:10.1016/j.fsigen.2015.07.016

24.

Wood I, Park S, Tooke J, Smith O, Morgan RM, Meakin GE. Efficiencies of recovery and extraction of trace DNA from non-porous surfaces. Forensic Science International: Genetics Supplement Series. 2017;6:e153-e155. doi:10.1016/j.fsigss.2017.09.022

25.

Pang BCM, Cheung BKK. Double swab technique for collecting touched evidence. Legal Medicine. 2007;9(4):181-184. doi:10.1016/j.legalmed.2006.12.003

26.

Dror IE, Charlton D, Péron AE. Contextual information renders experts vulnerable to making erroneous identifications. Forensic Science International. 2006;156(1):74-78. doi:10.1016/j.forsciint.2005.10.017

27.

Criminal Procedure Rules-2015-part-19.pdf. http://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/criminal/docs/2015/crim-proc-rules-2015-part-19.pdf

28.

Channel 4 News. Jordan Peterson debate on the gender pay gap, campus protests and postmodernism - YouTube. Published online 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aMcjxSThD54

29.

Why is evidence continuity and integrity so important? R v Sean Hoey, 2007. http://www.bailii.org/cgi-bin/markup.cgi?doc=/nie/cases/NICC/2007/49.html&query=sean+and+hoey&method=boolean