

Thomas Hanley
Fingerprint Examiner / I.A.I. Senior Crime Scene Analyst
PO Box 314
East Middlebury, VT 05754

**Kenneth Parker Panting / Pollock Krasner House Specimens
Supplementary Fingerprint Report**

File No.: 2007-04-03

Ref: 1. 2007-04 (and supplements)
2. Scientific Examination Report –
P. Wertheim 3-14-08
3. File No. 24514 NH Materials Testing Lab, Inc

Date: April 21, 2008

Request: Review a report from Mr. Pat Wertheim containing his conclusions as to his examination of fingerprint specimens I submitted to him on November 9, 2007 and December 4, 2007.

Report Notes:

Mr. Wertheim conducted his examination of the materials I submitted to him independent of my report. The result was that Mr. Wertheim assigned his own identification numbers to the specimens that I submitted. This section will correlate my numbering system with Mr. Wertheim's to avoid confusion.

My Identification Nbr - Mr. Wertheim's Identification Nbr

Print 1	Print 2
Print 2	Print 1
Not indexed	Print 3
Print 4	Print 4

Conclusion:

I concur with Mr. Wertheim's opinion and conclusion in his report as stated in paragraph 66, to wit, that he individualized the print made from a cast that I obtained from the blue Devoe paint can (labeled Print 1A in report 2007-04, the cast is labeled as cast C) in the Pollock studio.

I concur with Mr. Wertheim's identification of Print #1 (Mr. Wertheim's print #2) as being made by one and the same finger as that which left the print in soft paint on the blue Devoe paint can (my print 1A, from Cast C) in the Pollock studio.

I concur with Mr. Wertheim's conclusion in Paragraphs 55 and 56. I saw and reported these suspicions in my report # 2007-04-02, page 2.

I concur with Mr. Wertheim's observations and opinions in Paragraphs 42-43; 45-54

In my report dated November 2, 2007 I stated that based on an examination of Level 2 detail, in the print made from Cast B, I did not find that this print had sufficient Level 2 detail to be individualized. This conclusion stands, however, the examination was based on insufficient detail.

In my initial work, I preserved the best quality of the three casts (Cast C) for submittal to Mr. Wertheim. Using a thinner transfer medium of lesser quality in order to prevent damage to the casts, the resultant transfer print from Cast B was of insufficient quality for individualization.

My concurrence of Mr. Wertheim's opinion and conclusions is based on the following:

- His recording of a transfer print from the cast of the print I label as 1A (blue Devoe paint can) was of finer quality.
- His demonstration that detail in the image which I took to be incipient ridges, creating differences in the

print that I could not rectify, were actually trace material and deformities in the casting medium (paragraph 69).

- Points charted (Figure 19, page 23) demonstrate the identification to my satisfaction.
- Image enhancement improved the readability and interpretation of print 1 (Mr. Wertheim's print #2) and the print from Cast C.
- At my request, The New Hampshire Materials testing Laboratory, Inc., conducted an examination of a section of wood containing Print #4 that I excised from the back of the Parker painting. A report filed by Chemist Jeffery Masse, dated December 11, 2007 states "The fingerprint in question was closely examined under an optical microscope at 40X magnification and it appeared to us that the fingerprint was on the wood surface and beneath the clearcoat". It is important to note that the clear material is *covering* the print and is referred to as a *clearcoat*. It is also noted that the print is *on* the wood surface, indicating the print was not developed by any type of reagent or known development medium.

In consideration of these facts, I concur with Mr. Wertheim's findings.

Thomas Hanley
Fingerprint Examiner