

REVIEW PRIORITISATION FORM

Case: *John Russell 1989*
(Missin)

AVAILABILITY

Investigation Documents (Including running sheets, investigator notes, TIMS, E@gle.i, statements from original and subsequent investigations)	Rating	Assessment
Documentation substantially available	10	10
Documentation partly available	7	
Some documentation available	4	
No documentation available	0	

Witnesses	Rating	Assessment
All key witnesses available	10	3
Most key witnesses available	7	
Some key witnesses available	4	
No witnesses available	0	

Physical Evidence (exhibits, crime scene photographs and analysis, ballistics reports, PM report, fingerprints)	Rating	Assessment
Physical evidence substantially available	10	0
Physical evidence partly available	7	
Some physical evidence available	4	
No physical evidence available	0	

Average rating for availability:	4
---	---

SUSPECT:

Reason for suspicion (suspect includes a group of suspects or criminal organisation)	Rating	Assessment
Strong suspect identified with good circumstantial evidence in existence	10	8
Strong suspect with some circumstantial evidence in existence	8	
Possible suspect identified – motivation and opportunity existed	6	
Possible suspect identified – motivation or opportunity existed	4	
No suspect	0	

Availability of suspect	Rating	Assessment
Suspect location known	10	8
Suspect location not known but may be found	7	
Suspect has left jurisdiction or is unlikely to be located	4	
No suspect or suspect deceased	0	

Ability to target suspect (using Undercover Branch, Listening Devices, Telephone Interception or other methods)	Rating	Assessment
Suitable investigative techniques that have not previously been tried exist and may prove successful	10	8
Investigative techniques have previously been used but may prove successful if tried again	7	
Limited opportunity for targeting suspect with new investigative techniques	4	
No suspect or suspect deceased	0	

Average rating for suspect:	8
------------------------------------	---

EXISTENCE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY:

Ability to utilise new technology	Rating	Assessment
Physical evidence exists that is likely to yield strong DNA evidence	20	10
New technology exists to analyse existing physical evidence (other than DNA) that is likely to link a known suspect to the offence (such as fingerprints / fibres etc)	20	
Physical evidence exists that is likely to yield trace DNA evidence	15	
New technology exists to analyse existing physical evidence (other than DNA) that may link a known suspect to the offence (such as fingerprints / ballistics etc)	12	
Physical evidence exists that may yield DNA evidence	10	
New technology exists to analyse existing physical evidence (other than DNA) that may provide new lines of inquiry	8	
Physical evidence exists that is unlikely to yield DNA evidence	2	
New technology exists to analyse existing physical evidence (other than DNA) that is unlikely to provide new lines of inquiry	2	
No physical evidence available	0	

PASSAGE OF TIME:


Witnesses (including relatives or associates of suspect)	Rating	Assessment
Evidence suggests that, at the time of original investigation, circumstances existed that prevented one or more key witness from fully cooperating with investigators and the passage of time is likely to affect the level of cooperation received now	10	5
Evidence suggests that, at the time of original investigation, circumstances existed that prevented one or more key witness from fully cooperating with investigators and the passage of time may affect the level of cooperation received now	8	
Key witnesses, through contact with the suspect or relatives, may have learnt more about the offence since it occurred	6	
There is nothing to indicate that key witnesses were less than fully cooperative with investigators	2	
Key witnesses no longer available	0	

OTHER LEADS:

Leads (including possible linkages to other offences)	Rating	Assessment
The case screening process has identified lines of inquiry that were not explored in the original investigation and those lines of inquiry can still be fully explored	10	7
The case screening process has identified lines of inquiry that were incomplete and those lines of inquiry can still be fully explored	8	
The case screening process has identified lines of inquiry that were not explored and those lines of inquiry may still be pursued to some extent	5	
The case screening process has identified lines of inquiry that were incomplete and those lines of inquiry can still be explored to some extent	3	
The case screening process did not identify any incomplete lines of inquiry that can still be explored	0	

Prioritisation assessment:		Rating:
Availability of brief / witnesses / physical evidence		4
Identification and availability of suspect		8
Existence of new technology		10
Opportunities presented by the passage of time		5
Other leads		7
Priority:		Total score: 34

Prioritisation assessment conducted by:

Name: 
 Name: JOHN LEHMANN
 Rank: D/C / INSPECTOR
 Date: 14 AUGUST 2013

Ranking:

High priority score of 42-60
 Medium priority score of 30-41
 Low priority score of 16-30
 Nil priority (close or suspend case) score of 15 or less