
From: Patrick Hodgetts <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, 1 May 2023 4:05 PM
To: Jacqueline Krynda
Cc: Katherine Garaty; Enzo Camporeale; Kate Lockery; Isabella Jiang; Aurhett Barrie
Subject: RE: NSW Special Commission of Inquiry into LGBTIQ hate crimes: Crispin Dye [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive]

[CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organisation. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.]

Dear Jacqueline

Further to the below and to your letter of 19 April, we are instructed that Crime Scene Officer Sim Te (FETS Fingerprint Unit, NSWPF) attended FASS on 26 April and met with Michele Franco (FASS) for the purpose of visually inspecting the brown mark on the white card.

We are instructed that Crime Scene Officer Te is of the opinion that the brown mark contains lines that may be consistent with fingerprint ridges, however the mark does not contain enough detail (including with the use of a forensic light source) to allow for a determination to be made whether the mark is a fingerprint or not. We are instructed that chemical enhancements may assist in determining whether the mark is a fingerprint, however we are informed that Michele Franco (FASS) considers that the use of chemical enhancements to identify any fingerprints will likely destroy any prospect of extracting any DNA from the exhibit.

Our instructing officers from the UHT understand that Michele Franco (FASS) has expressed the view that the most appropriate way forward in an attempt to maximise the retrieval of any evidence is for a sample of the brown mark to be cut from the exhibit and subjected to DNA testing. The result of that testing (of the sample) for DNA might then inform the appropriate next steps, and our instructing officers do not have any concern with that approach. If DNA testing of a sample cut from the brown mark is unsuccessful, then we respectfully suggest that Michele Franco be requested to suggest appropriate next steps with a view to maximising the prospect of obtaining any fingerprint and/or DNA evidence from the exhibit (including whether the cutting of a further sample from the brown mark is appropriate) for the consideration of the UHT.

As outlined in our email of 24 April, our instructing officers from the UHT generally defer to FASS regarding the appropriateness of forensic testing sequences, and where possible will engage with FASS to discuss available options depending on the nature of a particular investigation and state of any exhibits. In relation to this matter (and other matters whether forensic testing is being proposed), our instructing officers will ultimately be led by the views of FASS in relation to the most appropriate testing sequences to maximise the prospect of recovering information of value, however would be grateful to be kept informed of the testing proposed to be applied to the exhibits in advance so that it has an opportunity to express any concerns.

Kind regards



Patrick Hodgetts
Senior Lawyer
Office of the General Counsel
Locked Bag 5102, Parramatta NSW 2124

E: [REDACTED] P: [REDACTED] E/N: [REDACTED] M: [REDACTED]

This email and any attachments may be subject to legal professional privilege and should not be communicated to any third party without the consent of the sender. If you are not the named recipient please contact the sender to arrange for the return or destruction of the email.