

Report of John Richard Welch, B.Sc., MCSFS.

1. I am a forensic scientist specialising in the scientific examination of documents and handwriting. This has been my sole profession since 1972. In that year I graduated from the University of East Anglia with an honours degree in chemistry and was recruited to the Questioned Documents Section of the Metropolitan Police Forensic Science Laboratory. My training covered the whole range of forensic document examination apart from the botanical analysis of papers. I have provided expert evidence in matters relating to documents in dispute on numerous occasions. I first gave evidence in person in the early part of 1973. The bulk of my work has been in criminal investigations but I have also undertaken many examinations in non-criminal matters. I have completed in excess of 1700 cases and have given evidence in court in person over 200 times. My work is based in the south-east of England but I undertake work on cases from across the UK and abroad. In addition to courts in south-east England I have attended as an expert witness courts in York, Swansea, Manchester, Newcastle, Birmingham, Leicester, Dublin, Belfast, Cyprus, Bermuda, Hong Kong and Malta. I have participated in research into various aspects of document examination and have authored papers published after peer review. I was registered as a document examiner with the Council for the Registration of Forensic Practitioners during the existence of that organisation (2001-2009); I am a member of the American Society of Questioned Document Examiners and of the UK Chartered Society of Forensic Sciences. I progressed through three promotions at the Metropolitan Police Forensic Science Laboratory and its successors before leaving what was by then the London Laboratory of FSS Ltd in July 2010. I now work as a private consultant in forensic document examination.

2. On the instructions of the Berlin based NGO “Recherche Zentrum – Investigativ gegen Vertuschung” and for the assistance of the court, I have examined the following items.

1. ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.36
2. ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.37
3. ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.38
4. ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.39

INSTRUCTIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS.

3. Each of the four documents listed in paragraph two above is a photocopy. It is suspected that each of the four original documents was altered before the photocopies were made. I am to examine the photocopies so as to locate any alterations made to the originals and determine what was present before the alterations were made.

TECHNICAL BACKGROUND.

5. A document can be altered in many ways and it is possible that what has occurred may not be visible in a photocopy of the altered document. What appears to be one document in a photocopy may have been assembled from parts of several documents by physical "cut-and-paste" procedures. Writing or typing added at a later time may not be obvious even if different inks have been used. Elements of a document may be removed by abrasion or chemical action; also, they may be obscured by covering with correction fluid or opaque card or paper that blends with the background. If there is no need to be surreptitious then parts of a document may be obscured by dark ink or other obvious covering.
6. Whilst a photocopy may hide features of the original document it is possible that a detailed examination of the photocopy may show evidence that

surreptitious alterations have been made and enable some of aspects of the original document to be identified. Evidence of alteration would include traces of partially erased or obscured lines, traces of the edges of overlying material, (edge marks) and differing densities of typing or rules (printed straight lines).

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS.

7. Each of the four photocopies shows alterations that have been made prior to the photocopying process. The obscuring of some entries with black ink or similar is obvious; there is evidence of other alterations which have been made surreptitiously. In addition to the observations and conclusions described below I have prepared photocopies of the four documents on which I have marked my observations and conclusions and they form part of this report.

ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.36

8. There are eight areas obscured with black ink or a similar substance. I have found that each of the eight areas contains typed entries which I record below.

Delta 1320 (E

Delta 1315, 1320, 1043, 7461

----- geb

----- in Dessau, wh. -----

Dr -----

Delta 1045 (-----)

Delta 1042

Delta 1023

9. In the column headed "Wer gemeldet?", near the bottom of the rectangle for entry "02" there is a faint horizontal line. I consider that is a partially erased or obscured ink line, or possibly the image of an edge or of a cut in the paper. In the vicinity of that column there are some rules whose density and ends suggest they have been enhanced manually.

10. The typing of the time "01.11" is darker than that of the times earlier in the document and in the area of that typing there are some irregular dark marks. Both features can be caused by typing on top of dried white correction fluid. I consider it likely that this time was typed over an obscured previous entry.

ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.37

10. There are seven areas obscured with black ink or a similar substance. I have found that each of the seven areas contains typed entries which I record below.

	Delta 1043 (
	Delta 1042
Herr -----	Delta 1042
-----	Delta 1028
	Delta 1040

11. In the column headed "Wer gemeldet?", near the top of the rectangle for entry "12" there is a faint line sloping down to the right. I consider that is a partially erased or obscured ink line, or possibly the image of an edge or of a cut in the paper. In the vicinity of that column there are rules whose density and ends suggest that they have been enhanced manually.
12. The typing of the times "03.01" and "05.06" is darker than that of the times elsewhere in the document and in the areas of those times there are some irregular dark marks. Those features can be caused by typing on top of dried white correction fluid. . I consider it likely that those times were typed over obscured previous entries.

ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.38

13. There are nine areas obscured with black ink or a similar substance. I have

found that each of the nine areas contains typed entries which I record below.

D1045

D1040

D1027

D1040

D1027

D1027

D1045

IdentNr. 056626

TgbNr. 2956

14. In the column headed "Wer gemeldet?" the top line of the rectangle for entry "16" is very thin at the left end and its thickness increases steadily as it extends to the right. That may be due to something which visually blends with the paper background overlapping and obscuring part of that line. In the rectangle for entry "17" there is a faint horizontal line. I consider that is a partially erased or obscured ink line, or possibly the image of an edge or of a cut in the paper. The density and ends of some rules in the vicinity of this column suggest that they have been enhanced manually.
15. In the column headed "Inhalt der Meldung" near the top of the rectangle for entry "16" there is a faint line sloping down to the right. I consider that is a partially erased or obscured ink line, or the image of an edge or of a cut in the paper. To the right of that faint line there are irregular dark marks whose left-hand end is immediately below the right-hand end of the faint line. Those observations suggest that the faint sloping line is the top edge of something which blends visually with the paper background and which is obscuring entries in the rectangle. The irregular dark marks are protruding beyond the right-hand edge of the obscuring item.
16. The typing of the time "11.15" is darker than that of the times elsewhere in the document and in the area of that time there are some irregular dark marks.

Those features can be caused by typing on top of dried white correction fluid. I consider it likely that this time was been typed over an obscured previous entry.

ROSE LAGEFILM BD.II, BL.39

17. There are twelve areas obscured with black ink or a similar substance. I have found that each of the twelve areas contains typed entries which I record below.

	D1045 + D1027
	D1045
	TgbNr.2957
OK-AN 413	D1040
	D1042
	Delta 1042
	Delta 1023
	Delta 1028
	Delta 1045
	Delta 1043
	Delta 1045

18. In the column headed "Wer gemeldet?" the bottom line for the rectangle for entry 26 is not aligned with the lines to each side. At the bottom of the rectangle for entries 31, 32, and 33 there is a very faint line protruding from which are traces of typing. I consider that a piece of paper or card, blending with the paper background, has been placed to obscure typing. At the bottom of the rectangle for entry 34 there is a faint horizontal line. I consider that is a partially erased or obscured ink line, or possibly the image of an edge or of a cut in the paper. The left-hand end of that faint line coincides with the bottom of a section of a vertical rule whose density suggests has been overwritten. In the column headed "Inhalt der Meldung", in the rectangle for entry 34 there are several features which show that a rectangle of card or similar that blends

with the paper background has been positioned to obscure an entry. The left-hand edge of the obscuring article is revealed by it intercepting a printed letter "N", a printed letter "V", and a printed letter "G". The bottom edge of the obscuring article is revealed by the lower parts of typed characters protruding from it. The top edge is revealed by a faint line and the upper parts of typed characters protruding from it. The right-hand edge is revealed by some irregular marks which align with the right-hand end of the top edge.

19. Between entries "33" and "34" three short vertical rules are missing. Those two entries are each timed at "18.00".
20. The density and ends of some rules suggest that they have been enhanced manually.
21. The typing of the times "12.45", "13.24", and "15.00" is darker than that of the times elsewhere in the document and in the areas of those times there are some irregular dark marks. Those features can be caused by typing on top of dried white correction fluid. I consider it likely that those times were typed over obscured previous entries.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

22. Each of the four documents visible in the photocopies listed in paragraph two has had a number of alterations made to it in addition to the blacking out of some typed entries. Apart from those obscured typed entries I have not been able to determine what was present before the alterations were made.

J R Welch, B.Sc., MCSFS.
24th October 2023.