

Mr W A Gilchrist,
Deputy Crown Agent,
25, Chambers Street,
EDINBURGH EH1 1LA

27, Donnini Court,
South Beach Road,
AYR KA7 1JP

6 May 2002.

Dear Mr Gilchrist,

I refer to your letter of 18 April.

Thank you for your prompt reply.

You will understand that matters have moved on somewhat with the statement to the Minister for Justice signed by **129 world fingerprint experts**.

This document referring to SCRO's alleged identification of my daughter's fingerprint states:

'There are so many basic differences of a primary nature both in detail, location and relations between the two compared prints that we are astonished that any qualified expert or even an unqualified trainee could deliver a conclusion of identity.....'

'We acknowledge that where the quality of a latent print is so low that a positive identification cannot be made then expert opinions might differ if an attempt was made to speculate as to the possible donor. The McKie print does not fall into this category.....'

'It can be easily demonstrated and proven that the SCRO experts were clearly wrong in identifying the mark as Shirley McKie's and this makes the SCRO defence that it is a matter of opinion false and untenable.....'

'If not admitted it will further undermine fingerprint evidence, the Scottish judicial system and the position and credibility of the SCRO.'

If you do not have a copy of that statement I am sure Mr Michael Russell MSP will be pleased to supply you with one.

As you also might be aware many if not all of the 129 experts have also compared the Marion Ross print in the David Asbury case and have come to a similar conclusion.

While this level of world criticism makes SCRO's decision to re-instate the experts even more of a mystery any decision by you to even consider reinstating them as expert witnesses giving evidence in Scottish courts would be an affront to justice, totally unjustified by the evidence and against the public interest.

You are well aware that the Lord Advocate's criminal enquiry did not exonerate the experts. It was your decision that there was not enough evidence to prosecute. A decision that I still do not accept.

I would appreciate your comments and early confirmation that you do not intend to accept **any SCRO experts** as expert witnesses given that organisation's intransigence, failure to co-operate in establishing the truth and statement that fingerprinting is a matter of opinion and not of fact.

Yours sincerely,

Iain A J McKie