

## **'20 Reasons why SCRO and Peter Swann are wrong.'**

- 1) **May 1999.** Shirley McKie found unanimously 'not guilty' of perjury in the High Court Glasgow – Jury **rejects** the evidence of 3 SCRO experts.

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/1\\_%2014%20May%201999%20-%20Lord%20Johnston%20sums%20up.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/1_%2014%20May%201999%20-%20Lord%20Johnston%20sums%20up.pdf)

- 2) **December 1999.** BBC Scotland engages **4 English experts** to independently examine the 'Shirley McKie mark'. They unanimously conclude that, 'the mark was not made by Shirley McKie'.

<http://www.onin.com/fp/htm/wwwboard/messages/23.html>

- 3) **January 2000. 13 Lothian and Borders Experts** write to the Justice Minister: *'At best the apparent 'misidentification' is a display of gross incompetence by not one but several experts within the bureau. At worst it bears all the hallmarks of a conspiracy of a nature unparalleled in the history of fingerprints.'*

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/LandBExpertsLetteran2000\\_000.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/LandBExpertsLetteran2000_000.pdf)

- 4) **June 2000. Two independent international experts** brought to Scotland by the HMCI state that the mark was not made by Shirley McKie and, *'that decision could have been reached at an early point in the comparison process.'* The SCRO is deemed 'not fully effective and efficient' and 28 major recommendations and 20 suggestions are made to improve performance.

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/4\\_%20%20August%202000%20-%20HMCI%20Report%20into%20%20SCRO.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/4_%20%20August%202000%20-%20HMCI%20Report%20into%20%20SCRO.pdf)

- 5) **June 2000.** The Minister for Justice and the **Lord Advocate** apologise to Shirley McKie in the Scottish Parliament and confirm that the SCRO 'identification' was wrong.

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/2\\_%20%2022%20June%202000%20-%20Wallace%20apology%20and%20debate.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/2_%20%2022%20June%202000%20-%20Wallace%20apology%20and%20debate.pdf)

- 6) **July 2000** Kristian Rokkjaer and Frank Rasmussen **two Danish experts** commissioned by Crown Office examine all productions and conclude the 'Marion Ross mark' is a mis-identification by the SCRO experts.

<http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/TheDanishReport2.pdf>

- 7) **August 2000. National Forensic Training Centre** at Durham following examination of SCRO productions, state that both the 'Shirley McKie and Marion Ross identifications' are wrong and criticise processes and court presentation.

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/04\\_05\\_06\\_precogone.pdf](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/04_05_06_precogone.pdf)

(Page 16 of statement)

- 8) **October 2000. Police Major Inquiry team**, under Deputy Chief Constable of Tayside, confirm that SCRO experts are wrong in the 'Shirley McKie and Marion Ross identifications'.

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/04\\_05\\_06\\_mckiereport.pdf](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/04_05_06_mckiereport.pdf)

- 9) **May 2002. 171 experts from 18 countries** including 26 USA states agree that the SCRO is wrong in the 'Shirley McKie identification'. They use internet images previously **used by SCRO experts** in a special presentation to international experts at the Scottish Police College Tulliallan.

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/10\\_%20%2025%20March%202002%20-%20Statement%20letter%20to%20Jim%20Wallace.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/10_%20%2025%20March%202002%20-%20Statement%20letter%20to%20Jim%20Wallace.pdf)

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/9\\_%20%2025%20March%202002%20-%20Comments%20from%20the%20experts%20statement.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/9_%20%2025%20March%202002%20-%20Comments%20from%20the%20experts%20statement.pdf)

- 10) **August 2002. David Asbury Conviction Quashed:** The Crown offers no evidence at the appeal and accepts that *'The fingerprint evidence was unreliable'*.

[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml:sessionid=CANRAMXZHBDBJQFIQMGC5OAVCBQUJVC?xml=/news/2000/08/23/nmurd23.xml&secureRefresh=true&\\_requestid=96223](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml:sessionid=CANRAMXZHBDBJQFIQMGC5OAVCBQUJVC?xml=/news/2000/08/23/nmurd23.xml&secureRefresh=true&_requestid=96223)

<http://thescotsman.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=891702002>

- 11) **Sept. 2002.** Petition to the Scottish Parliament by **4 world renowned experts** seeks an enquiry into Openness and Accountability within SCRO. To date no action has been taken.

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/16\\_%203%20December%202002%20-%20Petitions%20Committee%20meeting.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/16_%203%20December%202002%20-%20Petitions%20Committee%20meeting.pdf)

- 12) **February 2002.** The **Lord Advocate** Colin Boyd states, *'The BBC Frontline Scotland programme on the case of Shirley McKie..... helped uncover what where at best serious defects in the analysis of fingerprinting at the Scottish Criminal Records Office and forced the authorities, including myself, to act to ensure that such a case would not happen again.'*

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/7\\_%2019%20February%202002%20-%20Speech%20by%20the%20Lord%20Advocate.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/officialreportsPDFs/7_%2019%20February%202002%20-%20Speech%20by%20the%20Lord%20Advocate.pdf)

- 13) **August 2004. American experts** using new technology report that SCRO was wrong in identifying Shirley McKie's fingerprint.

[http://scotlandtoday.scottishtv.co.uk/content/default.asp?page=s1\\_1\\_1&newsid=5167](http://scotlandtoday.scottishtv.co.uk/content/default.asp?page=s1_1_1&newsid=5167)

- 14) **and**

- 15) **September 2004, Two** reports commissioned by the Scottish Executive from John McLeod fingerprint expert delivered. They are known to confirm that the 'McKie and Ross identifications' are wrong. Gagging orders placed on the reports by the Scottish Executive and Parliamentary Enquiry refused access.

<http://scotlandonsunday.scotsman.com/index.cfm?id=609422006>

- 16) **June 2005. Three Grampian Police experts**, with a total experience of 54 years, publish report stating that the SCRO identification of the Shirley McKie print by SCRO is wrong.

[http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/Aberdeenreportsigned\\_001.pdf](http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/Aberdeenreportsigned_001.pdf)

- 17) **March 2006. First Minister** Jack McConnell admits that the identification of the 'McKie print' was an "honest mistake".
- <http://news.scotsman.com/topics.cfm?tid=1385&id=506432006>
- 18) **April 2006. Three Grampian Police experts** who disagreed with SCRO in June 2005 submit a further report to the Lord Advocate stating that the SCRO identification of the Marion Ross print is also wrong.
- <http://news.scotsman.com/topics.cfm?tid=1385&id=417882006>
- 19) **February 2006.** Shirley McKie awarded **£750,000** by the Scottish Executive in an out of court settlement.
- <http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/AHUNDREDTHOUSANDTHANKS.pdf>
- 20) **April 2006.** Following an enquiry led by Deputy Chief Constable **David Mulhern** assisted by three international fingerprint experts a report is submitted to the Minister for Justice confirming the 'Shirley McKie identification' is wrong and lays out an **action plan** to restore confidence in the SCRO and Scottish Fingerprint Service.
- <http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/FinalisedActionPlan-20April2006.pdf>
- <http://www.shirleymckie.com/documents/MoreonMulhern23.4.06.pdf>
- <http://web.mac.com/feorlean/iWeb/MWR%20/Current%20Blog/2DBCE6AF-49BE-4A8E-BEE9-18A6AA47B315.html>

*As SCRO, Peter Swann and their supporters continue to claim they are right in the face of such overwhelming evidence a number of questions are relevant:*

- *'Why won't they admit their mistakes ?'*
- *'How long will it be until more mistakes are revealed at SCRO ?'*
- *'Do they have any concern about the damage they are inflicting on fingerprinting as a forensic science?'*
- *'Are they abiding by the codes of conduct of their professional bodies?'*
- *'How many experts in the Scottish Fingerprint Service have confidence in their SCRO colleagues ?'*
- *'Given the overwhelming evidence against certain experts in SCRO why does the Crown Office continue to rely on their evidence in the courts ?'*
- *'Does this reliance constitute danger of further mis-carriages of justice?'* ?

.....