

# Individual Report

## Test 09-545:

### Paint Analysis

Participant Code: **U1234A**  
WebCode: **ABCDEF**

Test Summary: Each sample pack consisted of three items, the known sample (Item 1) and two questioned paint chips (Items 2 and 3). Items 1 and 3 were both from the same paint panel; Item 2 was from a second, different paint panel. (Please see the Summary Report for additional summary comments and information.)

Examination Results		
<i>Could the questioned paint chips (Items 2 and/or 3) have come from the damaged area of the suspect vehicle (Item 1)?</i>		
	<u>Item 2</u>	<u>Item 3</u>
<b>Participant U1234A</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Response Summary</b>		
No. Participants: 140	Yes 4	140
	No 135	0
	Inc 1	0

Examination Methods		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stereomicroscope	<input type="checkbox"/> Polarized Light	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fluorescence
<input type="checkbox"/> Pyrolysis GC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FTIR	<input type="checkbox"/> Solubility/Chemical
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> XRS/XRF	<input type="checkbox"/> SEM/EDX	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Microspectrophotometry
Other:		

Conclusions
The paint from the traffic sign post, Item 3, was indistinguishable in the properties examined from the known paint sample from the suspect's vehicle, Item 1 and therefore could have originated from the same source.
Additional Comments
The paint sample from the bicyclist's clothes, Item 2, was found to be different in chemical composition from the known paint sample, Item 1, and could not have originated from the same source.