Q.P.9. COURT BRIEF CHECK LIST

Answer all/every issue, rectify (or cause to be rectified) all faults.

DEFENDANT/S

....

SURNAME **GIVEN NAMES**

....

Magistrates Court and No. **Date of First Appearance**

Answer each by:-
Cross (X) if fault found or action required.
Dash (-) if n/app. or n/req.;
Tick (✓) if correct,

		Action Taken/Required
Wording of Charges on Q.P.9.		
Bench Charge Sheet with Q.P.9.		
Bench Charge Sheet on undertaking on Summons		
Averments - used as required		
Amendments - cross if required		
Statute correct		
Sections correct		
All elements covered by full facts		
Should charge be substituted		
Within time jurisdiction		
Within locality jurisdiction		
Authority to prosecute required		
Certificates attached		
Compensation/Restitution sought		
Quotes attached/figures shown		
Orders		
For disposal of property sought		
Pecuniary penalty sought - amount $_____		
Forfeiture - by what Statute?		
Property		
Drugs		
Utensils		
Disposal of property S. 685B CC		
Criminal History (has nil/attached)		
Copy of/Details of Message		
Traffic History (has nil/not required/attached)		
Drugs Offence		
Election made on Q.P.9.		
Summary/Indictment		
Weight of Drugs/Number of Plants shown		

Defects Rectified (prior to dispatch) **Yes / No** **O.K.**
(If no further action required)

Comments:- .....

.....

.....

.....

....

NAME RANK REG.NO. SIGNATURE DATE

R

CRM 113-119

R

APPENDIX:

Methods used in the typing of Samples in this Laboratory.

HUMVWA typing was performed using PCR DNA technology and automated fluorescence based detection.

HUMTH01 typing was performed using PCR-DNA technology and automated fluorescense based detection.

HUMF13A typing was performed using PCR DNA technology and automated fluorescence based detection.

HUMFES typing was performed using PCR DNA technology and automated fluorescence based detection.

CONFIDENCE LIMITS on profile relative frequencies were calculated as per: Ranajit Chakraborty, M. R. Scrimivasn, and Stephen Daiger. (1993). Evaluation of Standard Error and Confidence Interval of Estimated Multilocus Genotype Probabilities, and Their Implications in DNA Forensics. Am. J. Hum. Genet. 52: 60-70.

This statement has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *National Association of Testing Authorities* (Australia) and the *American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board*. It contains all the important information considered pertinent to this case. It is, however and of necessity, a summary of the total analysis. No important findings have been intentionally omitted. All details of the analysis are contained in the *case record* and this is available to *Officers of the Court* on a *need to know basis*.

Standard Operating Procedures for DNA Testing at the John Tonge Centre Forensic Biology Section include:

- scientists record tests to be carried out on items in the DNA Analysis Record Logbook
- technicians perform the tests under supervision
- two scientists read the test results "blind". This means that the origin of the test sample as well as the results recorded by the other reader are unknown to them at the time of reading
- interpretation of the test results is the responsibility of the case scientist who re-reads the tests before reporting
- each case which has results which may be detrimental to any party is subject to *peer review*
- peer review is the review of casework for scientific and technical correctness by a peer forensic biologist.
- all cases are subject to an *administrative review*
- an administrative review is a procedure used to check for consistency with laboratory policy and for editorial correctness

Scientists, of necessity, are *close* to their casework. The above process ensures that conscious or subconscious bias is *not* an issue. It is part of a quality system designed for forensic laboratories. It produces procedural *fairness*.

Until September 1996 part of the STR (HUMTHO1, HUMFES, HUMVWA, HUMF13A) analytical procedure was performed off site at the School of Science and Technology, Nathan Campus of the Griffith University. The Queensland Department of Health and Griffith University share ownership of a specialised instrument at that site. John Tonge Centre staff and an officer half-funded by Queensland Health performed that part of the procedure which detected and measured the DNA fragments. Since September of 1996 all DNA testing has been performed on-site within the forensic biology section at the John Tonge Centre for Forensic Sciences, Queensland Department of Health, Coopers Plains Campus.

12/2/97

NOTES

R

CO-OFFENDERS:

1._____
DOB: / /
Dealt with? Y / N
D.C.- Sent. Remarks Y / N
Original Deps Y / N
M.C- QP9 Y / N
C/H attached Y / N

2._____
DOB: / /
Dealt with? Y / N
D.C.- Sent. Remarks Y / N
Original Deps Y / N
M.C- QP9 Y / N
C/H attached Y / N

3._____
DOB: / /
Dealt with? Y / N
D.C.- Sent. Remarks Y / N
Original Deps Y / N
M.C- QP9 Y / N
C/H attached Y / N

4._____
DOB: / /
Dealt with? Y / N
D.C.- Sent. Remarks Y / N
Original Deps Y / N
M.C- QP9 Y / N
C/H attached Y / N

VSS

Is this a VSS matter? Y / N
Has the complainant been contacted? Y / N

Phone number:_____

Is there a VIS on file? Y / N

PROBATION/SUSPENDED SENTENCE

When imposed: / /
Length_____
Is this offence a breach? Y / N
Original Deps? Y / N
Sentencing Remarks? Y / N

Probation Officer:

_____

C.C. Office;_____

Ph No:_____

FURTHER INFORMATION:

RESTITUTION DETAILS CONTINUED:

R

Bail Status : ◯ Bail ◯ Custody

Bail Address :

☐ Surety **Amount :**

☐ Reporting ☐ Sun ☐ Mon ☐ Tue ☐ Wed ☐ Thur ☐ Fri ☐ Sat

Reporting Station :

☐ Non Contact with Complainant ☐ Non Contact Crown Witness

☐ Curfew **Curfew Start :** **Curfew End :**

Other Details :

R

OFFICIAL STATEMENT FROM FORENSIC BIOLOGY, JTCFS QUEENSLAND HEALTH
PEER REVIEWED YES/NO
CASE ANALYST: B Reed
DATE ISSUED: 12/2/97

APPENDIX:

Methods used in the typing of Samples in this Laboratory.

HUMVWA typing was performed using PCR DNA technology and automated fluorescence based detection.

HUMTH01 typing was performed using PCR-DNA technology and automated fluorescense based detection.

HUMF13A typing was performed using PCR DNA technology and automated fluorescence based detection.

HUMFES typing was performed using PCR DNA technology and automated fluorescence based detection.

CONFIDENCE LIMITS on profile relative frequencies were calculated as per: Ranajit Chakraborty, M. R. Scrimivasn, and Stephen Daiger. (1993). Evaluation of Standard Error and Confidence Interval of Estimated Multilocus Genotype Probabilities, and Their Implications in DNA Forensics. Am. J. Hum. Genet. 52: 60-70.

This statement has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the *National Association of Testing Authorities* (Australia) and the *American Society of Crime Laboratory Directors/Laboratory Accreditation Board*. It contains all the important information considered pertinent to this case. It is, however and of necessity, a summary of the total analysis. No important findings have been intentionally omitted. All details of the analysis are contained in the *case record* and this is available to *Officers of the Court* on a *need to know basis*.

Standard Operating Procedures for DNA Testing at the John Tonge Centre Forensic Biology Section include:

- scientists record tests to be carried out on items in the DNA Analysis Record Logbook
- technicians perform the tests under supervision
- two scientists read the test results "blind". This means that the origin of the test sample as well as the results recorded by the other reader are unknown to them at the time of reading
- interpretation of the test results is the responsibility of the case scientist who re-reads the tests before reporting
- each case which has results which may be detrimental to any party is subject to *peer review*
- peer review is the review of casework for scientific and technical correctness by a peer forensic biologist
- all cases are subject to an *administrative review*
- an administrative review is a procedure used to check for consistency with laboratory policy and for editorial correctness

R

Scientists, of necessity, are *close* to their casework. The above process ensures that conscious or subconscious bias is *not* an issue. It is part of a quality system designed for forensic laboratories. It produces procedural *fairness*.

Until September 1996 part of the STR (HUMTHO1, HUMFES, HUMVWA, HUMF13A) analytical procedure was performed off site at the School of Science and Technology, Nathan Campus of the Griffith University. The Queensland Department of Health and Griffith University share ownership of a specialised instrument at that site. John Tonge Centre staff and an officer half-funded by Queensland Health performed that part of the procedure which detected and measured the DNA fragments. Since September of 1996 all DNA testing has been performed on-site within the forensic biology section at the John Tonge Centre for Forensic Sciences, Queensland Department of Health, Coopers Plains Campus.

OFFICIAL STATEMENT FROM FORENSIC BIOLOGY, JTCFS QUEENSLAND HEALTH
PEER REVIEWED YES/~~NO~~
CASE ANALYST: BRice
DATE ISSUED: 12/2/97

R

Exhibit No. 2
Magistrates Court
BRISBANE
10/4/97. S.M.

R

Australia and not apply for any such document.

REASONS FOR GRANTING BAIL:-

ASSOCIATE

CPK

R

Australia and not apply for any such document.

REASONS FOR GRANTING BAIL:-

ASSOCIATE

REASONS FOR GRANTING BAIL:-

ASSOCIATE

R