

TECHNIQUE & TYPE	TYPE(S) OF SITUATION	WHAT TYPE(S) OF CRIME	EVALUTION - USEFUL	EVALUATION – NOT USEFUL	CASE STUDIES
The forensic technique I am going to discuss is <b>Databases</b> , and the database is <b>DNA</b> .	This is particularly useful in <b>Laboratory</b> situations, because forensic scientists are able to analyse DNA samples recovered from crime scenes and match it with sample of known offenders held on the national DNA database, this is when the offender has left samples behind such as saliva, blood or semen.	It is very useful when investigating <b>violent crime</b> , particularly sex crimes.	DNA is useful to identify an individual because everyone's genetic code is thought unique, unless they have an identical twin. The string of chemical letters in a person's DNA can therefore act like a unique bar code to identify them.  DNA and fingerprints can be left wherever a person goes: for example, on a glass or cup that they have been drinking from. This means that they can be used to track individuals – i.e. to find out whether they have been at a particular place, such as a crime scene or meeting place – where there might not be a scanner or a camera.	DNA is easily contaminated: contamination can lead to miscarriages of justice (example). The danger of contamination is if anything greater now, since the minutest quantities of DNA can now be analysed.  Suspects need to be on the DNA database to match them with a crime. In order to obtain a match with DNA from a crime scene, suspects must <b>already</b> be on the national DNA database.  The database overrepresents black males and this is dangerous. The database now holds the profiles of approximately 5 million citizens, or 8% of the population of Britain. Among black men between the ages of 18 and 35, however, that figure rises to more than 75%.	<b>Useful:</b> The case of Colin Pitchfork  <b>Not Useful:</b> The case of Adam Scott. Show the dangers of over-relying on DNA evidence. Scott was wrongly accused of rape in 2011 and spent five months in prison on remand on the basis contaminated DNA sample.
	DNA databases are less useful in some situations such as 'street' crimes because DNA normally has to be bagged and sent to a laboratory under carefully controlled conditions and the results can take a long time to come back.	It is less useful when investigating <b>property crime</b> as objects that have been stolen at crime scenes such may only carry minute traces of DNA. Moreover, unless the suspect has been convicted of a crime their DNA profile will not be on record. For these types of crime, fingerprints may be a better alternative.			
The forensic technique I am going to discuss is <b>Fingerprints</b> .	<b>Useful</b> – This is particularly useful in crime scene situations, because police and forensic scientists are able to obtain fingerprint evidence that links the people to that scene, this is particularly useful if a suspect's prints are found in a place where they would not normally be found.	<b>Useful</b> – It is very useful when investigating property crime, because as the offender often leave prints on objects of interest such as door handles or items which have been stolen.	Fingerprint evidence is very reliable. The chances of any two individuals sharing the same fingerprints are roughly one in sixty-four billion  Fingerprints are unique to each and every one of us; they cannot be forged or copied and they cannot be altered to appear as someone else's.	Fingerprints taken from crime scenes are never 'perfect' – that is they may only represent a small part of someone's actual prints, this may reduce reliability.  Another reason for lack of reliability is fingerprint analysis involves human judgements, which are 'subjective'. This means there is no guarantee that two different examiners who follow it's the process will reach the same results	<b>Useful:</b> One case where fingerprints were used to secure a conviction was the case of Harry Jackson, a burglar who was the first person convicted on fingerprint evidence in the UK in 1902, his fingerprints were found by the newly formed Metropolitan Police Fingerprint Bureau.  <b>Not Useful:</b> One case where fingerprints led to misidentification and a possible miscarriage of justice was the case of Brandon Mayfield, who was mistakenly linked to bag used in the Madrid train bombings in 2004. Mr Mayfield was under suspicion because he was a Muslim covert, further investigations completely cleared him,
	<b>Not Useful</b> – Fingerprinting is not so useful in street situations, because many people have a legitimate reasons to be present in the scene and also there is less physical touching of items.	<b>Not Useful</b> – It is also not so useful when investigating e-crime, because offenders rarely leave a physical traces of their crimes, in these sorts of crimes investigators are looking for a 'digital' fingerprint which is an electronic record left on computers or computer networks.	Fingerprint evidence is not only important as a means of identifying a suspect but also as a means of proving the suspect's presence at the scene of a crime especially if the scene of the crime is somewhere he or she may not have had any reason to be		