

# *Cecil Greenfield*

## *Forensic Examiner of Questioned Documents*

P.O.Box 76259  
Wendywood 2144  
Tel: Off. +27 11 804 1340  
Fax: +27 11 804 1678  
Cell: +27 83 230 2409  
Email: [Greenfield@worldonline.co.za](mailto:Greenfield@worldonline.co.za)  
Website: [www.cecilgreenfield.com](http://www.cecilgreenfield.com)

### **RESUME OF EXPERTISE:**

#### **BACKGROUND:**

Over a period of some fifty years I have made an in-depth study of all aspects of handwriting analysis and identification, and am familiar with the works of internationally recognised authorities on the subject.

In February 1981 I passed the entrance examination of the American Association of Handwriting Analysts. In 1988 I qualified for professional membership to the World Association of Document Examiners; court qualified in 1990, and in 1991 I qualified for membership of The British Institute of Graphologists.

I am a **founder member of the South African Association of Forensic Document Examiners** (created on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2008), an active member of the Forensic Science Society of U.K (since 1993), and an active associate member of the International Association for Identification of the U S A (since 1985); I served as a member of their Standing Committee on Forensic Laboratory Analysis in 1991. The Association that was founded in 1915 has a membership in excess of 5000 members worldwide. I subscribe to and receive literature from handwriting and forensic science related associations, and utilize information available on the Internet.

#### **EXPERIENCE:**

I have been involved as a document examiner/handwriting expert in some 2000 investigations since 1983, for banks, insurance companies, schools, universities, private investigators, and for the legal profession.

Among others, I have been called upon to express expert opinion concerning document related matters, for Spoornet/Transnet, for The Ombudsman for Banking Services, for

Trade Unions including NUM, NUMSA, and PAWUSA, the Institute of Chartered Accountants (SA), and for the South African Revenue Services.

I have appeared as an expert witness in Magistrate's, Industrial, and High Courts in the Republic of South Africa, in Swaziland, Botswana, and in the other neighbouring territories.

I have been called as an expert witness at arbitration, at disciplinary hearings, and before the Law Society of Natal. Over the years I have, on occasion, been asked to express an opinion and to present expert testimony, regarding type-script, postmarks and rubber-stamp marks.

#### **QUALIFICATIONS:**

In view of my background and experience I am capable of expressing a worthwhile opinion as to whether handwriting (including signatures) is or is not that of a specific person, and also regarding the integrity of documents generally

#### **ARTICLES IN JOURNALS:**

My article "Write into the Future" was included in the November/December 2004 edition of The Journal of Forensic Identification; i.e. the journal of the International Association for Identification of USA, and in the July 2004 edition of IA Adviser – the journal of The Institute of Internal Auditors of South Africa. My article "Conflicting Evidence of Handwriting Experts" appeared in the June 2005 edition of "De Rebus" – the journal of the Law Society of South Africa. **A copy of the above described articles can be found in my website.** An abridged version of a judgement given by the late Justice Harold L Berman was included in the August 1995 edition of the S.A. Law Journal. It appears as "A Trimestrial Potpourri" entitled "The Curious Case of the Sheiks" - it includes my involvement.

## **EQUIPMENT:**

### **For Viewing:**

An **Olympus stereoscopic zoom microscope**, fluorescent and ultra-violet light boxes, loupes and various magnifying devices, and an overhead projector. Comprehensive lighting facilities, including fibre optic, for detailed close-up image illumination. High resolution scanning facilities, including a Foster and Freeman **Video Spectral Comparator (VSC4)** for the examination and comparison of inks, and for the detection of overwritten writings, erasures, latent indentations, and details hidden beyond the visual spectrum.

### **For Photography:**

**Analogue and digital Canon , Nikon, and Olympus cameras** with facilities for high resolution macro and micro photography.

### **For Measuring:**

Various instruments and grids, including **0.05mm dial callipers**.

### **Computer Software:**

**Analysis “Soft Imaging System”** for image acquisition, image archiving, documentation, interactive measurements, graphic overlay, direct printing and macro scripting facilities.

### **Typewriters/Printers:**

Comprehensive **catalogues of typestyles/fonts** used by the manufacturers of typewriters and printers. Furthermore I have a sizable collection of working portable typewriters in my “museum” dating back to 1912.

### **Library:**

I have a comprehensive library of books by well known authorities on all aspects of handwriting and typescript analysis and investigation.

## **APPROACH TO ESTABLISHING THE AUTHENTICITY OF DISPUTED SIGNATURES:**

1. In order to ascertain whether or not disputed signatures are authentic, an adequate number of **acknowledged signatures** would be necessary for use **as standards for comparison purposes.**
2. The **quantity of standards required** would depend on the overall consistency of the writer's normal signature; **natural variation** is bound to occur in everybody's signature. **A larger number of standards would be necessary if the writer has a tendency to vary his/her signature considerably.**
3. The best standards would be the signatures written spontaneously on documents **contemporaneous with the disputed signatures**, and preferably those appearing on documents similar to the questioned documents.
4. **Request specimens**, where the writer is asked to produce **exemplar signatures**, are of less value for comparison purposes than are collected specimens as described above. However, if the specimens submitted differ significantly from the collected specimens, this would suggest that the writer is being deceptive.
5. Generally the examiner should not be deceived by **self-serving standards.**
6. The **standard of writing capability** demonstrated in the known and disputed writings would be compared. It is axiomatic that a person **cannot write beyond his/her ability or skills.**

7. The **line quality, including the evenness of the line as well as the pressure pattern,** would be compared. **Hesitation, tremor, and inappropriate pen lifts occurring within the line** would be sought.
  
8. **Individual habits, including: the slope, the alignment of the signature's components with the given base line, the positioning of pen-lifts and line re-starts, the line direction and the sequence of strokes, the spacing between letters and strokes, the positioning of the "i" dots and the "t" bars, the proportional height of the short and tall letters, the positioning of the apices of the tall letters etc, would be compared.**
  
9. Generally, **common individual characteristics** occurring among the letter formations would be sought.
  
10. Consistency in the **overall spontaneity** demonstrated by the speed and fluency of the line would be investigated; for example the occurrence of tapering **flying starts and finishes** of lead and end strokes,
  
11. **Persistent dissimilarities** that could not be argued away as natural variations would be sought.
  
12. **Latent guide lines and grooves within the line,** coupled by **the lack of spontaneity of the line,** would be investigated regarding the **possibility that the signatures were traced.**