Opinion Letter

Prepared for: Coalition Against Genocide

NB261-7-24-Coalition Against Genocide

Eye for the Obvious
Nanette M. Barto
Forensic Document Examiner
7631 Mariposa Avenue,
Citrus Heights, CA 95610
Phone: 916-225-3016
Fax: 916-910-9657
Nanette@handwritingdocumentexamination.com

This letter contains a statement of the request of the client, descriptions of the questioned and comparison documents, a synopsis of the examination conducted, and this document examiner's opinion.

Q: Description of the Questioned Documents

I examined the following questioned documents:

Exhibit Q.1 Page 1 of 3. Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) typewritten letter dated November 26, 2012, to President Barack Obama.

Exhibit Q.2 Page 2 of 3. Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) typewritten letter with 1-10 Names and Signatures of Indian MPs.

Exhibit Q.3 Page 3 of 3. Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha) 11-40 Names and Signatures of Indian MPs.

1.0 Request

I was asked to examine a high resolution scan of a three page document bearing the signatures of 39 individuals to determine the authenticity of the document, and to exclude possibilities of alterations. Original was requested, and was not available.

2.0 Basis of Opinion

2.1 The basis for handwriting identification is that writing habits are not instinctive or hereditary but are complex processes that are developed gradually through habit and that handwriting is unique to each individual. Further, the basic axiom is that no one person writes exactly the same way twice and no two people write exactly the same. Thus writing habits or individual characteristics distinguish one person's handwriting from another.

2.2 A process of analysis, comparison and evaluation is conducted between the known standards and questioned document(s).

2.3 Based on the conclusions of the expert, an opinion will be expressed. The opinions are derived from the ASTM Standard Terminology for Expressing Conclusions for Forensic Document Examiners. (Attached as Appendix B)

3.0 Observations

As a result of the examination and analysis, my observations are as follows:

3.1 Font, leading, and kerning are consistent between each page indicating that the document was created all at one time.

3.2 Staples impressions are consistent with the 3 page document having been stapled together at the same time.

3.3 The jpeg scan was scanned in at 300 dpi and in color. Examination of the handwriting revealed that this document was the original wet ink document scanned in at a high resolution.

3.4 Careful examination of the document blown up to 400% revealed that each entry was crisp, smooth, and fluid handwriting in various color and types of inks. Natural pooling, breaking, and feathering of ink can be easily seen to support that this is a scan of an original document.

3.5 Examination for halo effects, pixel distortion, breaks in borders or baselines to determine if any alteration by way of cut and paste/computer alteration revealed no instances of these characteristics.

3.6 Examination of each signature for internal consistency of form, construction, entrance/exit, slant, spacing, ratio, and overall gestalt to determine if more than one entry was executed by the same hand showed no instances of similar characteristics between any two signatures. Signatures show no sign of trace or simulated forgery whereby excluding these characteristics: awkward/slow pen movement; tremors; stops/starts; and, blunt endings. Each signature is written with fluidity and speed, and bears their own fine/subtle traits and characteristics indicating that each signature was executed by a different hand.

4.0 Opinion

Based on a thorough analysis of the documents submitted to me, my professional expert opinion is as follows:

4.1 Using accepted principles and methods of forensic examination, it is my opinion that the Q1 – Q3 document was created in a single event, and that the signatures found upon it are original/authentic wet ink signatures.

4.2 Q1-Q3 are high resolution scans in a jpeg format of the original/authentic document, and this is based on the evidence I have been provided.

5.0 Declarations and Signature

Attached is Appendix A, a current copy of my CV as evidence of my special knowledge, skill, experience, training and education.

Executed at Citrus Heights, California this 26th day of July, 2013.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Nanette M. Barto, QDE

See attached for notary.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Eye for the Obvious
Nanette M. Barto
Forensic Document Examiner
7631 Mariposa Avenue,
Citrus Heights, CA 95610
Phone: 916-225-3016
Fax: 916-910-9657
Nanette@handwritingdocumentexamination.com

I am, Nanette M. Barto, a court qualified Forensic Document Examiner. Beginning my career in 2007, I have examined over 260 document examination cases involving over 5500 documents. I trained with the International School of Forensic Document Examination and have apprenticed under a leading court-qualified Forensic Document Expert.

Forensic Examination Provided For:

Disputed documents or signatures including: wills, checks, contracts, deeds, account ledgers, medical records, and autograph authentication. Investigation and analysis including: questioned signatures, suspect documents, forgeries, identity theft, anonymous letters, alterations, obliterations, erasures, typewritten documents, altered medical records, graffiti, handwritten numbers, and computerized and handwritten documents.

Education

- American River College: Associate in Arts - Psychology, Graduation Date May 2012
- American River College: Associate in Arts – Legal Assisting, Graduation Date May 2011
- International School of Forensic Document Examination: Certified Forensic Document Examination, Graduation Date July 2009
  Specific Areas of Training:

  Handwriting Identification and Discrimination, Signature Comparison, Techniques for Distinguishing Forged Signatures, Disguised Handwriting, Altered Numbers, Anonymous Writing, Laboratory Procedures, Forensic Microscopy and Forensic Photography, Identifying Printing Methods, Papers and Watermarks, Factors that Affect Writing, Demonstrative Evidence Training, Demonstrative Evidence in the High-Tech World, Forgery Detection Techniques, Detection of Forged Checks, Document Image Enhancement, Graphic Basis for Handwriting Comparison, Ethics in Business and the Legal System, Mock Courtroom Trails

- 2 year on-the-job apprenticeship with Bart Baggett, a court qualified document examiner and the president of the International School of Forensic Document Examination, October 2007 – October 2009.
  Apprenticeship Included:

  Gathering documents, setting up case files, scanning and photographing documents, assisting with on-site examinations, interacting as client liaison with attorneys and

clients, accounting and billing, peer reviews, preparing court exhibits, directed and witnessed client hand written exemplars. I managed 59 cases consisting of 657 documents during this time period.

Furthermore, I began taking active individual cases that were mentored and/or peer reviewed by Bart Baggett.

Further Qualifications:

I am a Notary Public closing home loans since 2004. This has provided me with a reference base for how a person signs in all conditions. I was licensed from 2005 – 2009 in Real Estate and Mortgages giving me firsthand knowledge of deeds, contracts, and loan documents.

Laboratory Equipment:

Ms. Barto's laboratory is equipped to handle forensic handwriting analysis. Her laboratory consists of equipment used for examination, such as: 10x – 40x digital microscope; HP high resolution flat bed scanner/copier/fax; light table; numerous magnifying devices; Nikon COOLPIX 35mm digital camera; protractor and metric measuring devices; black lights; supporting computer programs.

Library:

Library consists of numerous forensic document examination titles, other handwriting reference materials, and behavior profiling.

Court Testimony: 2009-2010

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
1221 Oak St., Dept. 24, 3rd Flr.
Oakland, CA
Judge Patrick Zika
Dismuke vs. Dismuke (Represented Defendant)
Dkt# RG05228940
February 10, 2009

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
100 Bicentennial Drive
Sacramento, Ca. 95826
Judge John M. O'Donnell
Youa vs. Youa/Xiong/Child Action (Plaintiff – Pro Bono)
Dkt#09SC05006
December 18, 2009

Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
400 County Center, Dept. 28
Redwood City, Ca. 94063
Judge George A. Miram
Dickson vs. Scagliola(Represented Defendant)
Dkt#PRO120063
October 26, 2010

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
100 Bicentennial Drive
Sacramento, Ca. 95826
Judge Delbert W. Oros
Sone vs. Fisher (Represented Plaintiff)
Dkt# 09SC00967
March 26, 2009

Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
24405 Amador St Dept 507, Flr. 2
Hayward, Ca. 94544
Judge Elizabeth Hendrickson
Hong vs. Wang (Represented Plaintiff)
Dkt# FF07342127
September 24, 2010

Court Testimony Continued: 2011-2012

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
3341 Power Inn Road
Sacramento, Ca. 95826
Judge Gerrit W. Wood
Wenzell v. Wenzell
Dkt#34-2009-00057473
January 13, 2011

Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin
222 East Weber Street
Stockton, California 92114
Judge Carter P. Holly
Bafaiz v. Morrison
Contract Case
July 22, 2011

Superior Court of California, County of San Joaquin
222 East Weber Street
Stockton, California 92114
People v. Serratos III
Criminal Case
February 13, 2012

Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara
191 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95113
Judge William J. Monohan
Reynolds v. Lydecker
Dkt # 1-10-CV-171079
Civil Law
June 26, 2012

Superior Court of California, County of Contra Costa
725 Court Street
Martinez, CA 94553
Judge David B. Flinn
Scarano v. Bellmore
No. P12-00905
Probate Law
February 27 & 28, 2013

Superior Court of California, County of Nevada
220 Church Street
Nevada City, CA 95959
Commissioner
Hassan v. Hassan
Family Law
July 9, 2013

Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo
400 County Center, Dept.
Redwood City, Ca. 94063
Judge Stephanie Garratt
Leigh v. Lampert
TRO Hearing
March 30, 2011

Superior Court of California, County of Merced
2260 N Street
Merced, CA 95340
Judge Gerald W. Corman
Chaudhry v. Hossain
Dkt # FLM-47893
Family Law - February 8, 2012

Superior Court of California, County of Sonoma
3055 Cleveland Ave
Santa Rosa, CA 95401 Dept #19
Judge Arthur Wick
Niffenegger v. Long
Dkt # SCV-249528
Criminal Case
February 27, 2012

Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
720 9th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Albaz v. Saleh
Unlawful Detainer
November 29, 2012

Superior Court of California, County of Plumas
520 Main Street
Quincy, CA 95971
Arbitrator Christopher Burdick
County of Plumas, Employer, v. Ted Sieck, Employee
C.S.M.C.S. Case #ARB-12-0173
May 15, 2013

Listed as an Expert Witness for: Sacramento County – Placer County – Fresno County, California, Public Defenders Office. Referred by: Public Defender, David Bonilla, Franz Criego, and Trisha Pal.

LEVELS OF OPINION-BASED ON ASTM GUIDELINES FOR EXPRESSING CONCLUSIONS

Since the observations made by the examiner relate to the product of the human behavior there are a large number of variables that could contribute to limiting the examiner's ability to express an opinion confidently. These factors include the amount, degree of variability, complexity and contemporaneity of the questioned and/or specimen writings. To allow for these limitations a scale is used which has four levels on either side of an inconclusive result. These levels are:

- **Identification / Elimination**

May be expressed as 'The writer of the known documents wrote / did not write the questioned writing.' This opinion is used when the examiner denotes no doubt in their opinion; this is the highest degree of confidence expressed by a document examiner.

- **Strong Probability**

May be expressed as 'There is a strong probability the writer of the known documents wrote / did not write the questioned writing.' This opinion is used when the evidence is very persuasive, yet some critical feature or quality is missing; however, the examiner is virtually certain in their opinion.

- **Probable**

May be expressed as 'It is probable the writer of the known documents wrote / did not write the questioned writing.' This opinion is used when the evidence points strongly toward / against the known writer; however, the evidence falls short of the virtually certain degree of confidence.

- **Evidence to Suggest**

May be expressed as 'there is evidence to suggest the writer of the known documents wrote / did not write the questioned writing.' This opinion is used when there is an identifiable limitation on the comparison process. The evidence may have few features which are of significance for handwriting comparisons purposes, but those features are in agreement with another body of writing.

- **Inconclusive**

May be expressed as 'no conclusion could be reached as to whether the writer of the known documents wrote / did not write the questioned writing.' This is the zero point of the confidence scale. It is used when there are significantly limiting factors, such as disguise in the questioned and/or known writing or a lack of comparable writing and the examiner does not have even a leaning one way or another.

According to the rules of the forefathers of document examination, Albert Osborn, Ordway Hilton, Wilson Harrison, and James V.P. Conway, a single significant difference in the fundamental structure of a writing compared to another is enough to preclude common authorship. (*Handwriting Facts and Fundamentals,* Roy Huber and A.M. Headrick, CRC Press LLC, 1999, pp 50-51).

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT
(RAJYA SABHA)

सत्यमेव जयते

President Barack Obama,
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington , DC 20500

November 26, 2012

Subject: Human rights violations in the Indian State of Gujarat and the US policy on Chief Minister Narendra Modi

Dear Mr. President,

We, the undersigned members of India's Parliament, are writing to express our concern about a possible change in US policy with respect to Mr. Narendra Modi, Chief Minister of the Indian State of Gujarat. As you may know, the United States has barred Mr. Modi from entering the country, under Section 212 (a) (2) (g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, that makes any foreign government official who "*was responsible for or directly carried out, at any time, particularly severe violations of religious freedom*" ineligible for a visa.

As you may recall, in 2002, Mr. Modi presided over one of the worst sectarian massacres in the history of independent India, which led to the killing of over 2,000 people, the rape of hundreds of women and the displacement of over 150,000 people. In the wake of these colossal and horrendous crimes against humanity, several governments across the world decided to boycott Mr. Modi and his state administration.

In March of 2005 and again in June of 2008, a number of Congresspersons in the United States wrote to then - Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice to express their profound concern over a possible visit to the US by Mr. Narendra Modi. Based on these concerns, and the recommendation of the United States Commission for International Religious Freedom (USCIRF), the State Department has rightly kept in place the ban on Mr. Modi's entry to the US.

However, there are reports that the State Department could be considering a change in this longstanding policy with respect to Mr. Modi's US visa. These reports are all the more disconcerting, in the context of the statement made by US Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asia Robert Blake in which he is reported to have indicated that Mr. Modi was free to apply for another visa.

We wish to respectfully urge you to maintain the current policy of denying Mr. Modi a visa to the United States. Given that legal cases against the culprits including many senior officials in Mr. Modi's administration are still pending in the court of law, any revoking of the ban at this juncture would be seen as a dismissal of the issues concerning Mr. Modi's role in the horrific massacres of 2002. It would legitimize Mr. Modi's human rights violations and seriously impact the nature of US-India relations by sending a message that the United States values economic interests over and above the universal values of human rights and justice.

Mr. Modi's personal complicity in the pogrom has been documented by national NGOs including India's own National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), international human rights organizations as well as investigative journalists. The recent conviction of a sitting member of the Gujarat Legislative Assembly, Maya Kodnani of the BJP, is actually a damning indictment of the Modi administration, and proof that the pogrom was planned and executed at the highest levels of the state government.

Mr. Modi has not only obstructed the course of justice, he has also failed to provide rehabilitation to the survivors of whom 16,000 continue to live in refugee colonies lacking basic amenities. Of the hundreds of women raped in 2002, there have been convictions in only two cases. His administration has even ignored a court order to restore the places of worship that were attacked and destroyed during the pogrom of 2002. Mr. Modi's administration has curtailed religious freedom by legislating a ban on religious conversion.

Unfortunately, Mr. Modi's relentless efforts at rehabilitating his own image, including a campaign by his PR firm, APCO Worldwide have created an illusion of Gujarat as a prosperous, progressive state. The reality on the ground could not be further from the truth.

Not much has changed in the last 10 years since those mass killings took place in Gujarat. Barring a handful of convictions, the hundreds of perpetrators who roamed the streets of Gujarat in February and March of 2002, killing, raping and destroying property continue to evade the law. Even these few convictions have been obtained through the sheer tenacity of NGOs and human rights activists in the face of harassment and obstruction of justice by Mr. Modi's administration.

The viciousness and barbarism that marked the Gujarat pogrom of 2002 including the burning alive of hundreds of people, and brutal sexual violence against women, make the Gujarat riots among the worst human rights violations in recent history.

In this regard, we, as human beings and as Members of India's Parliament, respectfully urge you to direct the State Department to maintain the ban on Mr. Narendra Modi's US visa. Such a ban would be consistent with US law and the shared values of the United States and India, and represent a formidable defense of the principles of human rights. Maintaining the longstanding US policy on Mr. Narendra Modi's visa is important for the ongoing struggle for justice in Gujarat.

As India and the United States address the challenges facing our societies, the time to come together on issues of human rights and justice could not have been more opportune. We sincerely urge you to fulfill our request and stand in solidarity with the survivors, human rights activists and all those who value justice and freedom of religion.

Sincerely,

Names and Signatures of Indian MPs

Sno	Name of the Member	Signature
1		
2	Husain Umar Dalwai	
3	DR. I.K.P. RAMALINGAM.	
4	M.P. Achuthan (R.S)	
5	A.S. Malathabathi	
6	SABIR ALI	
7	G. N. Ratanpuri	
8	Dr. B. K. Murkhuji	
9	Sitaram Yechury	
10	MOHAMMAD ADEEB	

11	SHAH M.P.	A.A. JINNAH
12	S.THANGAVELU	[illegible]
13	S.D SHARIQ MP J&K	[illegible]
14	ALI ANWAR ANSARI	[illegible]
15	PRADIP BHATTACHARYA	P. Bhattacharya
16	DHIRAJ PRASAD SAHU	[illegible]
17	SHANTARAM NAIK M.P	[illegible]
18	Dr. E.M.S. NATCHIAPPAN	[illegible]
19	V. Hanumantha Rao	[illegible]
20	ANANDABHASKAR RAPOLU	[illegible]
21	RATNA BALT	[illegible]
22	Anil Desai	[illegible]
23	Biswajit Daimary	[illegible]
24	JOY ABRAHAM	[illegible]
25	PANKAJ BORA.	P.Bora.
26	Avinash Pande	[illegible]
27	VANDANA CHAVAN	Chavan
28	ISHWARLAL JAIN	[illegible]
29	Prof. ALKA KSHATRIYA	[illegible]
30	Praveen Rashtrapal	[illegible]
31	Mahendra Singh Mahra	[illegible]
32	Mohammed [illegible]	[illegible]
33	Mohd Ali Khan	[illegible]
34	Parvez Hashmi	[illegible]
35	DR. Vijaylaxmi Sadho	[illegible]

36 Dr Abhishek Singhvi SINGHVI [illegible]

37 EKNATH M.GAIKWAD [illegible]

38 Jayawant G. Awale [illegible]

39 Sanjeev G Naik [illegible]

40 Marotrao Kowase [illegible]

CALIFORNIA JURAT WITH AFFIANT STATEMENT

☒ See Attached Document (Notary to cross out lines 1–6 below)
☐ See Statement Below (Lines 1–5 to be completed only by document signer[s], *not* Notary)

1
2
3
4
5
6

Signature of Document Signer No. 1

Signature of Document Signer No. 2 (if any)

State of California
County of Sacramento

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this
26th (Date) day of July (Month), 2013 (Year), by
(1) Nanette M. Barto (Name of Signer),
proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me (.) ~~(.)~~
(and
(2) _____ (Name of Signer),
proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me.)

C. BARTLETT
Commission # 1976921
Notary Public - California
Sacramento County
My Comm. Expires May 30, 2016

Signature C. Bartlett
Signature of Notary Public

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Further Description of Any Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: Opinion Letter
Document Date: 7/26/13 Number of Pages: 10
Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: N/A

RIGHT THUMBPRINT OF SIGNER #1	RIGHT THUMBPRINT OF SIGNER #2
Top of thumb here	Top of thumb here