

شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلو

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم





MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلو



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم



MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكترونى والميكروفيلم

جامعة عين شمس التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



MONA MAGHRABY



Comparative Study between Variable Computer Printed Documents to Identify the Type of the Producing Output Devices

Thesis

Submitted for Partial fulfilment of the degree of M.D in Forensic Medicine and Toxicology

Presented by

Abeer Sayed Abdo Borae

(MSC.)

Assistant Lecturer in Department of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Supervised by

Prof. Yasser Fouad Abd El-Monem Al-Akid

Proferror of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

Ass. Prof. Nesrine Abd El-Rahaman Mahmoud

Assistant Proferror of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University

General. Dr. Khaled Abd El-Azeem Mahmoud Tamim

Former Director of Document Examination at Forensic Labs General Administration of Criminal Evidence – Ministry of Interior

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University
2021



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgment

First of all, I would like to express my deep gratitude to **Allah** for his care and generosity throughout my life...

No words can express my deepest appreciation and profound respect to **Prof. Dr. Wasser Found**Abd El-Monem Al-Akid, Professor of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology, Ain Shams University, for his continuous guidance, support and constructive criticism during the work. It was a great honor to work under his supervision.

Also, my profound gratitude to Ass. **Prof. Dr.**Mesrine Abd El-Rahman Mahmoud, Assistant Professor of Forensic Medicine and Clinical Toxicology, Ain Shams University, for her kind supervision, support and help. She has generously devoted much of her time and her effort for supervision of this study.

I would like also to thank General. Dr. Khaled Abd El-Azeem Mahmoud Tamim, Former Director of Document Examination at Forensic Labs, General Administration of Criminal Evidence – Ministry of Interior, for his support and help during the work.

Last but not least, I dedicate this work to my Mother, my Father's soul and my Husband, whom without their sincere emotional support, pushing me forward this work would not have ever been completed.

Abeer Sayed Abdo Borae

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	i
List of Figures	v
List of Abbreviations	XX
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	3
Review of Literature	
₩ History of Forgery	4
Classification and Methods of Forgery	10
Operating Mechanisms of the Printer Devices	s18
Examination of a Questioned Document	29
Materials and Methods	46
Results	59
Discussion	132
Conclusion	172
Recommendations	175
Summary	176
References	
Arabic Summary	

List of Tables

Table No	. Title	Page No.
Table (1. a):	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by differe selected inkjet printers on the computer typed docum samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and digital microscope	nents (n= 44 I direct light
Table (1.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the meathickness of letters for computer typed documents profour different models of inkjet printers (n= 44 sampl were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring De	duced by the es). Samples
Table (2. a):	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by differe selected laser printers on the computer typed docum samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and digital microscope	nents (n= 44 I direct light
Table (2.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the meathickness of letters for computer typed documents profour different models of laser printers (n= 44 sample were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring De	duced by the es). Samples
Table (3. a):	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by differe selected photocopiers on the computer typed docum samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and digital microscope	nents (n= 44 l direct light
Table (3.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the meathickness of letters for computer typed documents profour different models of photocopiers (n= 44 sample were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring De	duced by the es). Samples
Table (4. a):	Comparison between the general criteria induced by different the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and photocopier) on computer typed documents (n= 132 samples). Sa examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope	the produced amples were
Table (4.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for compar measured mean thickness of letters of computer type produced by the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and (n= 132 samples). Samples were examined by the Pap Measuring Device.	d documents photocopier) er Thickness
Table (5. a):	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by differe selected inkjet printers on the handwritten and scanne (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV ray light digital microscope.	d documents ys and direct
Table (5.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the meathickness of letters for scanned handwritten documents the four different models of inkjet printers (n= 44 samp were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device	produced by les). Samples

List of Tables (Cont...)

Table No	. Title	Page No.
Table (6. a):	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by diff selected laser printers on the handwritten and scar (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV light digital microscope.	nned documents rays and direct
Table (6.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the nather thickness of letters for handwritten and scanned docuby the four different models of laser printers (nather than scanned by the Paper Thickness Measurement of the printer of the pri	ments produced = 44 samples).
Table (7. a):	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by diff selected photocopiers on the scanned handwritten 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays digital microscope	documents (n= and direct light
Table (7.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the natherithms of letters for scanned handwritten docume the four different models of photocopiers (n= 44 same were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring December 2015).	nts produced by mples). Samples
Table (8. a):	Comparison between the general criteria induced by of the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and photocopier) of hand-written and scanned documents (n= 132 sar were examined by UV rays and direct light digital mid	on the produced mples). Samples
Table (8.b):	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for commeasured mean thickness of letters of hand-wriproduced by the studied printers (Inkjet, laser ar (n= 132 samples). Samples were examined by the Measuring Device.	tten documents nd photocopier) Paper Thickness
Table (9. a):	Comparison between the criteria of the intersect pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours in signing and typing and ten-computer typed then significantly with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) ballpoint pen; all documents were produced by the printer model and examined by UV rays and direct digital microscope (n = 20 samples)	aterval between gned documents using the same the same inkjet illumination of
Table (9.b):	Comparison between the mean thickness of the in (μm) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed interval between signing and typing and the tenthen signed documents with 3 hours interval between signing using the same ballpoint pen. All deproduced by the same inkjet printer model and expaper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples	ntersecting site d with 3 hours computer typed veen typing and ocuments were xamined by the

List of Tables (Cont...)

Table No	o. Title	Page No.
Table (10. a):	Comparison between the criteria of the intersect pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours is signing and typing and ten-computer typed then swith 3 hours interval between typing and signing ballpoint pen; all documents were produced by printer model and examined by UV rays and direct digital microscope (n = 20 samples)	interval between igned documents) using the same v the same laser at illumination of
Table (10.b):	Comparison between the mean thickness of the (μm) for the ten pre-signed then computer-type interval between signing and typing and the ten then signed documents with 3 hours interval between signing using the same ballpoint pen. All of produced by the same laser printer model and of Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples	ed with 3 hours -computer typed ween typing and documents were examined by the les)105
Table (11. a):	Comparison between the criteria of the intersect pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours is signing and typing and ten-computer typed then swith 3 hours interval between typing and signing ballpoint pen; all documents were produced photocopier model and examined by UV rillumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples	interval between igned documents) using the same I by the same rays and direct
Table (11.b):	Comparison between the mean thickness of the (μm) for the ten pre-signed then computer-type interval between signing and typing and the ten then signed documents with 3 hours interval bet signing using the same ballpoint pen. All a produced by the same photocopier model and a Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples	ed with 3 hours -computer typed ween typing and documents were examined by the
Table (12. a):	Comparison between the criteria of the intersect pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours is signing and typing and ten-computer typed then swith 3 hours interval between typing and signing rollerball pen; all documents were produced by printer model and examined by UV rays and direct digital microscope. (n = 20 samples)	interval between igned documents) using the same the same inkjet at illumination of
Table (12.b):	Comparison between the mean thickness of the (μm) for the ten pre-signed then computer-type interval between signing and typing and ten-comsigned documents with 3 hours interval between signing using the same rollerball pen. All opproduced by the same inkjet printer model and opproduced by the same inkjet printer	intersecting site ed with 3 hours uputer typed then reen typing and documents were examined by the

List of Tables (Cont...)

Table No	. Title	Page No.
Table (13. a):	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours intersigning and typing and ten-computer typed then signed with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) us rollerball pen; all documents were produced by the printer model and examined by UV rays and direct ill digital microscope (n = 20 samples)	rval between ed documents sing the same e same laser lumination of
Table (13.b):	Comparison between the mean thickness of the interval pre-signed then computer-typed interval between signing and typing and the ten-conthen signed documents with 3 hours interval between signing using the same rollerball pen. All docuproduced by the same laser printer model and example Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples)	with 3 hours mputer typed on typing and uments were mined by the
Table (14. a):	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours intersigning and typing and ten-computer typed then signed with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) us rollerball pen; all documents were produced be photocopier model and examined by UV rays illumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples)	rval between ed documents sing the same y the same and direct
Table (14.b):	Comparison between the mean thickness of the interval (μ m) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed interval between signing and typing and the ten-conthen signed documents with 3 hours interval between signing using the same rollerball pen. All docuproduced by the same photocopier model and examples Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples)	with 3 hours mputer typed on typing and uments were nined by the

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1.1):	The architecture for a typical inkjet printer	20
Figure (1.2):	The sequence of absorption of the ink droplet into a polike paper formed of random network of microfibers	
Figure (1.3):	Laser printer components and process	22
Figure (1.4):	A side view of the cartridge of a typical laser printer sequence of events occurs during laser printing	
Figure (1.5):	Photocopier components and process showing the events occurs during photocopying	
Figure (1.6):	Shows the flatbed scanner architecture	28
Figure (4.1):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of inkjet printers showing around the inkjet-printed marking. Sample was examing illumination of digital microscope.	scattered ink ned by direct
Figure (4.2):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of inkjet printers showing hair defined edges of inkjet-printed markings. Sample was direct illumination of digital microscope.	y-like and ill- examined by
Figure (4.3):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produc the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that markings are dull and not homogenous. Sample was direct illumination of digital microscope.	ed by one of inkjet-printed examined by
Figure (4.4):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that paper over the inkjet-printed marking didn't disrupt it Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital m	ed by one of folding of the s integration.
Figure (4.5):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that spaper over the inkjet-printed marking didn't disrupt it Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital m	scratching the sintegration.
Figure (4.6):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by selected models of inkjet printers showing that the inkjet-pri are not homogenous and their edges are hairy-like and ill-de was examined by ultraviolet light.	one of the four inted markings efined. Sample
Figure (4.7):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of laser printers showing absorbed around laser-printed marking. Sample was examine illumination of digital microscope.	ence of toner ed by direct
Figure (4.8):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of laser printers showing that e printed marking are sharp and well-defined. Sample we by direct illumination of digital microscope	ed by one of dges of laser- vas examined

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (4.9):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of laser printers showing that markings are bright and homogenous. Sample was direct illumination of digital microscope.	t laser-printed examined by67
Figure (4.10):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of laser printers showing that paper over the laser-printed marking broke it. Sample was by direct illumination of digital microscope	folding of the was examined
Figure (4.11):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of laser printers showing that paper over the laser-printed marking induced its disrupt was examined by direct illumination of digital microsco	scratching the ption. Sample
Figure (4.12):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of laser printers showing to printed markings are homogenous and their edges a well-defined. Sample was examined by ultraviolet light	ced by one of hat the laser- are sharp and
Figure (4.13):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of photocopiers showing absearound photocopied marking. Sample was examined billumination of digital microscope	ence of toner y direct
Figure (4.14):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of photocopiers showing the photocopied markings are slightly sharp. Sample was direct illumination of digital microscope.	that edges of examined by
Figure (4.15):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of photocopiers showing that markings are moderately bright and moderately Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital	t photocopied homogenous.
Figure (4.16):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of photocopiers showing that paper over the photocopied marking broke it. Sample vby direct illumination of digital microscope	folding of the was examined
Figure (4.17):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of photocopiers showing that paper over the photocopied marking induced its disrupt was examined by direct illumination of digital microscopies.	scratching the ption. Sample
Figure (4.18):	Photomicrograph of computer typed document product the four selected models of photocopiers showing photocopied markings are moderately homogenous are are slightly sharp. Sample was examined by ultraviolet l	ing that the add their edges

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (4.19):	Photomicrograph of document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an showing that the inkjet-printed markings are document produced from an inkjet-printed markings are document produced from a prod	lull and not fined. Sample
Figure (4.20):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a showing that the laser-printed markings are bright and and their edges are sharp and well-defined. Sample v by direct illumination of digital microscope	homogenous was examined
Figure (4.21):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a showing that the photocopied markings are moderated moderately homogenous and their edges are slightly swas examined by direct illumination of digital microscopies.	ely bright and sharp. Sample
Figure (4.22):	Photomicrograph of document produced from an showing examined criteria by using UV light where markings are not homogenous and their edges are hadefined.	inkjet-printed iry-like & ill-
Figure (4.23):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a laser pre- examined criteria by using UV light where laser-printed homogenous and their edges are sharp and well-defined	l markings are
Figure (4.24):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a photocopied examined criteria by using UV light where photocopied moderately homogenous and their edges are slightly shared to the company of	l markings are
Figure (4.25):	Photomicrograph of document produced from an inkjet p that folding of the paper over the inkjet-printed marking h it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital m	ad no effect on
Figure (4.26):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a laser p that folding of the paper over the laser-printed marking br was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.	oke it. Sample
Figure (4.27):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a photoc that folding of the paper over the photocopied marking br was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.	oke it. Sample
Figure (4.28):	Photomicrograph of document produced from an showing that scratching the paper over the inkjet-pri had no effect on it. Sample was examined by direct il digital microscope.	nted marking lumination of
Figure (4.29):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a showing that scratching the paper over the laser-pri induced its disruption. Sample was examined by direct of digital microscope.	laser printer nted marking et illumination

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.	
Figure (4.30):	Photomicrograph of document produced from a showing that scratching the paper over the photoco induced its disruption. Sample was examined by direct of digital microscope.	pied marking et illumination	7
Figure (4.31):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned docum by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers the edges of inkjet-printed markings are hairy-line at Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital	showing that nd ill-defined.	31
Figure (4.32):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned docum by one of the four selected models of inkjet print scattered ink around inkjet-printed marking. Sample value by direct illumination of digital microscope	nters showing was examined	31
Figure (4.33):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned docum by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers the inkjet-printed markings are dull and not homoge was examined by direct illumination of digital microsc	showing that nous. Sample	31
Figure (4.34):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing of the paper over the inkjet-printed marking didnintegration. Sample was examined by direct illuminal microscope.	ng that folding 't disrupt its tion of digital	31
Figure (4.35):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document one of the four selected models of inkjet printers scratching the paper over the inkjet-printed marking distintegration. Sample was examined by direct illuminal microscope.	at produced by showing that dn't disrupt its tion of digital	
Figure (4.36):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document one of the four selected models of inkjet printers show criteria by using UV light where inkjet-printed mar homogenous and their edges are hairy-like and ill-define	t produced by ving examined kings are not	
Figure (4.37):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned docum by one of the four selected models of laser printers sho edges of laser-printed markings are irregular. Sample of by direct illumination of digital microscope	owing that the was examined	35
Figure (4.38):	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned docume by one of the four selected models of laser print scattered toner around laser-printed marking. Sample by direct illumination of digital microscope	nters showing was examined	35