



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية  
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرو فيلم

# بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم



**MONA MAGHRABY**



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية  
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم



# شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم



**MONA MAGHRABY**



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية  
التوثيق الإلكتروني 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 Boraie**

*(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



بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سببنا أنك لا تعلم لنا  
إلا ما علمتنا أنك أنت  
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

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. Yasser Fouad 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. Nesrine 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 Jamim**, 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.
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of Figures.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations.....</b>	<b>xx</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Aim of the Work.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Review of Literature</b>	
☞ History of Forgery .....	4
☞ Classification and Methods of Forgery.....	10
☞ Operating Mechanisms of the Printer Devices.....	18
☞ Examination of a Questioned Document .....	29
<b>Materials and Methods.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Results.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>176</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>Arabic Summary.....</b>	<b>١</b>

# *List of Tables*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (1. a):</b>	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by different models of selected inkjet printers on the computer typed documents (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope.....	61
<b>Table (1.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the measured mean thickness of letters for computer typed documents produced by the four different models of inkjet printers (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	62
<b>Table (2. a):</b>	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by different models of selected laser printers on the computer typed documents (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope.....	65
<b>Table (2.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the measured mean thickness of letters for computer typed documents produced by the four different models of laser printers (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	66
<b>Table (3. a):</b>	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by different models of selected photocopiers on the computer typed documents (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope.....	69
<b>Table (3.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the measured mean thickness of letters for computer typed documents produced by the four different models of photocopiers (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	70
<b>Table (4. a):</b>	Comparison between the general criteria induced by different types of the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and photocopier) on the produced computer typed documents (n= 132 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope. ....	74
<b>Table (4.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for comparison of the measured mean thickness of letters of computer typed documents produced by the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and photocopier) (n= 132 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	75
<b>Table (5. a):</b>	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by different models of selected inkjet printers on the handwritten and scanned documents (n= 44 samples).Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope. ....	79
<b>Table (5.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the measured mean thickness of letters for scanned handwritten documents produced by the four different models of inkjet printers (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device.....	80



## *List of Tables (Cont...)*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (6. a):</b>	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by different models of selected laser printers on the handwritten and scanned documents (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope. ....	83
<b>Table (6.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the measured mean thickness of letters for handwritten and scanned documents produced by the four different models of laser printers (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	84
<b>Table (7. a):</b>	Percentage of similarity for criteria induced by different models of selected photocopiers on the scanned handwritten documents (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope. ....	87
<b>Table (7.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for the measured mean thickness of letters for scanned handwritten documents produced by the four different models of photocopiers (n= 44 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	88
<b>Table (8. a):</b>	Comparison between the general criteria induced by different types of the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and photocopier) on the produced hand-written and scanned documents (n= 132 samples). Samples were examined by UV rays and direct light digital microscope. ....	92
<b>Table (8.b):</b>	ANOVA one-way statistical analysis for comparison of the measured mean thickness of letters of hand-written documents produced by the studied printers (Inkjet, laser and photocopier) (n= 132 samples). Samples were examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. ....	93
<b>Table (9. a):</b>	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting site of (ten pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) using the same ballpoint pen; all documents were produced by the same inkjet printer model and examined by UV rays and direct illumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples). ....	98
<b>Table (9.b):</b>	Comparison between the mean thickness of the intersecting site ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and the ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing using the same ballpoint pen. All documents were produced by the same inkjet printer model and examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples). ....	99

## *List of Tables (Cont...)*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (10. a):</b>	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting site of (ten pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) using the same ballpoint pen; all documents were produced by the same laser printer model and examined by UV rays and direct illumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples). ....	104
<b>Table (10.b):</b>	Comparison between the mean thickness of the intersecting site ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and the ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing using the same ballpoint pen. All documents were produced by the same laser printer model and examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples). ....	105
<b>Table (11. a):</b>	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting site of (ten pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) using the same ballpoint pen; all documents were produced by the same photocopier model and examined by UV rays and direct illumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples). ....	110
<b>Table (11.b):</b>	Comparison between the mean thickness of the intersecting site ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and the ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing using the same ballpoint pen. All documents were produced by the same photocopier model and examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples). ....	111
<b>Table (12. a):</b>	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting site of (ten pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) using the same rollerball pen; all documents were produced by the same inkjet printer model and examined by UV rays and direct illumination of digital microscope. (n = 20 samples). ....	116
<b>Table (12.b):</b>	Comparison between the mean thickness of the intersecting site ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing using the same rollerball pen. All documents were produced by the same inkjet printer model and examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples). ....	117

## *List of Tables (Cont...)*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (13. a):</b>	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting site of (ten pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) using the same rollerball pen; all documents were produced by the same laser printer model and examined by UV rays and direct illumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples). .....	122
<b>Table (13.b):</b>	Comparison between the mean thickness of the intersecting site ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and the ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing using the same rollerball pen. All documents were produced by the same laser printer model and examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples). .....	123
<b>Table (14. a):</b>	Comparison between the criteria of the intersecting site of (ten pre-signed then computer typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing) using the same rollerball pen; all documents were produced by the same photocopier model and examined by UV rays and direct illumination of digital microscope (n = 20 samples). .....	128
<b>Table (14.b):</b>	Comparison between the mean thickness of the intersecting site ( $\mu\text{m}$ ) for the ten pre-signed then computer-typed with 3 hours interval between signing and typing and the ten-computer typed then signed documents with 3 hours interval between typing and signing using the same rollerball pen. All documents were produced by the same photocopier model and examined by the Paper Thickness Measuring Device. (n = 20 samples). .....	129

# *List of Figures*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (1.1):</b>	The architecture for a typical inkjet printer .....	20
<b>Figure (1.2):</b>	The sequence of absorption of the ink droplet into a porous medium like paper formed of random network of microfibers .....	21
<b>Figure (1.3):</b>	Laser printer components and process .....	22
<b>Figure (1.4):</b>	A side view of the cartridge of a typical laser printer showing the sequence of events occurs during laser printing .....	25
<b>Figure (1.5):</b>	Photocopier components and process showing the sequence of events occurs during photocopying.....	27
<b>Figure (1.6):</b>	Shows the flatbed scanner architecture .....	28
<b>Figure (4.1):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing scattered ink around the inkjet-printed marking. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	63
<b>Figure (4.2):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing hairy-like and ill-defined edges of inkjet-printed markings. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	63
<b>Figure (4.3):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that inkjet-printed markings are dull and not homogenous. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	63
<b>Figure (4.4):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that folding of the paper over the inkjet-printed marking didn't disrupt its integration. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	63
<b>Figure (4.5):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that scratching the paper over the inkjet-printed marking didn't disrupt its integration. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	63
<b>Figure (4.6):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that the inkjet-printed markings are not homogenous and their edges are hairy-like and ill-defined. Sample was examined by ultraviolet light. ....	63
<b>Figure (4.7):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing absence of toner around laser-printed marking. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	67
<b>Figure (4.8):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing that edges of laser-printed marking are sharp and well-defined. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	67

## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (4.9):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing that laser-printed markings are bright and homogenous. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	67
<b>Figure (4.10):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing that folding of the paper over the laser-printed marking broke it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	67
<b>Figure (4.11):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing that scratching the paper over the laser-printed marking induced its disruption. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	67
<b>Figure (4.12):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing that the laser-printed markings are homogenous and their edges are sharp and well-defined. Sample was examined by ultraviolet light.....	67
<b>Figure (4.13):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of photocopiers showing absence of toner around photocopied marking. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	71
<b>Figure (4.14):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of photocopiers showing that edges of photocopied markings are slightly sharp. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	71
<b>Figure (4.15):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of photocopiers showing that photocopied markings are moderately bright and moderately homogenous. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	71
<b>Figure (4.16):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of photocopiers showing that folding of the paper over the photocopied marking broke it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	71
<b>Figure (4.17):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of photocopiers showing that scratching the paper over the photocopied marking induced its disruption. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	71
<b>Figure (4.18):</b>	Photomicrograph of computer typed document produced by one of the four selected models of photocopiers showing that the photocopied markings are moderately homogenous and their edges are slightly sharp. Sample was examined by ultraviolet light. ....	71

## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (4.19):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from an inkjet printer showing that the inkjet-printed markings are dull and not homogenous and their edges are hairy-like & ill-defined. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	76
<b>Figure (4.20):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a laser printer showing that the laser-printed markings are bright and homogenous and their edges are sharp and well-defined. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	76
<b>Figure (4.21):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a photocopier showing that the photocopied markings are moderately bright and moderately homogenous and their edges are slightly sharp. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	76
<b>Figure (4.22):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from an inkjet printer showing examined criteria by using UV light where inkjet-printed markings are not homogenous and their edges are hairy-like & ill-defined. ....	76
<b>Figure (4.23):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a laser printer showing examined criteria by using UV light where laser-printed markings are homogenous and their edges are sharp and well-defined. ....	76
<b>Figure (4.24):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a photocopier showing examined criteria by using UV light where photocopied markings are moderately homogenous and their edges are slightly sharp.....	76
<b>Figure (4.25):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from an inkjet printer showing that folding of the paper over the inkjet-printed marking had no effect on it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	77
<b>Figure (4.26):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a laser printer showing that folding of the paper over the laser-printed marking broke it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	77
<b>Figure (4.27):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a photocopier showing that folding of the paper over the photocopied marking broke it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	77
<b>Figure (4.28):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from an inkjet printer showing that scratching the paper over the inkjet-printed marking had no effect on it. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	77
<b>Figure (4.29):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a laser printer showing that scratching the paper over the laser-printed marking induced its disruption. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	77



## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (4.30):</b>	Photomicrograph of document produced from a photocopier showing that scratching the paper over the photocopied marking induced its disruption. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	77
<b>Figure (4.31):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that the edges of inkjet-printed markings are hairy-line and ill-defined. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	81
<b>Figure (4.32):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing scattered ink around inkjet-printed marking. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	81
<b>Figure (4.33):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that the inkjet-printed markings are dull and not homogenous. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	81
<b>Figure (4.34):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that folding of the paper over the inkjet-printed marking didn't disrupt its integration. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	81
<b>Figure (4.35):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing that scratching the paper over the inkjet-printed marking didn't disrupt its integration. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope. ....	81
<b>Figure (4.36):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of inkjet printers showing examined criteria by using UV light where inkjet-printed markings are not homogenous and their edges are hairy-like and ill-defined. ....	81
<b>Figure (4.37):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing that the edges of laser-printed markings are irregular. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	85
<b>Figure (4.38):</b>	Photomicrograph of handwritten and scanned document produced by one of the four selected models of laser printers showing scattered toner around laser-printed marking. Sample was examined by direct illumination of digital microscope.....	85