

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA

Case Number: 21-01099CFANO

STATE OF FLORIDA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

CORNELIUS TREVON WHITFIELD,

Defendant.

DEPOSITION OF:

KARIANNA BABER

TAKEN BY:

Counsel for the Defendant

DATE:

July 16, 2026

TIME:

2:02 p.m. - 3:07 p.m.

PLACE:

Pinellas Co. Justice Center
14250 49th Street - 1100-4
Clearwater, FL

REPORTED BY:

Tamara M. Pacheco, RPR
Notary Public, State of FL

Pages 1 - 57

JTP REPORTING (727)422-8287

APPEARANCES

ANTHONY BRADLOW, ESQUIRE

Assistant State Attorney

14250 49th Street North

Clearwater, Florida 34620

Attorney for the State of Florida

JULIA SEIFER-SMITH, ESQUIRE

MARGARET RUSSELL, ESQUIRE

Assistant Public Defenders

14250 49th Street North

Clearwater, Florida 34620

Attorneys for the Defendant

ALSO PRESENT:

Christine Scott, Mitigation Specialist

INDEX

KARIANNA BABER	PAGE:
Examination by Ms. Seifer-Smith.....	4
Examination by Ms. Russell.....	52
Examination by Ms. Seifer-Smith.....	53
Certificate of Oath.....	55
Certificate of Reporter.....	56
Errata/Signature Page.....	57

EXHIBITS

(No exhibits were marked for identification.)

1 WHEREUPON,

2 KARIANNA BABER

3 (the deponent herein, being first duly sworn, was examined
4 and testified as follows:)

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY MS. SEIFER-SMITH:

7 Q. Can you please state your name for the record.

8 A. Karianna Baber.

9 Q. We're here in the matter of Cornelius Whitfield.

10 My name is Julia Seifer-Smith. I'm an assistant public
11 defender. Together with Margaret Russell, we represent
12 Mr. Whitfield in this matter. Also present is Anthony
13 Bradlow from the State Attorney's office.

14 Can you tell me what, if anything, you reviewed
15 in connection with this case before being sworn in by our
16 court reporter.

17 A. I had pulled and been looking over these
18 reports, and then I made this flash drive by request with
19 all my case files.

20 Q. Okay. Can you tell me how many reports you
21 reviewed?

22 A. I think there's five.

23 Q. Are they reports that you yourself authored?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Was there anything else that you reviewed in

1 connection with this case?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Anything else that you need to take a look at
4 before we get into things?

5 A. I don't think so, no.

6 Q. Okay. We've spoken before, but do you mind
7 telling me about, like, your profession, your credentials,
8 things like that.

9 A. Okay. I've been a latent print examiner for
10 over ten years now. I've been with St. Petersburg PD for
11 the last five. I'm also certified by the IAI as a
12 certified latent print examiner. I -- before coming here,
13 I worked at the Tulsa Police Forensic Lab. There I went
14 to a six-month training, the National Latent Print
15 Examiner Training Program, six months of training to be an
16 examiner. I finished their in-house training and was able
17 to work casework within less than a year. I was there for
18 about three years. And then before that I worked at
19 Denver Police Department doing fingerprints for about two.

20 Q. Goodness, you've moved around a lot.

21 A. I like to move.

22 Q. Are you leaving Florida anytime soon?

23 A. It's --

24 Q. No telling?

25 A. Yeah. Yeah.

1 Q. I know you mentioned that IAI having certified
2 you. Are you a member of that organization now?

3 A. I am.

4 Q. Okay. And do you hold any positions with them,
5 or are you just like a regular member?

6 A. Right now I'm just a regular member.

7 Q. And are you required either by the IAI or any
8 other governing bodies or perhaps by your own department
9 to continue to do education in your field?

10 A. Because I'm certified, I absolutely am required
11 to take continuing education, especially for
12 recertification which for me will be next year. That
13 requires a whole bunch. Our department requires about
14 forty, I think, hours per year. But certification, the
15 training can be a little bit more variable and intensive.

16 Q. Can you tell me a little bit about the training?
17 Like, what does that entail?

18 A. So training can include classes, a certain
19 number of hours for classes. Those classes have to be
20 registered with the organization and certified or checked
21 off as counting as credit hours for their certifications.
22 You can also teach, make publications, all sorts of --
23 those are the three big ones that I can think of to really
24 get all the training and hours that you need to take a
25 re-cert test.

1 Q. Have you published anything in the field?

2 A. I have not.

3 Q. Are you working on publishing anything?

4 A. I would love to.

5 Q. Are you working on it at all?

6 A. If I had spare time, yes.

7 Q. It sounds like at the moment you do not have
8 spare time for that?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Okay. And have you taught at any trainings?

11 A. Not here, no.

12 Q. Where have you taught?

13 A. I used to teach at the police academy in Tulsa.
14 we would do that every few months and take turns. That
15 would be a two-day training activity. I think that's my
16 biggest one. In Denver, I also remade and started their
17 training program and then also taught it to the
18 supervisors to get that going and off the ground as well.

19 Q. What kind of training program was that?

20 A. So basically to be a fingerprint examiner,
21 background of science, and then the skill of actually
22 being able to compare and see what you're seeing.

23 Q. And what is your educational background?

24 A. I went to the University of Wyoming where I got
25 a bachelor's degree in chemistry and a bachelor's degree

1 in criminal justice. And then I went to Huntington, West
2 Virginia to Marshall, and I got my Master of Science in
3 Forensic Science.

4 Q. And did you specialize in anything for your
5 master's?

6 A. I did. I specialized in crime scene, forensic
7 chemistry, and digital evidence.

8 Q. Do you use any of your chemistry background in
9 your bachelor's in your current work?

10 A. I do.

11 Q. Can you tell me how?

12 A. With processing. So there's different
13 chemicals. Those chemicals require certain surfaces and
14 react with certain things that fingerprints are made of.
15 So there's a lot of options, and that would be your
16 chemistry.

17 Q. For your master's, did you write a thesis?

18 A. I did.

19 Q. What was the thesis?

20 A. Age estimation of selfies for age determination.
21 Something around that. Something like that.

22 Q. Like selfie photos?

23 A. Yeah.

24 Q. How did you do that?

25 A. My job in grad school, I worked in ICAC lab, a

1 digital forensics lab, and at that time selfies were very
2 popular and becoming a problem for them in that lab. So
3 that's kind of how that started.

4 Q. Interesting. Okay. And, sorry, when did you
5 join the St. Petersburg Police Department?

6 A. February 1, 2021.

7 Q. Oh, goodness. So right before this case then it
8 seems?

9 A. Uh-huh.

10 Q. Sorry, is that a yes for our record?

11 A. Yes. Sorry. Yes.

12 Q. And can you tell me how you got involved in this
13 case?

14 A. It was my week to be assigned cases, and so it
15 was my assignment.

16 Q. Okay. And I guess I probably should have said
17 earlier because I think this applies to two cases. So the
18 court case numbers that I have are 21-01099CF and
19 21-01513CF. The St. Petersburg case that I have is
20 2021-006023. Is that the only, like, St. Petersburg
21 Police Department case that you've worked on with regard
22 to Mr. Whitfield?

23 A. So this one is my -- this one I was the primary
24 examiner. Yeah, I think as part of training on somebody
25 else's week I looked at the other case, but I didn't do

1 anything, other than for training purposes.

2 Q. Okay. And do you know when you became involved
3 in the Cornelius Whitfield cases?

4 A. Can I look at this?

5 Q. Look at whatever you need, whatever is going to
6 help you out. If you don't mind telling us what you used
7 to refresh your recollection, that would be super helpful.

8 A. Yes. All right. So I have a flash drive with
9 my work for each submission. There's three submissions
10 for this case, and they came in at different times. The
11 way that I make my case files is the day that I receive
12 the case, I start scanning everything in. So from this
13 date, it seems that I started scanning things in
14 February 24, 2001.

15 Q. 2021?

16 A. Yes. Is that what I said? Sorry, 2021.

17 Q. Okay. And how did it come to you? How did the
18 things that you then scanned in, like, what happened
19 there?

20 A. So the technician at this time put them in a
21 box, which we would grab when it was our assignment week.

22 Q. So I know you have some background in crime
23 scene, but for this particular case, you never went to a
24 scene. Is that fair?

25 A. Correct.

1 Q. So do you know how the case was assigned to you
2 rather than somebody else in your department?

3 A. We just rotate by week. It's really just
4 whoever's week it is happening, and that's what you get.

5 Q. Okay. So on February 24th of 2021, what do you
6 receive such that you know that you have a case assigned
7 to you?

8 A. So I -- for these first two submissions I
9 believe came around the same time. They came in a small
10 latent envelope, and inside of them are lifts.

11 Q. Okay. And do you receive anything in addition
12 to the lifts? Like, is there any kind of submission form
13 with information?

14 A. No. They put it on a log for us to like make
15 sure everything gets where it goes in the box at that
16 time, but other than that, no.

17 Q. And who was the forensic services technician
18 that we're talking about in terms of the latent lifts?

19 A. So submission one was done by Technician
20 Huffman. Submission two was done by Technician Thomas.

21 Q. And did you receive both submission one and two
22 on the same date?

23 A. One came a little later. So the second
24 submission seems to have come around March 3rd, 2021.

25 Q. Okay. So I guess let's talk about the first,

1 which you said was submission one.

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And you uploaded it looks like scans of the
4 latents on the 24th of February. Is that correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. So is that kind of --

7 A. 24th and 25th.

8 Q. Is that the first thing you did?

9 A. Yes, always.

10 Q. Okay. And you said you didn't receive any other
11 information about the latents, like the circumstances of
12 where they were collected or the circumstances of like
13 what kind of case it was, anything like that?

14 A. No.

15 Q. So once you have -- well, I guess kind of first
16 question, how many latents were submitted in submission
17 one?

18 A. Three. Or, no, just one. Sorry, one.

19 Q. And once you made that upload, what did you do
20 next?

21 A. So the first thing that I want to do is analyze
22 that lift for any friction ridge detail and furthermore go
23 through and analyze to see it's of value. Of value
24 meaning that I can move on and compare it because there's
25 enough information in that impression. So that's what

1 I'll do very, very first. If there are things of value, I
2 crop them out and give them a letter.

3 Q. What do you mean by a letter?

4 A. So we label them by letters. One impression is
5 A. One impression is B. One impression is C.

6 Q. If I can just take a look and see what you're
7 looking at.

8 A. Uh-huh.

9 Q. Okay. So you received one latent card from
10 Technician Huffman.

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. And it looks like there are multiple impressions
13 on that one card. Is that fair?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Okay. So do you analyze each of those
16 impressions individually?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Okay. And I think we're looking at it upside
19 down perhaps. It sounds like you also differentiate
20 between each one of the impressions, A, B, C, D?

21 A. That are of value, yes.

22 Q. And did you make any determinations in terms of
23 the value of any of these impressions?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Can you tell me what that was?

1 A. I determined that there were three of value
2 impressions. The rest of them, there was not enough
3 information for me to move on to the comparison step. So
4 I note they're called no value, so I can't do anything
5 with them.

6 Q. So really it's just 1A, B, and C. Is that fair?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. And I guess kind of like at the outset, just so
9 that we're oriented in terms of the number of reports that
10 you did, is the first report just like indicating that you
11 received a submission and that you're going to work on the
12 case?

13 A. So it's that we put something into AFIS. An
14 AFIS search was conducted. So we received it, did the
15 analysis, and found out what was of AFIS quality and ran
16 that.

17 Q. So when you run something in AFIS, since this is
18 a latent card with multiple impressions on it, do you
19 submit the whole card? Do you just submit portions of the
20 card? Can you explain that?

21 A. So this can be by examiner discretion and what
22 kind of technology you have. At this time we were able to
23 take pictures of the card, so that's probably how I did
24 it. I like to crop everything out and do it digitally, so
25 one-by-one instead of using the old photo camera.

1 Q. So when you say crop it out individually, you
2 mentioned that like each impression would get a letter.
3 Does that mean that 1A would be uploaded separately from
4 the rest of the impressions?

5 A. So I would pick the best one, especially because
6 these look like a cluster. If later on in my comparison
7 they weren't a cluster, I would go back and run whatever I
8 needed to, but in this case, I just picked one.

9 Q. What is the meaning of a cluster?

10 A. So it's like a simultaneous impression. So
11 based on its appearance, it looks like those were made
12 with one touch I would say, ish, yeah.

13 Q. So I guess the kind of supposition there is if
14 it's made with one touch, then it's all coming from one
15 particular person; so you would be getting the same kind
16 of result?

17 A. In theory, yeah, to start. That's the first,
18 yeah.

19 Q. Which impression did you select to upload? I'm
20 sorry, please feel free to manipulate.

21 A. So I selected impression B.

22 Q. And why did you select impression B?

23 A. It's the most pretty print. The clarity and
24 the -- the clarity is great. There's not a lot of
25 distortion. So it's a pretty great print to run in the

1 system.

2 Q. So I think you mentioned earlier, in terms of
3 like the cropping, that it was like a photograph that you
4 would take and digitally upload that photograph to the
5 system, and you would tell AFIS to search to see if there
6 was anything that like could potentially be identified to
7 this latent. Is that fair?

8 A. This impression, yes.

9 Q. I'm sorry, this impression. That makes more
10 sense. And were there any AFIS returns?

11 A. There was.

12 Q. Can you tell me in terms of the AFIS returns if
13 you designate anything to AFIS, like how many returns to
14 make, like if it's five, if it's three, if it's ten,
15 whatever it is?

16 A. So at this time, I can't remember how many
17 returns there were because we have a new version of the
18 system, and that kind of changed everything.

19 Q. When -- sorry. Just quickly, do you know when
20 that new version came out?

21 A. Within the last two years, ish. Yeah.

22 Q. And do you recall what that change was?

23 A. It's just digital updates. That's, you know,
24 beyond my -- that's IDEMIA thing, beyond my purview.
25 That's the company that kind of runs AFIS I guess you

1 could say.

2 Q. Okay. Did you save any of the AFIS data from
3 2021 when you were doing this work?

4 A. I did.

5 Q. Okay. Is that going to have any of the
6 information in it? We'll find out in a moment.

7 A. Yeah. It just has my comparison.

8 Q. Okay. And so when you say comparison, it's just
9 the side-by-side. Is that right?

10 A. Uh-huh.

11 Q. Is that a yes?

12 A. Yes. Sorry, sorry.

13 Q. So it doesn't indicate how many potential
14 returns there were?

15 A. No. So currently right now, being a local
16 search, we get back three I believe. There might have
17 been more of them, but I don't remember. I don't remember
18 off the top of my head.

19 Q. And my recollection is that there is like a
20 local search, a state search, and then there's like a
21 national or kind of like anything search. Is that fair?

22 A. Yes. So they go by levels, yes.

23 Q. Okay. And so do you know if what we're looking
24 at here in terms of your comparison if that just came from
25 local or if it was another search?

1 A. It was a local search.

2 Q. Okay. And is that where you always start, just
3 with a local search?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Do you then move on to each level, or does that
6 depend on something?

7 A. So if I don't make an identification from any
8 responses or candidate list in local, then I would start a
9 state search. If I didn't make any identifications in
10 there, I would go to the NGI, national database.

11 Q. And do you know where this particular standard
12 came from in terms of the list of returns, like if it
13 was -- let's say if we're looking at a list of five, if it
14 was the first, if it was the fifth?

15 A. Not by the screen-shot.

16 Q. Okay. And the way that AFIS works, is the
17 return given a kind of like competence level? Like, the
18 system return is being like 99 percent confident that this
19 is an identification or 80 percent confident? Anything
20 like that?

21 A. No.

22 Q. So the number that that standard is on the list,
23 does that have any bearing for you?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Do you go through all of the returns?

1 A. If I do not make an identification, I'll go to
2 the next. And then if I don't make an identification,
3 I'll go to the next.

4 Q. Okay. So you only would go through all of the
5 returns if you had not made an identification with the
6 return above it. Is that fair?

7 A. Correct. Yeah.

8 Q. Do you know where this was on your list?

9 A. No, I can't remember.

10 Q. Is there any way of recreating this list?

11 A. It might be saved in the system to be honest
12 with you. I'm not sure.

13 Q. But we don't know?

14 A. I'm not sure.

15 Q. So certainly what we're looking at is something
16 that, like, you believe that there was a potential
17 identification?

18 A. With this, yes.

19 Q. Okay. And how did you arrive at that
20 conclusion?

21 A. So I do the comparisons from the returns from
22 AFIS. So I am going through and marking just like I would
23 a side-by-side when I'm doing this in AFIS. So this is my
24 AFIS side-by-side. I'm going through and doing the
25 identification back and forth, marking points until I

1 conclude that it's an identification, and then I move on
2 from there.

3 Q. So what we're looking at in terms of the latent
4 card, the standard card, there are blue dots. The blue
5 dots were added by you. Is that fair?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Does the system add anything itself, or does it
8 just like pull up the impressions side-by-side?

9 A. So you can manipulate it to your style, and you
10 can turn on and off markings that were used to generate
11 the search initially. But I -- I usually just go through
12 and do my comparison like I normally would do.

13 Q. That's right. I forgot that you can put
14 markings on it initially. Do you do that? Do you put
15 markings on initially for the search?

16 A. Depends.

17 Q. Do you know if you did in this case?

18 A. I don't think I would have.

19 Q. Why not?

20 A. Because this print is so clear and pristine and
21 pretty.

22 Q. So I'm guessing but I'm not certain that by
23 marking something in advance of like having the AFIS
24 search run that you're basically telling the system, like,
25 I think these are the points you need to look at the

1 impression?

2 A. Not necessarily. You're marking a map of the
3 events that are going on so to create a constellation or a
4 road map, which then the system goes through and looks to
5 see if there's any kind of constellation anywhere else
6 that looks like that, and that's what it pulls from.

7 Q. And you did not do that in this case. Is that
8 right?

9 A. I did. You have to do that to run the search.
10 So either you can ask the computer to mark the points for
11 you, or you can mark the initial points that make the
12 constellation.

13 Q. I see. The blue marks that we see on the
14 latent, are those your constellation marks?

15 A. No. This would be afterwards comparison. Like,
16 the search has already been done at this point.

17 Q. Okay. Do you know if there are similarities as
18 to the points you put up here versus the constellation
19 points for the search?

20 A. No.

21 Q. And in terms of like making a conclusion, is
22 there like a set number of points that's required either
23 by policy within your department or by the IAI?

24 A. There are not.

25 Q. So there's no minimum by which you can say this

1 is an identification?

2 A. Not by points. Not by counting, no.

3 Q. What is required in order to make an
4 identification?

5 A. So you want to look for sufficient agreement
6 between the two, which is enough, and that's a threshold
7 that examiners have to learn and get comfortable with.
8 When something is very, very clear and pristine like this
9 one, it's -- the road map is very easy to see and to
10 follow. If there's a lot of distortion, that road map can
11 be a little bit more difficult. So you would want more
12 points to make your way through all of that distortion.
13 So it's based on clarity and quantity. So, again, there's
14 a threshold that you can reach where you have enough and
15 you can say that there's sufficient agreement between the
16 two impressions that there's an identification.

17 Q. Enough sufficient agreement sounds subjective.

18 A. It is.

19 Q. And so subjectivity doesn't tend to lend itself
20 to scientific practices?

21 A. So it's a subjective wording based on objective
22 features. So what I'm looking at is objective data, like
23 that is there, that is not subjective. But threshold
24 enough, the way we make conclusions is subjective. It can
25 be, uh-huh.

1 Q. Okay. What -- is there a policy or a practice
2 within your department by which you can say there is
3 enough subjective -- enough sufficient agreement here for
4 an identification?

5 A. At that point we identify it, and that's our
6 conclusion. There is no pre-req other than you've met
7 that threshold of sufficient agreement as an examiner.

8 Q. Are there any requirements in terms of the
9 documentation by which you then, like, make that
10 conclusion?

11 A. No.

12 Q. So you don't have to write down -- you don't
13 have to put down all your notes?

14 A. We don't.

15 Q. Okay. So that information in terms of how you
16 arrived at your conclusion can't necessarily be recreated
17 by somebody else?

18 A. So what I do after this side-by-side from AFIS
19 is I go back and make a different side-by-side. So that
20 is again showing my work and labeled with -- the digital
21 title labeled with what I'm comparing with this at this
22 time.

23 Q. So, I'm sorry, you said this is a different
24 side-by-side.

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. Can you explain how you do this one?

2 A. So this is back at my own personal computer with
3 software that's not AFIS. Putting up the latent. The
4 valuation of the impressions has already been made, so
5 I've already A, B, C valued them. So now I am comparing
6 them with the return that I got from AFIS that I concluded
7 was an identification. So I was able to pull that card or
8 a card from that file over to my desk and start doing
9 another comparison to do all of the of value impressions.

10 Q. Is it different card that you're pulling for
11 this secondary comparison than what was in AFIS?

12 A. Sometimes.

13 Q. Do you know if it was in this case?

14 A. No, I don't remember.

15 Q. And what is the computer program that you were
16 using at your desk for the second side-by-side?

17 A. This one -- actually, I can answer that
18 question, your first question.

19 Q. Okay. Yeah, sorry. Go ahead.

20 A. So with the incident number from the AFIS
21 return, that is basically the record number of the
22 cards -- of that return card. So when I go into that
23 number file with all the different records, I can choose
24 that one, or I can choose others. This might have been --
25 I can look. I used a different one.

1 Q. why?

2 A. Normally when I make this decision it's because
3 of the quality of the card and my ability to use the
4 present friction ridge detail. Sometimes one card might
5 be really great for one area but not great for other
6 areas. So you want to find a card that can kind of get
7 everything you want.

8 Q. Do you know if you pulled multiple cards in
9 order to make a determination as to which the best one
10 might be?

11 A. Not for this -- well, I looked at them. I
12 didn't pull and keep them. I was just scrolling through
13 the database and just pulling up the different records,
14 and knowing that I've already valued and what I'm looking
15 at, I can see if I'm getting the information I need from
16 the record to pull.

17 Q. And when you say information that you need from
18 the record, if you can be more specific?

19 A. That would be the friction ridge detail that's
20 recorded on those records, on the known standards.

21 Q. Okay. Were there multiple cards available to
22 you with regards to this particular file, like multiple
23 standards?

24 A. At this point I just used one. I don't remember
25 how, like, extensive the file was or not. That was just

1 the card that I chose for this.

2 Q. I guess my question is, so this standard card
3 that you pulled for your side-by-side comparison, the
4 different computer program than AFIS, was that
5 representative of different impressions than the
6 impression that AFIS used? Does that question make sense
7 to you?

8 A. Not really.

9 Q. Okay. So I guess my question is like -- and I
10 don't know which finger off the top of my head lift one
11 was compared to for AFIS. Let's say it was like right
12 ring finger. I guess the question is, like the AFIS --
13 I'm sorry. The standards that you compared at your desk,
14 was it a different -- from a different occasion, like a
15 different --

16 A. It's a different record number, yes.

17 Q. And so the different record number indicates
18 that it was taken on a different date?

19 A. Yeah. It's an entirely -- well, I wouldn't say
20 entirely. It is actually kind of entirely a different
21 record. So each record that goes into the system gets a
22 number, and that's its record number. That record number
23 doesn't change. So no matter how many times you print it
24 or where you print it from or what state you print that
25 particular record from, it is the exact same record. Does

1 that make sense?

2 Q. I think so.

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. So you do the side-by-side comparison at your
5 desk, separate software, and you're making your own marks
6 on it in terms of tracking side-by-side. Is that fair?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. And were these marks different than what you had
9 done in AFIS?

10 A. Not significantly. So they're close, but
11 they're not exact.

12 Q. Does everybody in your office do this, like make
13 the comparison on AFIS and then goes back to their desk
14 and does a side-by-side in a separate program?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Is that something that's part of the policy
17 and/or practice at your office, or is that just kind of
18 what you do?

19 A. It's kind of what you do. I don't believe
20 there's requirements for like what you need in your case
21 file. All of us do something a little bit different.
22 Like, our markings will be a little bit different, so
23 that's not the same.

24 Q. In terms of the markings being different, can
25 you tell me a little bit more about that?

1 A. So different people, different examiners will
2 see different things a little bit faster. We call this a
3 target group. It's just something that kind of makes your
4 eye happy, and it's kind of your starting point for where
5 you start your back and forth and going around. So just
6 because I am using this area doesn't mean the rest of the
7 area could be used by another examiner if they found
8 something different that they wanted to start with, which
9 is kind of cool in my opinion.

10 Q. Okay. And in terms of the marks that you used,
11 do you use like different actual markings or signage to
12 indicate what you're looking at?

13 A. So I mostly go by colors, and I'm marking ridged
14 events.

15 Q. Can you tell me about that?

16 A. So I'm not marking ridge events specifically.
17 I'm just marking that something is happening here. That's
18 because your friction ridge skin isn't stable like a
19 stamp. It moves. So just because something looks one way
20 in one and different in the other doesn't mean that ridge
21 event is false. It just could be pressure, distortion,
22 movement, any of those things.

23 Q. So are you marking that you see distortion? I
24 guess I'm not understanding what the marking is.

25 A. So this marking -- let's see. Basically, it

1 says something happened right here, and then over
2 something is happening, and then something is happening,
3 something is happening. Instead of I think this is a
4 bifurcation, because it looks like a bifurcation, and this
5 looks like a bifurcation, I'll mark it like that. Does
6 that make sense?

7 Q. Okay. So you're not saying -- you're not being
8 concrete about it and saying this is a bifurcation that I
9 see on both the latent and the standard. You're just
10 saying something appears to be happening.

11 A. A ridge event is happening, yes.

12 Q. Okay. But I think you also said that these
13 ridge events can be different on the latent versus the
14 standard due to pressure, movement, perhaps the way that
15 like the processing method occurred?

16 A. (Nods head.)

17 Q. Things that are not necessarily explainable just
18 by looking at a side-by-side.

19 A. As an examiner you would be able to -- like, I'm
20 trained to see it. We go through training to see that.
21 But again, like this is a pretty clear perfect -- what I
22 would call a pretty clear, perfect print. So there's no
23 major worry, I guess, about any of that. I don't see
24 anything other than this area not being recorded in the
25 known variable, but that indication doesn't change the

1 fact that those events are happening.

2 Q. Okay. I think I understand. What level -- what
3 brings you to the level of comfort to say like I have
4 sufficient agreement and it's enough for me to say I have
5 an identification?

6 A. So to the point that I don't need to continue to
7 prove to myself that it came from a different source. So
8 what I'm trying to do in my side-by-side and my markings
9 is I start with they're not the same. This could not have
10 come from the same person. As I'm marking, the more
11 information I see that's in sufficient agreement until I
12 reach a point that can't be made by someone else, another
13 source, that's when I stop.

14 Q. And at what point do you reach that level?

15 A. It depends on the impression, on the latent
16 impression. Again, if it's a really difficult, complex
17 impression, more information is needed just to get through
18 that complexity, but this one is pretty standard or
19 pretty, like, clear. There's still quite a lot more
20 things in there.

21 Q. Okay. About how many markings are there?

22 A. Eighteen, nineteen, I think.

23 Q. Okay. Once you get to the point where you're
24 like I have enough markings, I feel confident in this,
25 what do you do next?

1 A. So at that point I have made my evaluation
2 that's an identification, and then I would go on to the
3 next impression to compare.

4 Q. Just -- this was 1A?

5 A. This is B.

6 Q. Oh, this is B.

7 A. So because I ran that one in AFIS, I would start
8 with that one even though they're labeled A, B, C.

9 Q. I see. Okay. And so then you would move on to
10 the other impressions that you thought were of value and
11 sufficient to be run through AFIS. Is that fair?

12 A. Compared.

13 Q. Compared. Okay. And would you go through all
14 the steps that we just discussed?

15 A. For the side-by-side, yes. I wouldn't go
16 through the AFIS process unless necessary, but I would
17 start that comparison process the same way.

18 Q. Okay. And are you not going through AFIS
19 because you made that initial conclusion that it was a
20 cluster, meaning it likely came from the same hand at the
21 same time?

22 A. Yeah. I would say that was my guess, but yes,
23 that would be why.

24 Q. Okay. And when you made the identification in
25 impression B, can you tell me what that conclusion sounds

1 like? You're saying there's an identification, but do you
2 designate like to what person, to what hand, to what
3 finger?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So can you tell me about that identification?

6 A. So we designate the identification to the finger
7 and then to the name that is present on the card.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. At least that's how I save the file. Now, in
10 the reports we add different demographic information.

11 Q. Oh, like when you say like black male and the
12 date of birth?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. But that's also just from the card, isn't it?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. So when it says identified to whitfield, left
17 middle, whitfield came from the card, but left middle came
18 from your assessment?

19 A. Yeah, from the impressions and the card.

20 Q. So because you said B was the one that you had
21 chosen to go through AFIS, that you then do the
22 side-by-side with the standard that was available to you,
23 like the whole card. The conclusion that I see in the
24 report is that was left middle finger. Is that right?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. So because you believe this to be a cluster, are
2 you then just looking at the impressions for the other
3 left fingers with regard to the other impressions that you
4 thought were of value for comparison?

5 A. Yes, based on if that were to be a cluster how
6 the fingers would line up anatomically I guess.

7 Q. Okay. And were you able to make conclusions
8 with respect to A and C?

9 A. I did.

10 Q. And what were those conclusions?

11 A. A was identified to the left ring of Whitfield,
12 and C was identified to the left index.

13 Q. With these identifications, do you have any kind
14 of confidence rating as to them?

15 A. No.

16 Q. Just identification?

17 A. Uh-huh.

18 Q. Any further work that you did with regards to
19 this particular latent lift that you had received from
20 Technician Huffman?

21 A. From me, no.

22 Q. I know you like wrote this all up in a report a
23 couple of days later. Pretty self-explanatory. What then
24 happens next for you on this case?

25 A. So then to wrap up this submission, there's a

1 verification step where another examiner repeats the
2 comparison analysis portion and makes their own
3 conclusions. If they are in agreement, then we can issue
4 a report.

5 Q. Who was the verifier in this case?

6 A. I believe it was Rebecca.

7 Q. Monclova-Wolf?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And you say believe. You're not sure?

10 A. I know for sure she did the third submission,
11 but I did not check and look at the back of the cards to
12 see who actually did. We normally would give the same
13 person different submissions just to keep not all three of
14 us in court to be honest at the same time.

15 Q. How long have you worked with Rebecca?

16 A. Since I started here.

17 Q. Okay. Oh, and you had just started right before
18 this case I think?

19 A. Uh-huh.

20 Q. Has she ever disagreed with you when she's been
21 a verifier on your cases?

22 A. It happens.

23 Q. She's disagreed with you?

24 A. It happens, yeah.

25 Q. Have you ever disagreed with her when you've

1 been a verifier on her case?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And what happens when there's a disagreement?

4 A. Then there needs to be some sort of
5 conversation. Usually that will be the two of us
6 examiners going through and showing each other what we see
7 versus what the other sees and if a different conclusion
8 could be met. So if we have to change the conclusion --
9 like let's say I'm being aggressive is what we would call
10 it, and she was like, no, that's not an ID, that would be
11 inconclusive or something else, we would go with the most
12 conservative -- just the most conservative conclusion.

13 But usually a lot of those disagreements come up
14 with valuing impressions. If somebody sees -- like might
15 just not see something on a lift or see something on a
16 scan that it's like, oh, there it is. You missed it. No
17 big deal, and then you just keep on going.

18 Q. What are the types of conclusions that are
19 available to you?

20 A. So the three conclusions in the field are
21 identification, inconclusive, and exclusion. We do
22 insufficient, so no value, identification, inconclusive,
23 and then no ID.

24 Q. What is no ID?

25 A. The department defines no ID as they did not

1 come from the same source.

2 Q. When you say "the department," do you mean the
3 St. Petersburg Police Department?

4 A. Yes, our SOP.

5 Q. Okay. How does the IAI define no ID, or does
6 the IAI even recognize that as a possible conclusion?

7 A. It would essentially mean, like, I can't find
8 that impression. I tried. I can't find it, rather than
9 an exclusion.

10 Q. You seem a little uncomfortable with some of
11 these conclusions. Can you explain why?

12 A. With my background and training, I have been
13 trained and previously worked in environments that were
14 more aligned with IAI and best practice standards.

15 Q. And St. Petersburg Police Department doesn't
16 necessarily conform to best practice standards?

17 A. Some things I would disagree with.

18 Q. In terms of their practices and best practices?

19 A. Yeah, definitions and things like that.

20 Q. Do you know who developed the standard operating
21 procedures for your department?

22 A. No idea.

23 Q. Okay. I imagine it was determined, like, before
24 you arrived?

25 A. Yeah. It has not changed since before I

1 arrived. There was a version change, but that was
2 grammar, not changing practice or definitions or anything
3 like that.

4 Q. Okay. Do you -- I think you had said your work
5 started on 2/24. The supplement date I have is 2/26.
6 Does that mean all the work that we've talked about
7 occurred somewhere between 2/24 and 2/26 then?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And that's just with latent lift one. Anything
10 else that we should talk about with regards to that latent
11 lift?

12 A. Not that I can think of.

13 Q. Okay. How about submission number two? I think
14 you had said something about the submission coming in on
15 the 5th of March perhaps.

16 A. Around the 3rd. That's the first scan.

17 Q. I'm sorry.

18 A. A little bit later.

19 Q. Tell me what you received in this submission.

20 A. So this submission is another submission of
21 lifts. It contained five lifts.

22 Q. Okay. And does that mean that you followed the
23 same kind of practice, like you uploaded each of those,
24 scanned them all in?

25 A. Yes.

1 Q. And then what did you do with that?

2 A. So this, I found one impression of value that I
3 ran through AFIS. I did not get any identifications. So
4 there was nothing beyond our status report to report.

5 Q. Which of the lifts did you believe had an
6 impression that was sufficient enough to run through AFIS?

7 A. Lift one.

8 Q. And how many impressions were on lift one?

9 A. All impressions in total?

10 Q. Sure.

11 A. I'm seeing something wet happening up here that
12 may or may not friction ridge skin. Maybe this is an
13 impression, but there's definitely an impression right
14 there.

15 Q. When you say right there, noting that there are
16 potentially multiple impressions, when you identified the
17 right there, is that the one you would have submitted to
18 AFIS?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Okay. And you said you did not get any returns
21 in that AFIS search. Is that right?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. Do you know if any additional work was done with
24 regards to that card since March of 2021?

25 A. No. What happens, if we run everything through

1 all three databases and nothing comes back as an
2 identification, like this example, it stays in the system
3 and is constantly being run against new records that are
4 being uploaded in the system. So if the system thinks
5 that it found an identification, we would get a
6 notification from the Sheriff's office and start a
7 comparison and see if that is happening. That happens
8 automatically. So that is still going on with that
9 impression.

10 Q. Okay. And does the notification come to you
11 since you were the examiner assigned?

12 A. It would go through the Sheriff's office first,
13 but yes, it would come to me.

14 Q. And safe to assume no kind of notifications
15 regarding this particular latent?

16 A. No.

17 Q. And when you said the three databases, are we
18 talking about the local, state, and national or beyond?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. Anything further with regards to submission two
21 that we should discuss?

22 A. I don't think so.

23 Q. I think you said the rest of the latents that
24 were submitted, you made a determination that they
25 weren't -- they did not have value for comparison?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. Okay. There's a third submission that you
3 worked on. Is that right?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. When did that come to you?

6 A. That came in July of 2021.

7 Q. Okay. And who did that come from?

8 A. Technician Salvador.

9 Q. Do you know what you received in that
10 submission?

11 A. Ninhydrin processed items.

12 Q. And what does that mean?

13 A. So fingerprints react differently on paper.
14 They actually kind of sink into the paper and don't wipe
15 off. They just kind of live inside the paper. So this is
16 a chemical that's specific to react with the components
17 that are stuck inside the paper of the fingerprint. It
18 turns purple when it reacts with something.

19 Q. When you say you received ninhydrin processed
20 items, that means that you didn't do the processing
21 yourself. Is that right?

22 A. Correct.

23 Q. And did you ever speak to Technician Salvador
24 about the work that she did in processing?

25 A. No.

1 Q. Have you worked with her on processing anything
2 before?

3 A. Not in regards to this case, but yes.

4 Q. Can you tell me about that?

5 A. My prior experience, I processed a lot -- not a
6 lot -- all of my own evidence. So my processing knowledge
7 and skills is a little different than other people's.
8 I've used a variety of chemicals and just have a hands-on
9 knowledge of how things -- how those chemicals work on
10 different things. So we made her -- we call it playing
11 with chemicals usually. That's just me kind of teaching
12 her, showing her what that chemical can do and what
13 surface you would want to use it on and what happens at
14 the end.

15 Q. Were the items that you received, were those
16 paper?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And in terms of practice, what is the best
19 processing for like viewing potential ridge detail on
20 paper?

21 A. At this time, ninhydrin would have been the
22 option.

23 Q. It sounds like that might have changed?

24 A. There is another option that we have, but it
25 wasn't available at this time.

1 Q. Okay. And when you say this time, you mean July
2 of 2021?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. So what is the process by which ninhydrin is
5 used?

6 A. So you can spray it -- spray the item of
7 evidence. You can submerge it, like dip it in or brush it
8 on. Let the solvent evaporate. With wet heat, so heat
9 and humidity, steam, you can speed up the reaction to see
10 it go faster. Ninhydrin will turn the things that it
11 reacts with purple, a purple color.

12 Q. Did you -- so you receive these items that have
13 already been treated with ninhydrin. Is that right?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. Was there anything else that you received from
16 Technician Salvador besides the ninhydrin, I guess,
17 processed items?

18 A. No.

19 Q. How many items did you receive?

20 A. Ten.

21 Q. And how did you receive them? Like, how were
22 they packaged?

23 A. So it looks -- looking at the case file and the
24 labeling, it came in four different envelopes. All ten of
25 these items came from different envelopes, I guess,

1 housing envelopes as a submission, if that makes sense.

2 Q. Okay. And you didn't receive anything but those
3 four envelopes. Is that right?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. So once you receive those what did you do?

6 A. I would scan them in just like I would a lift
7 and kind of go through the exact same process looking for
8 impressions of value, what's suitable for AFIS. Yeah, we
9 repeat the process even though it's a different item
10 and different -- there was a chemical and not powder.
11 It's still the same kind of the same for me.

12 Q. So in the report that I have dated 7/26/2021,
13 there is the section that says: The following ten
14 ninhydrin processed items were submitted by Forensic
15 Services Technician Salvador, and the ten item are then
16 listed. Then there's known fingerprint and palm standards
17 of two people, Cornelius Whitfield and Matthew Wehunt,
18 W-E-H-U-N-T. Does that mean that those fingerprints and
19 palm standards were also submitted?

20 A. No. No.

21 Q. How do we know that?

22 A. Because she wouldn't submit that. It's to show
23 like kind of what all is being compared and used for our
24 conclusions, that area. But she would only submit the
25 evidence. She wouldn't submit cards to compare.

1 Q. Were you asked to make comparisons to those two
2 people?

3 A. No.

4 Q. What were you asked to do?

5 A. So I ran AFIS. That's how I generated these
6 names.

7 Q. Just in the other report, there's an indication
8 that AFIS was run. I didn't see that here.

9 A. I have --

10 Q. It's on the very end. Okay. And so did you
11 follow up with the same kind of structures that we've seen
12 in the other?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. So in analyzing items number one through ten,
15 can you tell us if there were any that were of value for
16 further comparison?

17 A. So item one, there was nothing of value. For
18 item two, I found five impressions. For item three, there
19 was nothing of value. Item four, nothing of value. Item
20 five, one impression of value. Item six, five impressions
21 of value. Item seven, nine impressions of value. Number
22 eight, four impressions of value. Item nine, fourteen
23 impressions of value. Item ten, eleven impressions of
24 value.

25 Q. And I guess it looks like obviously there were a

1 lot of impressions of value. Many of them were
2 identified. How did you decide or I guess at what point
3 did you decide to come off of AFIS and do the
4 side-by-side?

5 A. So while I'm going through making the value
6 determination, I'm also looking at what is the prettiest,
7 again most clear, most beautiful prints that I could put
8 in AFIS first. If I have things left over from those
9 returns, if I get returns or identifications, then I would
10 put those left over ones into AFIS and search those.

11 Q. So it looks like for each of the items you made
12 a determination that there was a value, and you made
13 identifications for each and every one of those. Is that
14 right?

15 A. Correct.

16 Q. And so does that mean that each and every one of
17 those were put through both AFIS and then your separate
18 side-by-side?

19 A. No. I would have chosen ones from the items to
20 put into AFIS and then gone back to my computer and used
21 my side-by-side and knowns to get as many as I could to
22 see if there's anything left over. Does that make sense?

23 Q. Do you know if you used multiple standard cards
24 for -- it's just two people that we're looking at, but do
25 you know if you used multiple standard cards for each of

1 those two people?

2 A. I did for one person.

3 Q. which one?

4 A. whitfield.

5 Q. Okay. why did you do that?

6 A. Because one of the records had palm impressions
7 that I -- palm impressions, including the area that I
8 needed to compare, so I pulled that entire record for the
9 palms.

10 Q. Okay. And I think you had mentioned earlier
11 that Rebecca Wolf was the verifier in this case?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. when -- and I don't think we talked about it
14 earlier, but what does the verifier get from you? Like,
15 once you've made your conclusion, what do they get in
16 terms of your work?

17 A. So after we do the digital things, we will mark
18 on the card, on the item of evidence, and then the
19 verifier will get the items of evidence with the markings.
20 I also will transfer my digital work to them so they can
21 make a digital record themselves. They'll just get the
22 evidence also just with my markings on it, and they'll go
23 through and sign that they've verified it.

24 Q. Do you know since you've worked with Rebecca for
25 some time, when she does a verification -- like when she

1 receives a file for verification, does she do her own
2 side-by-side? Does she do her own markings?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. And is that part of the case file?

5 A. Not required.

6 Q. But does it -- when she does it, does it become
7 part of the case file?

8 A. It's not required for the verifier to document
9 their side-by-side. So if she had side-by-sides, I
10 don't -- I don't ever see them. That's in her -- she
11 keeps in that folder. That's just mostly because we don't
12 have a system where we can combine everything. Again, our
13 SOP doesn't require us to make side-by-side verification.

14 Q. Do you know if she does do side-by-sides for
15 verification?

16 A. Now I'm quite positive she does.

17 Q. In 2021 was she doing side-by-sides for
18 verification?

19 A. I do not remember.

20 Q. Do you do side-by-sides for verification?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Have you always done side-by-sides?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. So both for your initial work and also for your
25 verifier?

1 A. Correct.

2 Q. And it sounds like other examiners at the
3 St. Petersburg Police Department have not always done
4 that?

5 A. Correct. It's a style and what's required by
6 the SOP.

7 Q. Okay. How many -- not verifiers. How many
8 examiners at there at St. Pete?

9 A. Three.

10 Q. And who is your supervisor?

11 A. Now?

12 Q. Yes.

13 A. Karen Lofton. Sergeant Karen Lofton.

14 Q. Who was it in '21, if you remember?

15 A. So I started when there was a transition. I
16 can't exactly remember if we were having a transition then
17 or not, but I started with one person and around that time
18 a different person came in, if that makes sense.

19 Q. Do you recall who the prior person was?

20 A. Matt Wilson and then before would that Joe
21 Clester. Sergeants also.

22 Q. Are they -- are any of them examiners, or have
23 any of them been examiners?

24 A. No.

25 Q. If there is a difference of opinion regarding a

1 conclusion amongst the examiners, how is that resolved?

2 A. Like I said, we'll talk about it one-on-one. If
3 a third person needs to come in and kind of with fresh
4 eyes, different eyes not in the disagreement to make that
5 opinion, I guess that's how we typically would do that,
6 but it doesn't really go that far.

7 Q. Any further work on this case after that third
8 submission?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Were the names Whitfield or Matthew Wehunt
11 familiar to you for any reason before you worked on this
12 case?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Did you ever speak with any of the detectives
15 involved in the investigation?

16 A. No.

17 Q. Did you ever receive any kind of information
18 about the cases that these were involving?

19 A. No.

20 Q. And I think you mentioned you thought you were
21 involved in another Whitfield case.

22 A. (Nods head.)

23 Q. But just for training purposes?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. I know it was in your -- this was like your

1 first month on the job.

2 A. Right.

3 Q. Do you know what that involvement was?

4 A. It would be the one on the subpoenas.

5 Q. The 1099?

6 A. 4037.

7 Q. Okay. Do you know what you did or what you
8 reviewed in that case?

9 A. I would have -- I would have been, like, working
10 the case but not officially. Just for training purposes,
11 if that makes sense. So I would have gotten everything
12 the original examiner had, worked it myself, and basically
13 the trainer would say you agreed with the two of us or
14 whatever on your reporting or on your conclusions, if that
15 makes sense. Like supervised casework. So my work really
16 doesn't do anything. It's just for me to show competency.

17 Q. So the latent examiner under the other case
18 number was Rebecca Monclova or Wolf. Do you remember if
19 you arrived at the same or different conclusions than she
20 did?

21 A. I don't remember there being any kind of
22 disagreement at all. I don't think that there was. It
23 was training stuff, so that was -- that works a little
24 different than actually doing a verification or working a
25 case.

1 Q. Tell me, what's the difference.

2 A. That it's not going to be anything that I
3 report. Again, it's to prove or show competency to the
4 trainers that I'm competent and able to value things,
5 compare things -- well, impressions, not things and work a
6 case appropriately.

7 Q. Who were the trainers?

8 A. Rebecca and Sarah.

9 Q. Sarah is the other examiner in the office?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Do you know -- do you recall what you did in
12 that other case, like what you reviewed?

13 A. I probably would have just -- like verification,
14 pulled things out to value them, pulled the impressions
15 out to value them, and then would have compared them to
16 knowns that she had already found.

17 Q. So after her work was completed?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Okay. And do you recall what those conclusions
20 were that she arrived at?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Any further work that you have done on
23 Mr. Whitfield's cases?

24 A. No.

25 Q. Have you spoken to Ms. Wolf at all about the

1 work that she did?

2 A. what do you mean?

3 Q. Like anything more than, like, at the time when
4 she was the verifier.

5 A. (Shakes head).

6 Q. Like in more recent times since these cases have
7 been set for trial, things like that.

8 A. No.

9 Q. Anything else that we should know about your
10 involvement in the case?

11 A. I don't think so. Nothing comes to mind.

12 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Any questions, Ms. Russell?

13 EXAMINATION

14 BY MS. RUSSELL:

15 Q. I just have one little question.

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. Actually, I have two questions, but one is one
18 I'm just curious about that I'll ask you off record. So
19 you mentioned that -- just to bring you up to date, you
20 know, sort of where I'm going with this, that your
21 verifier Rebecca Monclova Wolf wouldn't have done
22 side-by-side comparisons as a verifier back then, but you
23 know that she would now, right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. why the change?

1 A. It's best practice and better scientific
2 integrity and proof of all work to document what we're
3 doing. So that's become more the direction we are going
4 now.

5 Q. why is that?

6 A. I don't want to answer the question. It is
7 probably because of my pushing back on some things.
8 Again, even in a situation like this, having our
9 documentation shows our scientific work that we're doing.
10 so that's our proof of our work, showing and documenting
11 that we actually did it rather than not having it
12 documented and just trying to go by memory and reports.

13 MS. RUSSELL: All right. Thank you.

14 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: Any questions, Mr. Bradlow?

15 MR. BRADLOW: I've got nothing.

16 EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. SEIFER-SMITH:

18 Q. Have you understood all the questions that we've
19 asked you today?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Have you had an opportunity to answer everything
22 fully and completely?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Anything you wish to add or change regarding the
25 testimony you've given?

1 A. No.

2 MS. SEIFER-SMITH: If anything occurs to you and
3 you feel like you left it out from our conversation, I'd
4 just ask that you reach out to Mr. Bradlow or to my office
5 and let us know. Otherwise, at this point, I will
6 conclude the deposition, and I'll reserve your right to
7 read. Thanks very much.

8 (Deposition concludes at 3:07 p.m.)

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 COUNTY OF PINELLAS)

2 STATE OF FLORIDA)

3 CERTIFICATE OF OATH

4
5 I, the undersigned authority, certify that KARIANNA
6 BABER personally appeared before me and was duly sworn.

7 witness my hand and official seal this 19TH day of
8 JULY, 2026.

9
10 Tamara M. Pacheco

11 Tamara M. Pacheco, RPR
12 COMMISSION # 474485
13 EXPIRES: March 30, 2028
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 STATE OF FLORIDA)

3 COUNTY OF PINELLAS)
4

5 I, Tamara M. Pacheco, certify that I was authorized
6 to and did stenographically report the Deposition of
7 KARIANNA BABER; that a review of the transcript was
8 requested; and that the transcript is a true and complete
9 record of my stenographic notes.

10 I further certify that I am not a relative, employee,
11 attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a
12 relative or employee of any of the parties' attorney or
13 counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially
14 interested in the action.

15
16
17 Tamara M. Pacheco18 Tamara M. Pacheco, RPR
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ERRATA SHEET

IN THE CASE OF: STATE OF FL v. CORNELIUS WHITFIELD

NAME OF DEPONENT: KARIANNA BABER

CASE NUMBER: 21-01099CFANO

Please read the transcript of your deposition. If you feel you need to make corrections, please note on this page. DO NOT mark on the transcript itself.
Sign and date the transcript below.

PAGE	LINE	ERROR/AMENDMENT	REASON FOR CHANGE
------	------	-----------------	-------------------

Signature

Date