Operation Canary Wharf – Blue Task 3 2022/23

**Case Background**

**Defendant:**

John CHURCHILL (d.o.b. 1/1/2002)

A Computer Science (Artificial Intelligence) B.Sc. Student at STFU. Room 216, Halls of Residence.

**Circumstances of the Case:**

Approximately at midnight on the 19th of November 2022, two students (Harry TURNBULL and Jade GREY) who were visiting the Halls of Residence for the South Thames Fictional University walking into room 216 by mistake.

Both TURNBULL and GREY had drunk a significant quantity of alcohol.

Both TURNBULL and GREY observed the defendant CHURCHILL sat at his desk. GREY approached CHURCHILL and realizing that they were in the wrong room tried to apologise and make light of situation. When she tried to look at his screen saying that he “shouldn’t be looking at porn all night”, CHURCHILL became aggressive. She states that she realized she was looking at a large-scale indecent photograph of a child on the screen, not adult pornography.

CHURCHILL’s aggressive behaviour towards GREY caused TURNBULL to intervene, which lead to loud shouting and a scuffle breaking out between CHURCHILL and TURNBULL. University security arrived quickly and removed TURNBULL and GREY from room 216. Officers from the Met Police were called to attend the scene as TURNBULL and GREY were belligerent towards the security.

When uniformed officers arrived, GREY stated that the defendant was watching Child Porn on his laptop computer, although TURNBULL states he did not see the computer. When officers attended room 216 to question the defendant, they noticed that on the screen was a web page relating to wiping software. As such the laptop computer was seized and at that time the defendant was arrested. A mobile phone has also been seized and sent for separate examination. Nothing of note is currently reported for the phone.

**Police Action Taken:**

The computer was processed by the Greenwich Hi-Tech Forensics Unit and an automated search for indecent photographs was positive. These are present within the web cache area of the disk. Internet history extraction shows indecent terminology being searched for.

The defendant has stated that he was researching ‘Deep Fake’ technology as part of his studies.

He admits that he wanted to make humorous meme-type pictures using classmates or lecturers at university, but whilst researching deepfakes he found articles about morphing porn actors and regular people.

He acknowledges that whilst trying to find pictures he could use to make deep fake pictures or “composites”, he may have strayed into pornographic sites that included indecent photographs, and this may have caused these pictures to be downloaded onto his computer’s ‘web cache’.

Defendant states that he did not search for indecent terminology.

Defendant states that there was no attempt to make ‘revenge porn’, and he just wanted to find out how pornographic deep fake pictures could be made as he had “read about it on the BBC”.

**Tasks**

Conduct an individual analysis on the provided image file.

Below are a set of 3 questions and a request for an opinion sought from the ‘Crown Prosecution Service’.

Produce an MG11-style statement detailing the results of your analysis, dealing with the answers to the questions and your opinion. Use the lecture material as guidance on how to structure the statement but it must conform to the normal statement style (be in first person, not contain pictures etc.) your paragraphs must be numbered, it must include details on who you are, your duties as an expert, and technical details of the system being examined.

**Question 1:**

The defendant has stated that he uses the laptop to play games online and do some university work, mostly doing his social activities on his phone. Are there artefacts present on the exhibit that support or undermine this assertion.

**Question 2:**

Is there any evidence to show that the indecent photographs have been saved or accessed?

**Question 3:**

If the laptop has been bought second-hand, is it possible that any discovered artefacts can be attributed to previous owners?

**Opinion:**

Can you support the defendant’s statements about seeking to make composite pornographic pictures? We are particularly interested if there is anything on the device which indicates that the defendant, or anyone else, has made conscious effort to search or access indecent material.

Currently there is no allegation that someone else used the computer. This computer is allegedly second-hand, and a recently bought refurbished computer.His old computer was recently reported stolen (there is a reported Crime Reference Number to confirm this).