

Sidebar
concluded

1 THE COURT: Okay.
2 (Whereupon, the sidebar conference
3 was concluded.)
4 Whereupon,
5 L Y N N S C A M A H O R N, was called as a witness
6 by the State, and after first being duly
7 sworn, was examined and testified upon
8 her oath as follows:

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. MARNOCHA:

11 Q Would you state your name for the Record,
12 please?

13 A My name is Lynn Scamahorn, and my last
14 name is spelled S-c-a-m-a-h-o-r-n.

15 Q Are you employed?

16 A Yes, sir.

17 Q Where are you employed?

18 A At the Indiana State Police Laboratory.

19 Q In what capacity?

20 A I'm a serologist.

21 Q And can you tell the jury something about
22 your educational background or training in that
23 area?

24 A I have a Bachelor's of Science in bio-
chemistry from Purdue University. In addition, I

Scamahorn/25
Direct

1 have in-house training from the Indiana State Po-
2 lice. Which means I went through every test and had
3 unknowns before I even got a case in real evidence.

4 In addition, I've had other training in
5 hair, besides blood, saliva and related body fluids.
6 Hair examinations was an additional training.

7 This training lasted about approximately
8 a year.

9 Q Are you currently approved through the
10 Police Laboratory to do DNA comparisons?

11 A That's correct.

12 Q And which laboratory do you work out of?

13 A The Indiana State Police Laboratory that
14 is located in Lowell, Indiana.

15 Q Now with respect to hair examination, is
16 it possible to compare and unknown hair sample to
17 known sample?

18 A Yes, that is possible.

19 Q How do you do that?

20 A What I do as a hair examiner, is we get a
21 certain amount of hairs from a person, and this is
22 called a hair standard.

23 What I look for as a hair examiner, is
24 the color, the length, if it's cut. And then I look
further beyond the color and length, and even micro-

1 | scopic, things to the eye, or things you can see.
2 | Such as, you know, I can tell that my hair is not
3 | curly by looking at it.

4 | In addition we take hairs and mount them
5 | on glass slides and we look under a microscope. So
6 | we look for microscopic things to compare the known
7 | hair with the unknown hairs.

8 | Microscopic things such as the scale
9 | pattern. There is something called the medulla
10 | which runs down the middle of the hair.

11 | You can kind of think of a hair as a
12 | pencil, that's a good analogy. If you take a pencil
13 | and cut it in half, the lead down the middle looks
14 | like the medulla in the hair; the wood, looks like
15 | the cortex, and that's just the structural part of
16 | the hair; the scales, which is the outside of the
17 | hair, is like the paint on a pencil.

18 | Q Now when you compare hairs, is it possi-
19 | ble for you to make an exact match between an un-
20 | known and known?

21 | A We don't do exact matches, we simply say
22 | that this unknown hair is similar to the known hair
23 | standard.

24 | Which means everything found in the known
Scamahorn/25 | hair standard, is also found in this unknown.
Direct

1 Q So you will say it's similar on hand or
2 could be dissimilar on the other hand?

3 A That's correct.

4 Q And that's as precise as you get?

5 A That's correct.

6 Q Could you for instance on your own head
7 compare a hair that came off of it and some known
8 things in your hair, and reach conclusions similar
9 and dissimilar?

10 A Yes, that is possible. Because every
11 hair on a person's head is not exactly the same.

12 Q Do people shed hair from their body as a
13 normal bodily function?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Head hair as well?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Now were you asked by the South Bend
18 Police Department in 1996 to make some analysis and
19 comparisons to both bodily fluids and fibers and
20 hairs that were submitted to you with respect to a
21 Connie Wawrzyniak, a Heidi Holdridge, Gwen Jensen
22 and also Richard Alexander?

23 A That's correct, yes.

24 Q And with respect to fluids, what did you
first look for when you got those kits?

1 A The first thing that I would look for of
2 course is a visual examination. I would want to
3 look at-- there are many things contained in a rape
4 kit, and the purpose of the rape kit is to find
5 something foreign to the victim, to the person that
6 the kit is taken from.

7 The first thing would be, there are
8 things called swabs, and if it's a swab of the
9 vaginal area, I would look for an obvious stain. So
10 the first thing is a visual examination.

11 Secondly, I would do a series of chemical
12 and immunological test to identify a stain. Just
13 because something looks like seminal material or
14 blood or saliva, I can't say that. As a scientist,
15 I would run tests to identify it.

16 Q Now with respect to the Gwen Jensen case,
17 did you analyze the findings in that, the rape kit,
18 to determine whether or not semen was present?

19 A Yes, I did.

20 Q And in your analysis did you find semen
21 to be present in the items in her kit?

22 A May I look at my notes?

23 Q Sure.

24 A (witness examining notes) The case where
Gwen Jensen, her kit?

1 Q Yes.

2 A No, there was no seminal material detect-
3 ed.

4 Q And if there were not an ejaculation in
5 that assault, would you expect there to be seminal
6 material?

7 A No. No ejaculation means there wouldn't
8 be any seminal material.

9 Q So at that point and time, at least as it
10 applies to serology, there was nothing further to
11 compare with respect to Richard Alexander's kit; is
12 that correct?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Now with respect to the Heidi Holdridge
15 case, did your examination of the rape kit that was
16 sent to you, did that reveal the presence of any-
17 thing?

18 A (witness reading notes) No seminal
19 material was detected.

20 Q Again, if there were no ejaculation,
21 would you expect to there to be semen?

22 A If there were no ejaculation, I wouldn't
23 expect it.

24 Q With respect to the Connie Wawrzyniak
case, did you examine the items which were sent to

1 you in that for the presence of semen?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And did you find semen to exist in that
4 case?

5 A Yes, seminal material was detected in
6 this case.

7 Q And did you send that down to another
8 laboratory at some point to make a further compari-
9 son and DNA analysis between the seminal material
10 found in the Connie Wawrzyniak case and the DNA from
11 Richard Alexander?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Who actually in the Indiana State Police
14 Laboratory performed those tests?

15 A The further DNA testing was performed by
16 Carl Sobieralski.

17 Q And do you know the results of that test?

18 A Yes, I have a copy of his report.

19 Q And what was that?

20 A Okay, I have a copy of that. I can read
21 it for you, would you like to read it?

22 Q Well, do you know whether or not there
23 was a match or not?

24 A No, there was no-- none of the DNA was
consistent with Richard Alexander.

1 Q Now with respect to the Heidi Holdridge
2 case, did you do any further examination?

3 A I did do a hair examination.

4 Q And what was the result of your hair
5 examination?

6 A The results were that hairs that were
7 found were sufficient to Heidi Holdridge, herself,
8 and one hair was found to be-- it possessed similar-
9 ities and differences.

10 Q So some of the hairs were similar to
11 hers-- at least one of them had similarities and
12 differences?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q Now with respect to the Gwen Jensen case,
15 were there items of hairs that you identified being
16 sufficient size or quality to make comparison in
17 that case?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Now with respect to-- how many hairs did
20 you actually compare in that case?

21 A How many hairs?

22 Q Yeah, unknowns?

23 A Unknowns?

24 Q (indicates affirmative)

Scamahorn/25
Direct

A I don't know that I have a specific

1 count, but I can tell you which items I did.

2 Q That's fine.

3 A Okay. I had hair on carpet sweepings,
4 which is our Item Two. I had hair on our Item
5 Three, which was identified as a bottle that con-
6 tained-- it was marked as pubic hair.

7 In addition, I had a plastic vile con-
8 taining several hairs in a vacuum sweeping.

9 Q Now with respect to the first hair that
10 you just testified to, did you compare that-- what
11 type of hair was that?

12 A Do you mean head hair or pubic hair?

13 Q Yes.

14 A I didn't specifically identify it as a
15 head or pubic hair.

16 Q And what was your reason for that?

17 A Because of the length of it, and because
18 it possessed Negroid characteristics. And a lot of
19 times a Negroid hair is a certain length, similar to
20 the length of a pubic hair, because they are very
21 dark and it's difficult to see differences, the
22 darker the hair is. So I can't necessarily say it's
23 one or the other.

24 And so what I would do is just compare it
to the standards that are given to me and say if it

1 matches or not.

2 Q So you weren't able to determine whether
3 it was a head or pubic hair; is that correct?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q When you compared that hair to both the
6 head and pubic hair of Richard Alexander, what did
7 you find?

8 A I found one hair-- and this is Item Two
9 again, that one hair was dissimilar to both the head
10 and pubic hair standards from Richard Lee Alexander,
11 and another hair possessed similarities and differ-
12 ences, to the pubic hair standards from Richard Lee
13 Alexander.

14 Q But because of the similarities and
15 differences, you are not willing to call that a
16 match; is that correct?

17 A Right, I didn't want to draw a conclu-
18 sion, because there were differences.

19 Q Now with respect to the other hair in the
20 vile, did you again compare that to the known head
21 and pubic hair standards from Richard Alexander?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And what was the result of that compari-
24 son?

Scamahorn/25
Direct

A The result was that there was one hair

1 that possessed similarities and differences to the
2 pubic hair standards from Richard Lee Alexander.

3 Again, because of the differences, I
4 didn't want to call a conclusion as to the origin.

5 MR. MARNOCHA: Pass the witness.

6 THE COURT: Mr. Korpel?

7 MR. KORPAL: Thank you, Judge.

8 CROSS-EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. KORPAL:

10 Q In your analysis-- back to your analysis
11 of Gwen Jensen, regarding Item number Two?

12 A Okay.

13 Q The carpet sweepings.

14 You're saying in Item-a that the hairs do
15 not match Richard Alexander's?

16 A That's correct.

17 Q But they were Negroid hairs?

Scamahorn/
Cross

18 A That's correct, they had Negroid charac-
19 teristics.

20 MR. KORPAL: I don't have anything else,
21 Judge.

22 MR. MARNOCHA: Nothing further, Your
23 Honor.

24 THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am, and you can
25 stand down.