The text in this document is provided for assisting in the preparation of NOEs for court purposes. These templates provide general information that may be covered in testimony by a lab analyst in the listed discipline. For case-specific information, attorneys should contact the analyst to discuss their expected testimony for inclusion in this notice.

The State of Alaska, by and through the undersigned attorney, hereby provides notice in the above-captioned case that the State intends to call [ANALYST NAME], Alaska Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory (ASCDL), 4805 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Ave., Anchorage, AK, 99507, (907) 269-5740, as an expert witness. Any reports authored by this expert have been or will be provided to the defense pursuant to Criminal Rule 16. Curricula vitae for ASCDL analysts are available on the lab’s website: <https://dps.alaska.gov/Statewide/CrimeLab/Quality-Assurance/SOQ>

The substance of [ANALYST NAME]’s expected testimony in this case is as follows:

Analyst will

1. Describe their education, background, training, qualifications, continuing education, and/or professional organization membership as it relates to performing chemical, physical, and optical techniques to locate, recover, preserve, compare, and identify latent fingerprints on evidentiary items.
2. Discuss evidence handling practices and procedures including how evidence is received and securely stored by the laboratory, as well as chain of custody.
3. Describe friction ridge skin and the difference between recovered latent prints and purposefully recorded known prints. Discuss development methods and recovery techniques across various surfaces, impression durability, and conditions impacting development.
4. Describe which items of evidence submitted to the Alaska Scientific Crime Detection Laboratory were processed or tested for the presence of friction ridge detail.
5. Describe each test method used, scientific principles related to that test method, quality control procedures in place, and any limitations, as well as the comparison methodology followed.
6. Explain the conclusions reached for each item or latent print analyzed.
7. Describe the quality assurance measures in place to ensure the integrity and validity of the opinions rendered in this case.
8. Comment on any other relevant matter on which the analyst is qualified to render an opinion.
9. *[Case-specific conclusions, and the basis of those conclusions, can be added here, after consultation with the assigned analyst]*