

**Report of the State Crime Laboratory Working Group:
Administrative Solutions to Alleviate Lab Backlog**

October 10, 2014

Prepared by Jessica Smith, UNC School of Government

Executive Summary

As a result of changes in the law regarding defendants' constitutional confrontation rights and budget issues, the State Crime Laboratory (Lab) is experiencing significant testing backlogs resulting in trial delays and case dismissals. Other groups have examined possible legal changes to address Lab backlog (such as procedures for remote testimony by Lab analysts). However, those solutions, even if adopted, funded, and found lawful, are unlikely to fully alleviate the problem. The State Crime Lab Working Group was formed to develop easily implemented administrative measures to reduce Lab backlog. The Working Group included district and superior court judges, prosecutors, and representatives from NC Indigent Defense Services, the State Crime Lab, and the NC Conference of District Attorneys. As described below, the Working Group developed seventeen recommendations for reducing backlog at the Lab. Additionally, the Working Group created a model memorandum of agreement that can be adopted by the judges and prosecutors in each of North Carolina's judicial districts to implement the Working Group's recommendations.

Background

Impetus for Creation and Goals

The impetus for creation of a Working Group came after Professor Jessica Smith brought a group of judges to the Lab as part of a NC Judicial College course. At the Lab, the group learned about the testing backlog. According to then-Director John, factors contributing to Lab backlog include:

- An insufficient number of analysts to handle existing case submissions, a problem exacerbated by non-competitive pay.
- The United States Supreme Court's *Melendez-Diaz* decision and the requirement that unless the defendant waives confrontation rights, analysts must testify live at trial. John explained that in 2012-13, Lab personnel logged 2,822 court hours; only 9.5% of this time was attributed to giving testimony; the remainder was travel and wait time.
- The State's geography and the fact that the Raleigh Lab is the only full-service State crime lab.

During John's presentation the group realized that certain practices by judges and prosecutors were inadvertently exacerbating the Lab's backlog. After that visit Smith asked volunteers to participate in a project to develop administrative measures to address backlog at the Lab and the Working Group was formed.

Membership

The members of the Working Group included the following:

G. Wayne Abernathy	Superior Court Judge
Seth Banks	District Attorney
Charlie Brown	Chief District Court Judge
Brandy Cook	District Attorney
Phil Ginn	Senior Resident Superior Court Judge
Greg Horne	Chief District Court Judge
Joseph R. John, Sr.	Consultant and Former Director, NC State Crime Lab

Gene Morris	Assistant District Attorney
Sarah Rackley Olson	Forensic Resource Counsel, NC Indigent Defense Services
James Roberson	Chief District Court Judge
Jessica Smith	Professor, UNC School of Government--Reporter for the Working Group
Joy Strickland	Assistant Attorney General and State Crime Lab Legal Counsel
Anna Mills Wagoner	Senior Resident Superior Court Judge & Chair of the Working Group
Megan Lively	Resource Victim Witness Legal Assistant, NC Conference of DAs

Recommendations

The Working Group's recommendations are set forth below. Rather than being presented in priority order, the recommendations are presented in an order that roughly follows the progression of a case through the trial process.

1. *Allow for testing priority in habitual and personal injury impaired driving (DWI) cases.*

Explanation: Existing procedures allow for testing priority for DWI death cases. A similar priority should be given to habitual DWI cases and DWI cases where personal injury occurred. Although this does not reduce overall court time for Lab analysts, it helps the Lab prioritize cases for testing.

Recommendation for implementation: This recommendation was implemented by the Lab after it was discussed at the Working Group's first meeting. Specifically, the Lab has modified the "Rush Request Form," creating check blocks for "Habitual" and "Personal Injury to Another." A copy of the new form is attached as Appendix B.

2. *The DAs' offices should use the Lab's Forensic Advantage (FA) System for all subpoenas for Lab analysts, notices releasing Lab analysts from subpoenas, rush testing requests, and stop work orders.*

Explanation: The FA System is the Lab's electronic information management system. Although all DAs' offices are using the FA System to retrieve discovery, most are not using the FA System to issue subpoenas for Lab analysts, release Lab analysts from subpoenas, submit rush testing requests, and submit stop work orders. The Lab reports that efficiency gains can be achieved by moving away from the current paper/fax system to full implementation of the electronic FA System.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

3. *All DA office personnel assigned to use the FA System should receive timely computer training.*

Explanation: In order to fully realize efficiency gains offered by the FA System, all users need to be trained to use it. Although the NC Conference of District Attorneys, in conjunction with Lab personnel, have offered some live training and other sessions are planned, Working Group members expressed concern that funding and scheduling issues may prevent all personnel from attending live training sessions.

Recommendation for implementation: (1) Incorporate training requirement into local memorandum of understanding. See sample memorandum in Appendix A. (2) In addition to continuing to offer live training, the NC Conference of District Attorneys should develop, in

conjunction with Lab personnel, an on-demand asynchronous screen simulation web-based training for existing and new DA personnel.

4. *Each DA should assign one person in each county to serve as the primary communication liaison between the DA's office and the Lab regarding scheduling of Lab analysts as witnesses and should provide the name of the liaison to the Lab's Court Coordinator.*

Explanation: Once a subpoena is issued by the Victim-Witness Legal Assistant or a prosecutor, further communication is required between the DA's office and the Lab regarding the specific date and time when the analyst will be required to appear, court schedule changes, and any conflicts that the analyst may have due to competing subpoenas. When the Lab is juggling tight schedules and multiple subpoenas for analysts, the Lab's Court Coordinator must be able to communicate with someone in the DA's office who is knowledgeable about the cases in question. When communication breaks down, unnecessary travel and wait time for analysts results. This recommendation is designed to ameliorate this inefficiency. In many counties, the primary communication may be the Victim Witness Legal Assistant (VWLA), or if there is no VWLA, an office manager, receptionist, or similar person. The decision about who should serve in this role is best left to the local DA. However, once a liaison is selected, his or her name and contact information must be provided to the Lab's Court Coordinator.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

5. *For all district court cases involving expert testimony, the district court judge should give the trial a priority setting at a time certain when the experts have been called to appear.*

Explanation: In many districts, experts, including Lab analysts, are noticed to appear first thing in the morning even if the trial cannot begin until the afternoon. For Lab analysts, this results in unnecessary wait time and contributes to Lab backlog. By giving the case priority and setting it for a time certain, wait time can be reduced. So that no unfair advantage is given to the State, the recommendation applies to all experts, including defense experts.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

6. *When the district court judge will be present and holding criminal court for all or most of the week, the judge should consider recessing the case until later in the week if doing so will make efficient use of the expert's time.*

Explanation: Flexibility in managing the district court docket can yield efficiency gains in terms of minimizing Lab analyst travel and wait time, for example when a single analyst is an expert in two cases scheduled the same week before the same district court judge. If the analyst can appear on one day for both cases, travel and wait time will be reduced. Because cases are scheduled in district court based on the charging officer's court date, evidence can be taken on that date and the case can be recessed, if necessary, for testimony from the Lab analyst later that week. The district court judge has authority to act in this way and doing so creates no jurisdictional issues. So that no unfair advantage is given to the State, the recommendation applies to all experts, including defense experts.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

7. *For DWI blood cases in district court in which the defense has filed a motion to suppress the blood sample and the blood has not yet been tested, the DA should schedule the suppression motion for a motions hearing date before trial. The motion should be heard then, absent a defense objection on grounds that the test results have not been received.*

Explanation: The standard practice in district court is to have the hearing on a suppression motion during the trial. However, if the suppression motion is held before trial and is granted, a stop work order can be submitted to the Lab and the analyst need not be called to court. In many circumstances, the suppression motion will seek to suppress evidence in addition to the blood test results. In these cases, the defense lawyer may have no objection to having the suppression motion heard before the blood test results have been received. However, when the only evidence sought to be suppressed is the blood test results, defense counsel may not wish to litigate the suppression motion until the test results have been obtained. To accommodate this possibility the recommendation allows for a defense objection to preclude a pretrial motion hearing before the test results have been received. Of course a pretrial hearing on the suppression motion always is desirable after the results have been obtained, to avoid calling the Lab analyst for trial if the motion is granted.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

8. *As soon as possible but no later than at the Monday calendar call, the DA should notify the trial judge and defense counsel of any cases on the trial calendar where a scheduling conflict may exist regarding expert testimony. The trial judge should address scheduling of trials involving experts at Monday calendar call.*

Explanation: The trial judge needs to be alerted about cases involving Lab analysts so that trials can be scheduled to make efficient use of experts' time. So that no unfair advantage is given to the State, the recommendation applies to all experts, including defense experts.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

9. *When a case has been given a final continuance because the Lab has not completed testing, the DA's FA rush testing request should indicate the reason for the request.*

Explanation: The Lab reported that it is at times inundated with rush testing requests and that some offices routinely label all testing requests as rush requests. Without a clear indication that the case is subject to dismissal for failure to test the required material, the Lab is unable to prioritize these cases in an informed manner.

Recommendation for implementation: When the DA's office requests a rush for this reason, personnel should do so in the FA system, indicating the reason for the request in "Reason for Rush Request" block.

10. *Unless the Lab analyst has been told to report to a specific courtroom at a specific time, analysts arriving for court should report to the DA's assigned communication liaison (see Recommendation 4 above). The liaison should immediately notify the prosecuting attorney of the analyst's arrival. The prosecuting attorney should so notify the judge as soon as practicable and the judge should, as appropriate, take expert testimony out of order.*

Explanation: The Lab reported that analysts often arrive in court and are unsure who to notify of their presence and waste time trying to determine where to report. If the VWLA or prosecutor has issued the subpoena, that person may be in court or managing witnesses

and thus not available to assist the analyst. Also, prosecutors are not regularly notifying the judge of the analyst's presence. Doing so is important because the trial judge has authority to take witnesses out of order and may do so, as appropriate and while fully protecting the defendant's rights. Through these procedures analyst wait time can be reduced. So that no unfair advantage is given to the State, the recommendation is worded to apply to all experts, including defense experts. When exercising discretion regarding whether to allow witnesses to testify out of order, the trial court should consider, among other things, the impact on the relevant party's presentation of its case to the jury.

Recommendation for implementation: (1) Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A. (2) The Lab's Court Coordinator shall inform all analysts that unless they have been told to report to a specific courtroom at a specific time that they should report to the DA's assigned liaison.

11. *The Lab should simplify the process for submitting FA System stop work requests by deleting the requirement that the DA's office attach the court's dismissal order to the request.*

Explanation: Under existing FA System procedure, a stop work order requires the prosecutor to attach a copy of the court's dismissal order. Prosecutors reported this to be an unnecessary and time-consuming step.

Recommendation for implementation: This recommendation is being implemented by the Lab.

12. *When testing has been requested in a case that has been resolved (by plea, etc.), the prosecutor shall, as soon as practicable but within five working days following the expiration of the appeal period, have a stop work order submitted in the FA System. The trial judge should remind the prosecutor to submit the stop work order.*

Explanation: A stop work order takes a case off the Lab's testing docket and ensures that time will not be wasted processing resolved cases.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

13. *When a case for which a Lab analyst has been subpoenaed or ordered to court is resolved prior to trial or is continued, the prosecutor should, at that time or as soon as practicable but within five working days following the expiration of the appeal period, have the analyst released from subpoena through the FA System. If the timing is such that the DA's liaison to the Lab has requested the analyst's presence at a specific date and time, the DA's office also should inform the Lab's Court Coordinator by phone or email of the release from subpoena. The trial judge should remind the prosecutor to release the analyst from subpoena.*

Explanation: The Lab reported that occasionally analysts are not notified that a case has been resolved and waste travel time driving to court, only to find that the proceedings have ended.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

14. *Every motion for a proposed testing order that involves the State Crime Lab shall be served on the Lab by mail and accompanied by the following certification by the requesting party:*

The undersigned attorney certifies that this proposed order has been served on the State Crime Lab's legal counsel and
(Check one)

The State Crime Lab has no objection to the proposed order.

The State Crime Lab has concerns about the proposed order as indicated in the attached document from the Crime Lab.

Signed and certified as true

Explanation: The Lab reported that court testing orders sometimes order the Lab to do something that is not proper or possible (e.g., a testing order that requires the Lab to upload DNA profiles to CODIS but federal rules prohibit such action for the specific items in question; or a testing order that requires the Lab to skip steps in testing to preserve evidence but doing so would result in non-compliance with accepted scientific protocol). When this occurs, Lab time is required to resolve these matters. The certification will address this issue, allowing the Lab to be heard about problematic testing orders before they are signed. The recommendation is limited to proposed testing orders that involve the State Crime Lab in some way; if the order pertains to testing of evidence not held by the State Crime Lab, notice to the Lab should not be necessary.

Recommendation for implementation: Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A.

15. *Every motion for a preservation of evidence order shall be served on the Lab and accompanied by the certification above in Recommendation 14. Additionally, all proposed preservation of evidence orders should include language that allows for required testing or, if the evidence will be consumed by testing, a date within 30 days by which the prosecutor, defense, and lab legal counsel shall submit proposals for how testing will be conducted.*

Explanation: The Lab reported that judges' preservation orders sometimes contain language that precludes any testing by the Lab. When testing is required by the case, Lab time is required to modify the testing order appropriately. Use of the proposed language will eliminate this problem.

Recommendation for implementation: (1) Incorporate into local memorandum of agreement. See sample memorandum in Appendix A. (2) Working Group members Joy Strickland and Sarah Olson have agreed to draft model language for preservation orders that will allow for required testing.

16. *When the Lab emails DAs with its Pending Testing Docket/Resolved Cases report, it should inform the DA that unless told otherwise, cases listed in the report will be removed from the Lab's testing docket within 30 days from the DA's receipt of the report.*

Explanation: Because the Lab is not always notified through the FA System when a case is resolved, resolved cases sometimes remain on the Lab's testing docket. To address this, starting July 1, 2014, the Lab began producing a list for each DA of pending cases cross-referenced against the State Bureau of Investigation's computerized Criminal History System. The Lab started sending these reports to DAs and asking that they inform the Lab whether any cases can be removed from the testing docket. The DAs' Executive Committee already has recommended that the Lab take a stronger approach with the DAs, informing them that unless the DA tells the Lab otherwise, the Lab will remove resolved cases from its testing docket. The Working Group concurs in this recommendation, but suggests Dec. 1, 2014, as the implementation date for this recommendation in order to create an opportunity for full notice to all DAs.

Recommendation for implementation: The Lab should modify its notification to the DAs accordingly.

17. The Lab should develop a report that identifies non-CR testing requests over 1 year old.

Explanation: The report noted immediately above only tracks testing requests that are associated with a criminal case. In some instances officers or others submit items for testing when there is no identified suspect and no CR number. Currently the Lab has no tool for examining its non-CR assigned testing docket. The Working Group was concerned that without a mechanism to weed out resolved non-CR testing requests, unneeded tests may contribute to backlog.

Recommendation for implementation: As a starting point, the Lab should request resources so that it can assess its "aging" non-CR testing docket.

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE

_____ COUNTY

SUPERIOR AND DISTRICT COURT DIVISIONS

**Memorandum of Agreement
To Establish Procedures Relating to Testimony
By State Crime Lab Analysts**

WHEREAS because of budget constraints and other issues the State Crime Laboratory (State Crime Lab) is experiencing a significant forensic testing backlog;

AND WHEREAS the backlog is exacerbated by the time State Crime Lab analysts are required to spend away from the State Crime Lab traveling to and from court, waiting to give court testimony, and giving court testimony;

AND WHEREAS the backlog is exacerbated when resolved cases are not promptly removed from the State Crime Lab's testing docket and by breakdowns in communication with the State Crime Lab regarding the need for analysts' presence in court;

AND WHEREAS the undersigned are of the opinion that there are administrative practices that will help to reduce State Crime Lab backlog.

THEREFORE the undersigned Senior Resident Superior Court Judge, Chief District Court Judge and District Attorney for Judicial District ____ agree to support the practices set forth in the attachments to this memorandum.

Senior Resident Superior Court Judge

Chief District Court Judge

District Attorney

Date

Procedures for the District Attorney's Office

- The District Attorney (DA) assigns _____ (name), _____ (title) as the primary communication liaison (communications liaison) between the DA's office and the State Crime Lab regarding the scheduling of State Crime Lab analysts as witnesses for cases in _____ County.
- The DA adopts the following procedures governing communication between the communications liaison and the State Crime Lab.
 1. The DA's communication liaison shall provide his or her name and contact information to the appropriate State Crime Lab Court Coordinator. The State Crime Lab's Court Coordinators are:
 - Margie McLamb (Raleigh & Triad)
 - Phone: 919-662-4509 ext. 1507
 - Email: mmclamb@ncdoj.gov
 - Note: When McLamb is not available Rodema Richardson (ext. 1203) and Laverne Samuels (ext. 1501) are her back-ups.
 - Alisa Taylor (Western Lab)
 - Phone: 828-654-9682
 - Email: altaylor@ncdoj.gov
- 2. All testing requests, rush requests, stop work orders, and release from subpoena requests shall be submitted through the Forensic Advantage (FA) System.
- 3. When a case has been given a final continuance because the State Crime Lab has not completed testing, the rush testing request submitted in the FA System shall indicate the reason for the request in the "Reason for Rush Request" block.
- 4. Once a subpoena has been issued for a State Crime Lab analyst, the communications liaison shall follow the case in question and provide notice to the State Crime Lab's Court Coordinator of the specific date and time that the analyst will be needed and shall specify the courtroom where the trial will be conducted. The communications liaison shall inform the State Crime Lab's Court Coordinator of any scheduling changes.
- Any personnel in the DA's office who are authorized to use the FA System shall complete training on the system within _____ (specify days or months) of being so authorized. For staff already using the FA System on the date this Memorandum of Agreement is signed, training shall be completed within _____ (specify days or months).
- For DWI blood cases in district court in which the defense has filed a motion to suppress the blood sample and the blood has not yet been tested, the DA shall schedule the suppression motion for a motions hearing date before trial and the motion will be heard then, absent a defense objection on grounds that the test results have not been received.
- As soon as possible but no later than at the Monday calendar call, the DA shall notify the trial judge and defense counsel of any cases on the trial calendar for which a scheduling conflict may exist regarding expert testimony, including State Crime Lab analyst expert testimony.
- Upon arrival in court, all State Crime Lab analysts shall report to the DA's communication liaison who shall immediately notify the prosecuting attorney that the analyst has arrived. The prosecuting attorney shall so notify the judge as soon as practicable.
- The prosecutor trying the case shall call State Crime Lab analysts to court in a manner that efficiently uses their time.

- When testing has been requested in a case that has been resolved (by plea, etc.), the prosecutor shall, as soon as practicable but within five working days following the expiration of the appeal period, have a stop work order submitted in the FA System.
- When a case for which a State Crime Lab analyst has been subpoenaed or ordered to court is resolved prior to trial, the prosecutor shall, as soon as practicable but within five working days following the expiration of the appeal period, have the analyst released from subpoena through the FA System. If the analyst is scheduled to appear in court within the next 24 hours, the prosecutor shall also have the State Crime Lab Court Coordinator informed by phone or email.

District Court Procedures

- For all district court cases involving expert testimony, the district court judge should give the trial a priority setting at a time certain when the experts have been called to appear.
- When the district court judge will be present and holding criminal court for all or most of the week, the judge should consider recessing the case until later in the week if doing so will make efficient use of the expert's time.
- For DWI blood cases in district court in which the defense has filed a motion to suppress the blood sample and the blood has not yet been tested, the DA shall schedule the suppression motion for a motions hearing date before trial and the motion will be heard then, absent a defense objection on grounds that the test results have not been received.
- When the judge has been informed that State Crime Lab analysts and other experts have arrived in court, the judge shall, as appropriate, exercise authority to take testimony from the experts out of order.
- When a case that involves State Crime Lab testing is resolved, the trial judge shall remind the prosecutor to submit a stop work order in the FA System.
- When a case for which a State Crime Lab analyst has been subpoenaed or ordered to court is resolved prior to trial, the trial judge shall remind the prosecutor submit a release from subpoena in the FA System.
- Every motion for a testing order shall be served on the State Crime Lab at least five working days before the anticipated hearing date and accompanied by the following certification by the requesting party:

The undersigned attorney certifies that this proposed order has been served on the State Crime Lab's legal counsel and
(Check one)

The State Crime Lab has no objection to the proposed order.

The State Crime Lab has concerns about the proposed order as indicated in the attached document from the Crime Lab.

Signed and certified as true

Service on the Lab shall be made by mailing the proposed order to:
North Carolina State Crime Laboratory
Attn: Lab Legal Counsel
121 East Tryon Road
Raleigh, NC 27603

- No hearing on a proposed testing order shall be conducted and no order shall be entered absent certification that the State Crime Lab has been served with the proposed order as indicated above.
- Every motion for a preservation of evidence order shall be served on the State Crime Lab as indicated above and accompanied by the certification immediately above. Additionally, all proposed preservation of evidence orders should include language that allows for required testing or, if the evidence will be consumed by testing, a date within 30 days by which the prosecutor, defense, and lab legal counsel shall submit proposals for how testing will be conducted.

- No hearing on a proposed preservation of evidence order shall be conducted and no order shall be entered absent certification that the State Crime Lab has been served with the proposed order as indicated above.

Superior Court Procedures

- As soon as possible but no later than at the Monday calendar call, the DA shall notify the trial judge and defense counsel of any cases on the trial calendar for which a scheduling conflict may exist regarding expert testimony, including State Crime Lab analyst expert testimony. The trial judge shall address scheduling of the trials involving experts at Monday calendar call.
- When the judge has been informed that State Crime Lab analysts and other experts have arrived in court, the judge shall, as appropriate, exercise authority to take testimony from the experts out of order.
- When a case that involves State Crime Lab testing is resolved, the trial judge shall remind the prosecutor to submit a stop work order in the FA System.
- When a case for which a State Crime Lab analyst has been subpoenaed is resolved prior to trial, the trial judge shall remind the prosecutor to have the analyst released from the subpoena in the FA System.
- Every motion for a testing order shall be served on the State Crime Lab at least five working days before the anticipated hearing date and accompanied by the following certification by the requesting party:

The undersigned attorney certifies that this proposed order has been served on the State Crime Lab's legal counsel and
(check one)

The State Crime Lab has no objection to the proposed order.

The State Crime Lab has concerns about the proposed order as indicated in the attached document from the Crime Lab.

Signed and certified as true

Service on the Lab shall be made by mailing the proposed order to:

North Carolina State Crime Laboratory
Attn: Lab Legal Counsel
121 East Tryon Road
Raleigh, NC 27603

- No hearing on a proposed testing order shall be conducted and no order shall be entered absent certification that the State Crime Lab has been served with the proposed order as indicated above.
- Every motion for a preservation of evidence order shall be served on the State Crime Lab as indicated above and accompanied by the certification immediately above. Additionally, all proposed preservation of evidence orders should include language that allows for required testing or, if the evidence will be consumed by testing, a date within 30 days by which the prosecutor, defense, and lab legal counsel shall submit proposals for how testing will be conducted.
- No hearing on a proposed preservation of evidence order shall be conducted and no order shall be entered absent certification that the Crime Lab has been served with the proposed order as indicated above.

APPENDIX B: RUSH REQUEST FORM

Rush Request Form
North Carolina State Crime Laboratory

Version 2
Effective Date: 7/10/2014

Rush Request Form

Name of District Attorney or ADA:			
Contact number and email address for DA or ADA:			
Name of Legal Assistant:			
Legal Assistant's contact number and email address:			
County:		Age of Case:	
Defendant / Subject Name:			
Victim Name:			
Date LE Agency submitted case to Lab:		Laboratory File Number*:	
LEO Contact: Name / Agency / File Number			
Date requested for case completion:		Trial Date (if confirmed):	
Criminal Charges:			
For DWI/DUI cases Statute of Limitation:		Habitual <input type="checkbox"/>	Fatality <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Injury to another <input type="checkbox"/>
Reason for Rush Request**:			

I, the undersigned District Attorney or Assistant District Attorney, am requesting that the North Carolina State Crime Laboratory complete the examination of the evidence submitted in the above reference case as quickly as possible.

Signature: _____

Please attach this request to your Forensic Advantage Web message. *Paperwork without a laboratory case number may not be able to be processed. This information can be located by your Agency's FA Administrator. **Rush requests without adequate justification may not be honored.

Form approved for use by: **Chuck McClelland**

Digitally signed by Chuck McClelland
DN: cn=Chuck McClelland, o=nc,
email=cmcclelland@ncsl.gov, c=US
Date: 2014.07.10 15:09:55 -0500