



**New Zealand Police**

**2014**

# **CREWE HOMICIDE INVESTIGATION REVIEW**



**Miscellaneous**

**APPENDIX 17**



## **Appendix 17**

### **Miscellaneous**

- 1. Report of Fingerprint Analysis (2013), by Mark HUMPHRIES, Principal Fingerprint Officer, New Zealand Police**
- 2. Report of Fingerprint Examination (1979), by Detective Sergeant Mervyn DEDMAN, Officer in Charge Fingerprint & Photography Section, Auckland, New Zealand Police**
- 3. List of items fingerprinted by Detective Sergeant Mervyn DEDMAN during the scene examination at the Crewe farm house in June 1970.**
- 4. Report of handwriting analysis (1978), by John WEST, Document Examiner, New Zealand Police**
- 5. List of Event Attendees on 17 June 1970**
  - Pukekawa Rate Payers Meeting**
  - Table Tennis**
  - Indoor Bowls**



## **Appendix 17**

**(1)**

**Report of Fingerprint Analysis (2013),  
by Mark HUMPHRIES, Principal Fingerprint Officer,  
New Zealand Police**



# REPORT FORM

SUBJECT: Operation Crewe.

ADDRESS: Auckland Fingerprint Section.

TEXT: Review of fingerprint related evidence.

*Report Date: 22/11/2012*

Detective Senior Sergeant G. Lendrum,  
Counties-Manukau

The following report summarises a review of the Fingerprint evidence in relation to Operation Crewe.

A request was made by Detective Superintendent A. Lovelock for the fingerprint section to search their records and review any evidence located pertaining to the Crewe homicides in 1970.

This would be in addition to any documents supplied by the review team.

On Friday December 3rd 2010 a search for fingerprint records relating to the Crewe homicides was undertaken at Auckland Central Police Station by Det. Supt. Lovelock and Principal Fingerprint Officer Humphries (O/C Auckland Fingerprint Section).

The search of the Fingerprint Section office and its' related on-site storage areas included two storage rooms on the ground floor and a large basement area located on the lower ground floor. Both are secured locations sited within the confines of the Auckland Central Police Station.

Currently both storage areas are kept locked and this has been the policy since the Fingerprint Section took control of the storage areas, the basement over 25 years ago and the ground floor since around 2000. However, there are no records held of who else may have, or have had, access to these areas beyond the keys retained in the secured fingerprint section and the master station keys held within the Auckland Central Police Station.

The search undertaken of the Fingerprint Section and the ground floor storage rooms located nothing pertaining to the Crewe homicide, related investigations or subsequent legal proceedings.

The search of the lower ground basement area located numerous ledgers containing crime scene attendance details from the 1960's and 1970's. An extensive search of the stored documentation and crime scene photographs yielded no additional items of interest.



Of note, in 1970 fingerprints were preserved by photography and the negatives retained, not the current method of using adhesive gel and acetate sheets.

Subsequent to this I was forwarded some fingerprint related documents from Detective Senior Sergeant G. Lendrum, which I was asked to review and submit my conclusions.

These documents are described as follows;

- 1 x Female Fingerprint Form with three (3) fingerprints attached and bearing the reference details [REDACTED] and
- 1 x set of fingerprints bearing the reference details [REDACTED] The reverse of the document was endorsed 'Mrs J Crewe'.

Consequently I compared the fingerprints on these respective forms and concluded they were made by the same person, believed to be Mrs Crewe.

Further to these I received;

- 1 x additional unnamed set of fingerprints bearing the reference [REDACTED]

These fingerprints were compared to those believed to be Mrs Crewe and I have concluded they were not made by the same person.

On reviewing the fingerprint records I have available, it would appear these prints ([REDACTED]) were recorded for the purpose of illustrating what good quality fingerprints should look like. Beyond this aspect they have no relevance to the criminal proceedings.

Additionally I reviewed the fingerprint evidence from previous court cases transcripts. However no physical evidence has been located and consequently is simply not available for technical review.

It is relevant to clarify the fingerprint process to provide context between the approach undertaken in 1970 and the current era. The focus of this evaluation is particularly in relation to those prints that were not identified, according to the court transcripts and copies of statements, and which remain unidentified.

Technology as it exists today was not available during the initial investigative period. Any comparisons conducted between prints preserved at crime scenes and prints recorded from persons of interest or prints retained by police from criminal convictions were completed manually. A Fingerprint Expert personally made comparisons from the crime scene prints to each individual finger on each fingerprint form held on record using a magnifying glass.

Modern electronic methods utilising computers to search fingerprint algorithms from crime prints against prints held electronically on the criminal record database, resulting in a list of 'nominated' persons of interest, were not available until 1991.

The advantage the current process is the ability to search crime scene prints against the entire New Zealand criminal fingerprint database. This culminates in the generation of a response list in a matter of minutes containing a pre-determined number of possible candidates, to whom deposition of the crime scene print may be attributed, based on the similarity of the prints in a matter of minutes.

These would then be compared on-screen by a fingerprint expert and if necessary using a magnifying glass resulting either in an identification, the prints were from the same source, or an exclusion, they were from different sources.

As previously stated, during the time of the homicide any comparisons would have been conducted manually by a fingerprint expert.

The observation is that, whilst I am unable to confirm the extent of comparison work that was undertaken, the modern approach would allow for a more extensive search against a nationwide database.

Comment must be passed on various statements from the court transcripts. These all follow a similar vein to that referenced below from the Royal Commission transcript, page 2, document reference [REDACTED].

*"On 17th September 1970, I endeavoured to fingerprint a male body at the Auckland Mortuary....The most that I could achieve was to decipher that the pattern type of the right ring finger was a whorl, which is a circular type pattern.*

*I had fingerprinted the bottles in the cocktail; cabinet that I had obtained a sequence of fingers that of the right fore, middle and ring fingers. The right ring finger was a whorl. I also obtained from one of the bottles a portion of a left thumb print. From these impressions I identified the left thumb to the rear vision mirror of the car. The right fore to the poker and others to fingerprints found in the baby's bedroom and medicine cabinet. I considered that these fingerprints were those of the occupier Harvey Crewe"*

These conclusions are further documented as 'Thought to be Mr Crewe' in various schedules prepared for court evidential purposes, including document reference [REDACTED]

The supposition that the unidentified prints could be attributed to Harvey Crewe, whilst a logical conclusion, would not, in my opinion, stand up to scrutiny in the modern scientific age.

This is my observation, not a criticism and based not on identifications and fact but circumstantial evidence.

The conclusions of Mr. Dedman do not eliminate the possibility that the prints could belong to an unknown person/person's who had access to the same areas. The inference drawn by the location and commonality of the prints in different areas of the house and vehicle, combined with the coincidence that the right ring finger is a whorl, as noted on the deceased believed to be Harvey Crewe, may appear valid and lend one to think it likely that they are all the prints of Harvey Crewe. However, this inference is not supported by the same level of proof and definitive conclusions offered by fingerprint identification.



There have been a number of statistical studies conducted that have sought to ascertain the commonality of specific pattern types occurring on a given finger. Some of these research studies have been summarised as follows.

#### Cummins and Midlo - 1943

- used data from Scotland Yard research in 1905.
- assessed 5,000 individuals, 50,000 prints. (5,000 ring fingers)
- 34.85% of patterns on the right ring finger were whorls. (the finger with the highest probability of being a whorl pattern.)

#### New Scotland Yard - no date (but manual published 1987).

- no information on size of sample group.
- 41.63% of patterns on the right ring finger were whorls. (the finger with the highest probability of being a whorl pattern.)

#### Babler - 1978

- assessed 81 American Caucasians only
- 42.5% of patterns on the right ring finger were whorls. (the finger with the highest probability of being a whorl pattern.)

All three studies concluded that the right ring finger is the most common finger for a whorl pattern to have been formed.

An examination of all the fingerprint records held on the New Zealand Police Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS), the electronic fingerprint database, was conducted on January 9th 2013.

Of the 707,396 right ring fingers on record, 415,533, equating to 58.74% of pattern types, were whorls. Overall whorls accounted for 38.18% of pattern types across all fingers. Whorls were the most common pattern type on right ring fingers and in addition the right ring finger was the finger most likely for a whorl to occur.

What could be perceived as the tenuous nature of the assumptions and conclusions reached by Mr. Dedman, given the frequency of whorls and in particular those on the right ring finger, can be given further credence via other research.

In his 1953 paper 'Finger Prints as Criteria of Ethnic Relationship', David Rife asserted that 'Whorls occur more frequently on right fingers' and 'Whorls also occur with greatest frequencies on ring fingers and thumbs'.

My findings must validate concerns with the supposition that as one of the deceased had a whorl on the right ring finger many of the prints from around the property could thus be attributed to being from the same source. Whilst this maybe true we are equally compelled to acknowledge the frequency and digit to which whorls may be attributed, to reiterate currently 58.74% of ring finger patterns on the NZ Police database are whorls, thus proposing alternative possibilities. Based purely on those New Zealand based statistics, it is apparent that the odds are better than even that a random member of the New Zealand population would have a whorl pattern on their right ring finger.

In my conclusion, due to the lack of notes and documentary evidence I cannot substantiate the observations and opinions of the fingerprint expert, Dedman.

There is no additional work in relation to this investigation that can be conducted from fingerprint perspectives until further exhibits, crime scene fingerprint photographs or fingerprint forms are located and submitted for analysis and comparison.

For your information and consideration,

Mark Humphries MHK981  
Principal Fingerprint Officer  
Officer in Charge Auckland Fingerprint Section.





## **Appendix 17**

**(2)**

**Report of Fingerprint Examination (1979),  
by Detective Sergeant Mervyn DEDMAN,  
Officer in Charge Fingerprint & Photography Section,  
Auckland, New Zealand Police**

FILE  
TYPE

(O-DET/SEN/SGT WHERE STATIONED REPORTING MEMBER INITIALS/REG. No.		SIGNATURE M. H. DEDMAN (REPORTING MEMBER)		DATE 26.7.79		CHECKED BY	
(WARDING INUTE CODE OF STATION/BRANCH FORWARDED TO		SIGNATURE (FORWARDING MEMBER)		DATE		FILE STATUS (Circle) ASSIGNED POSTED FILED/INACTV	
(MINUTED TO DET/SEN/SGT/CONST INITIALS REG. No. OF MEMPHIS SECTION INTENDED		SIGNATURE (MINUTING MEMBER)		DATE			
FILE		FISID		YEAR MONTH DAY NUMBER		P. FILE	

same pattern type as from the body. From there, I was able to identify these fingers separately, or together, on the poker, the baby's bedroom door and the medicine chest in the bathroom. The left thumb print on the bottles was identical with the left thumb print I had developed on the rear vision mirror on the car.

These impressions were all in positions one would normally expect an occupant of a house to handle. From what I had retrieved from the body and the evidence I had collected from the house, I considered that the opinion I expressed then and now, that these impressions were in fact made by Harvey CREWE, is sufficiently supported.



M H DEDMAN  
Supervisor, Fingerprint Section  
AUCKLAND





## **Appendix 17**

**(3)**

**List of items fingerprinted  
by Detective Sergeant Mervyn DEDMAN  
during the scene examination at the Crewe farm house  
in June 1970.**

CREWE INQUIRY

FUKUKAWA

The fingerprints of Mrs Crewe were obtained as a Complainant in a burglary at the address in 1967. The fingerprints are very poor especially in the left hand, therefore, some of the fingerprints not yet identified are no doubt portions of her left hand.

Mr Crewe's fingerprints were not obtained but I consider that I have from various exhibits obtained his right fore, middle and ring fingers and his left thumb.

No Palm Prints are available from the missing couple.

There were no fingerprints of the suspect identified in the house.

IDENTIFIED AS MRS CREWE

1. Door of babys room.
2. Cupboard door above can opener on buffet.
3. On inside of front door.
4. T.V. Flap.(folding door on T.V.)
5. Inside back door near light switch.
6. Drinking glass from table.
7. Milk bottles dated 17 & 15.
8. Babys bottle.
9. Lemon Hart Rum (Ex 97)

THOUGHT TO BE MR CREWE

1. Rear vision mirror from car.
2. Half full bottle DB Lager (Ex 95)
3. Drinking glass from kitchen.
4. Dewars Whisky.
5. Ginger Ale (Ex 96)
6. Napoleon Brandy (Ex 101)
7. Poker.
8. Cupboard door between sink.
9. Door frame to toilet.
10. Leg small coffee table.

NOT YET IDENTIFIED

1. Palm print window frame washhouse.
2. Door frame washhouse to hall.
3. Inside door bathroom cabinet.
4. Inside back door below handle.
5. " " " above handle
6. Passage/kitchen door frame.
7. Inside door of babys room.
8. Palm Print inside door babys room.
9. Coffee table (small)
10. Bathroom cabinet outside.
11. Big coffee table.
12. Palm Print on front mantel piece above fireplace.
13. Outside main bedroom door.
14. Lounge doorway (looks childs prints)
15. Inside front door.

NOT SUFFICIENT DETAIL, OR NO FINGERPRINTS DEVELOPED

1. Torch.
2. Empty milk bottle.
3. Will.
4. Car registration form.
5. 2 covering letters.
6. 1963 Diary.
7. Extension cord.
8. Babys plastic napkin cover.





## **Appendix 17**

**(4)**

**Report of handwriting analysis (1978),  
by John WEST, Document Examiner,  
New Zealand Police**



NEW ZEALAND POLICE  
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

KNIGGES AVENUE  
WELLINGTON 1, NEW ZEALAND

CABLES: MOMEN WELLINGTON  
TELEX: POLICEHQ NZ 3550  
PRIVATE BAG, TE ARO  
TELEPHONE: 723 000

8 June 1978

The Detective Chief Superintendent,  
Region Coordinator,  
Criminal Investigation Branch,  
AUCKLAND.

INMATE OF MT EDEN PRISON -  
GIVES INFORMATION ABOUT CREWE MURDERS

1. I have compared the handwriting on the maps and sketches, items 1 to 4 inclusive, with the writing attributed to Arthur Allan THOMAS.
2. In my opinion there is sufficient degree of similarity to demonstrate that THOMAS was responsible for the writing on items 1 to 4, in particular the writing in black ball point pen on items 3 and 4.
3. I have photographed the documents to preserve evidence before fingerprint treatment is carried out.

*J. A. West*  
(J. A. West)  
Document Examiner

*Det. Insp. O'Donovan,*

*B. Wilkinson*  
B. WILKINSON  
DET. CH. SUPERINTENDENT  
REGION COORDINATOR

13.6.78

*off BRB*

*Auckland*

*Documents to be examined  
for fingerprints of Alan Arthur  
Thomas*



## **Appendix 17**

(5)

### **List of Event Attendees on 17 June 1970**

- **Pukekawa Rate Payers Meeting**
  - **Table Tennis**
  - **Indoor Bowls**



**PUKEKAWA RATE PAYERS ASSOCIATION MEETING**

**Pukekawa hall**

Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> June 1970

No:	Name:
1.	ALEXANDER
2.	BALL
3.	t BENTON (TBC)
4.	BREWSTER
5.	BROPHY
6.	BUDGE (TBC)
7.	BURBERY
8.	DENIZE
9.	EYA
10.	EYRE (TBC)
11.	FULTON (TBC)
12.	HATWELL (TBC)
13.	HOSKINGS
14.	HOSKINGS (TBC)
15.	LINDBERG (TBC)
16.	LOGAN
17.	McCABE
18.	McCABE (TBC)
19.	McGUIRE
20.	MILLER (TBC)
21.	MURRAY
22.	NICHOLSON (TBC)
23.	ORR
24.	PAYNE
25.	RITCHIE
26.	SEXTON
27.	SEXTON
28.	SMEED
29.	SPRATT
30.	THOMAS
31.	WHITE
32.	KELLOW

**TABLE TENNIS EVENT - Opuatia**Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> June 1970

No:	Name:
1.	CALVERT
2.	EGGLESTON
3.	EGGLESTON
4.	CALVERT
5.	BURLING
6.	PARKER
7.	TURNER
8.	BELL
9.	LAMONT
10.	PHILLIPS
11.	INSOLL

**INDOOR BOWLS EVEN – Glen Murray**Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> June 1970

No:	Name:
1.	ALLEN
2.	BROWN
3.	EGGLESTON
4.	FLEMING
5.	FOX
6.	GARRETT
7.	GARRETT
8.	McPHATLAND
9.	MORRISON
10.	ROBINSON
11.	ROBINSON
12.	RUSH
13.	SMITH
14.	SMITH
15.	STUCKEY
16.	STUCKEY
17.	WOOTEN