OFFICIAL (SENSITIVE)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Streamlined Forensic Report (SFR)** | | | | **Case Management**  **Risk Form – Expert** | | |
| Relates to (person): | Click or tap here to enter text. | | Crime/Occ. No: | | | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Location: | Click or tap here to enter text. | | Forensic Case Ref: | | | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Date of Offence: | Insert Date | | Forensic Lab Ref: | | | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Seizing Officer: | Click or tap here to enter text. | | Other Ref 1: | | | Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  |  | | Other Ref 2: | | | Click or tap here to enter text. |
|  | | | | | | |
| Report provided by: | Click or tap here to enter text. | Organisation: | | | Click or tap here to enter text. | |
| Date of report: | Insert Date | | | | | |
| As a participant in the case above I have an obligation under CrimPR 1.2(c) and also as an expert under CrimPR 19.2(b)(ii)) to, at once inform the court and all parties of any significant failure which might hinder the court in furthering the overriding objective.    **The significant risk I bring to the attention of the court and all parties, is that the maker of the SFR1 (details above) has been listed as a trial witness.**  This is a significant risk because the SFR1 report is a summary of an expert’s conclusions (served under CrimPR 19.3) and is neither a statement, nor an expert’s report made in compliance with CrimPR 19.4. The maker of the SFR1 may not be able to provide admissible evidence of all matters stated within the SFR1 at this time.  The court and all parties are invited to confirm which, if any, of the findings in the SFR 1 are admitted as fact, and where a conclusion is not admitted, what are the disputed issues concerning that conclusion (as set out in CrimPR 19.3). The identification of disputed issues will enable the preparation of statements or expert reports in the appropriate form and, when necessary, the warning of the appropriate witness(es) for trial.  In cases in which an SFR1 (or summary of an expert’s conclusions) is to be served under CrimPR 19.3 the steps below should follow:     * The other party makes an admission as to agreed facts pursuant to section 10 Criminal Justice Act 1967 OR; * The other party responds where a conclusion is not admitted, setting out the disputed issues concerning that conclusion. This should be followed by the production of an SFR2 by the appropriate witness in s9 Criminal Justice Act 1967 format (and in compliance with CrimPR 19.4 when applicable) OR; * If there has been no response to an SFR1, or a response that does not comply with CrimPR 19.3(2), the court may want to consider listing the case for a case management hearing. In the absence of an admission, or any application and ruling as to hearsay, an SFR1 is unlikely to be admissible, and the maker of an SFR1 will not normally be able to provide admissible evidence of all matters stated within the SFR1 if they are warned to attend trial as a witness.   The court and all parties are asked to note that INSERT NAME will not be able to provide admissible evidence of all matters stated within the SFR 1. The court and all parties are therefore invited to reconsider the witness warning for INSERT NAME. | | | | | | |

FOIA – Redaction Required