

Adams case used the FBI method- no dissenting expert Reliagene was lab.

Coleman uses the actual frequency and the 95% upper confidence limit Scientist is Dr. Terry Melton. She used this method not the FBI's (same as mine).

Council- testimony allowed no other witnesses than FBI.

Johnson- statistical issue not addressed but Holland is co-author of paper presenting estimating frequency with upper confidence limit approach

Klinger<sup>1</sup> Good decision talks about Melton's suggestion that the estimated frequency (either 0 or what is observed) and a 95% upper confidence limit is accepted and cites other cases that reach same conclusion.

Murrin. Last three paragraphs on statistics says use the frequency plus the confidence limit as suggested by the FSS (Werren) and FBI (Wilson) witnesses. Follows our suggestion as well and discusses elsewhere the problem of one base pair mismatch. At this time they had not yet changed their protocol

Pappas: A 95% exclusion rate was used by both the FBI and Shields leading to the noted difference in the opinion. It was a statistical result rather than a verbal conclusion.

Scott: good discussion for us and includes note 9 to the Underwood decision saying a statement of percentage of population that would not be excluded is used to present evidence.

Than- Doesn't say much but say Dr. Melton can present some useful evidence even though there is no Vietnamese database. This case in Orange County Ca where a large population of Vietnamese live (over 100000 individuals).

Ware p38 of 49. statement that absent a statistical estimate the mtDNA evidence does not provide much to the layperson. Direct quote would help you.

Finally if you can get copies of both Rorrer and Dillon from PA they order the state to use appropriate statistics.

Hope this helps some. My report coming

Bill