1	that time. He wasn't home at the time of the arrest.
2	Q Did you tell that did you do anything to try
3	to investigate the case to try to get more evidence against
4	Mr. Bosquette after the identification by Miss
5	A Mo, I did not.
6	Q You felt that that was enough right there, that
7	you had a good enough case and you could go on to other
8	things; is that right?
9	A In in my opinion, yes, the case was solid
10	enough.
11	? Thank you very much, sir.
12	THE COURT: Redirect?
13	MR. SMITH: No further questions.
14	THE COURT: Witness, step down. Thank you.
15	Call your next witness.
16	MR. SMITH: Judge, the State would call Mr.
17	James McNamara.
18	JAMES J. McHAMARA
19	having been produced was first duly sworn as a witness and
20	was examined and testified as follows:
21	DIRUCT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. SMITH:
23	Q Would you please state your full name?
24	A My name is James J. McHamara.
25	Q What's your occupation?

1	A I'm a Forensic Serologist with the Florida
2	Department of Law Enforcement at Sanford Regional Crime
3	Laboratory.
4	Q How long have you been so employed?
5	A Since July of 1978.
6	MR. SMITH: Your Honor, I believe Mr. Morgenstern
7	is willing to stipulate that Mr. McHamara is an expert
8	in body fluids, the examination of body fluids.
9	MR. MORGENSTERN: That's correct, Your Honor.
10	THE COURT: In other words, you're stipulating
11	that he's an expert serologist.
12	MR. MORGENSTERN: Yes, Your Honor, I will so
13	stipulate.
14	THE COURT: All right, sir.
15	BY MR. SMITH:
16	Q Now, for the jury, Mr. McMamara, would you please
17	explain what's the nature of your work?
18	A Yes. A Forensic Serologist is an individual who
19	examines blood and other body fluids, primarily blood and
20	saliva, not only to identify what these substances or
21	stains are, but also, when possible, to go a little bit
22	further and conduct a series of grouping tests or typing
23	tests and this is done in an effort to show possible
24	sources of those stains or to eliminate people as being

sources of those body fluid stains.

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. So, what would you say the significance of that information that you obtain from analyzing these fluids would be?

The significance? Well, in -- courts of law, we are often called upon to testify as to the results of those testings, not only in identifying, but also, in grouping, the significance, I guess, being in an attempt to establish a consistency between the particular stain and the individual. There is no way in the field of serology that we can say with absolute certainty that a body fluid stain, such as blood or semen, is from a particular individual, as can be done in the field of latent fingerprints or firearms; but, comparisons in the field of firearms examination; however, we can show a consistency possibility of one individual being the source of the stains.

Q Okay. So, what you're saying, it's not an exact science, but it's an aid in investigation; is that a fair statement?

Α I believe I would say it's an exact science. Ιt is definitely an aid in investigation; however, it, again, cannot point to a particular individual with absolute certainty as to being the source of those stains.

- $\mathbf{O}$ Okay, that's what I meant.
- $\mathbb{A}$ Okay, that's correct.
- Thank you. Mr. McNamara, did you have occasion Q.

received?

25

evartment  ecsive?  ceived  ando  g from
eceive? ceived lando
ceived Lando Lando
ceived Lando Lando
ceived Lando Lando
lando ng Sron
lando ng Sron
; from
.SO
bmissions
now?
received
ple and a
that is,
ron
:

A The original items that were submitted to the lab were examined for the presence of any body fluids, primarily blood and semen, and the -- results of those examinations were on the pair of trousers, represented as being from Orlando Bosquette, a small reddish-brown stain was positively identified as being human blood. No semen was found on this exhibit.

Q Okay. Did you receive any underwear from Orlando Bosquette that you know of?

A No, sir, I did not.

Q Okay, thank you. Go ahead. What did you do with the rest of the evidence?

A There were two pairs of panties. One was not examined. The report indicated that it was accidentally sent to the laboratory and was not the correct pair of panties.

The other pair of panties were examined. Semen was identified on the tan panties by the presence of spermatozoa, a pre-productive cell. Grouping tests conducted on these panties indicated the presence of A and O postive factor in two separate cut areas that were tested. The other two indicated the presence of no blood group factors and additional grouping tests for enzymes found in semen that also can be found in a laboratory, those results were inconclusive. So, semen was identified on

the panties and grouping tests indicate the group of  $\Lambda$ 2 and 0 blood group factors. 3 In two spots on the panties, you found blood Q. groups A and O; is that correct? 4 5 That's correct. Correct me if I'm wrong. Two other spots on the 6 panties, I believe you said you could not detect any 7 8 blood grouping factors? A That's correct. 10 0 Okay. 11 The red pajama top, the -- my Exhibit No. 3, was examined also for the presence of any body fluids. Semen 12 was also identified on the red pajama top. Again, by the 13 presence of the spermatozoa, the male reproductive cell. 14 And grouping tests on this stain also failed to show the 15 16 presence of any blood group factors. 17 Okay. So, up to this point, we have two spots  $\mathbf{O}$ on the panties with A and O blood group factors, two 18 19 spots on the panties with no blood group factors; is that 20 correct? 21 I could say correct as to two cut areas or two <u>^</u> tested areas, other than the two spots. 22 23 Two, okay. And one or two areas on the pajama 24 top? 25 A. Two areas on --

•	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	

25

Again, with no blood group factors?

A That's correct. He blood group factor was detected.

Q Okay. What else did you do?

A That concluded the examinations that I conducted on the items of Submission Number One that was submitted to the laboratory.

Submission Number Two, which consisted of blood and saliva samples from both individuals, the results of those examinations, examination of the saliva sample and liquid blood sample from Orlando Bosquette were represented to me as being from Orlando Bosquette indicate that he is a Group O non-secreater.

Q What does that mean?

A The -- blood group 0 is one of four blood types with which most people are familiar, because of it's clinical importance in transfusions and the four groups or types are A, A-B, B, and C and O is the most common of those four; approximately, very approximately 45-percent of the population are of blood type O. It is the most common.

The non-secreater refers to the fact that 80percent of the population secreat in their body fluids
other than blood through blood type. That is, their
vaginal fluid or semen or saliva could be typed and you

could obtain a blood type simply from that fluid and not need a liquid blood sample. Twenty-percent of the population, for some reason, does not secreat that blood type and they are called non-secreaters and Mr. Bosquette, from the grouping on the blood and the type attempt on the saliva, it can be typed that he's a Type O non-secreater.

Q Okay. Based on the tests you performed to the clothing and the blood and salive samples you received from Mr. Bosquette, the defendant in this case, were you able to draw any conclusions?

A The only conclusion I could draw is that the -the stains where no blood group factors were found, that
is, on the pajama top and two areas or two cut areas of
the pair of panties, are consistent at least in that no
blood group factors were found and Mr. Bosquette is a
non-secreater. However, the other two cuttings or
tested areas in the panties, where the A and O blood
group factors are, are inconsistent with being from Mr.
Bosquette, in that he is a Type O non-secreater.

Also, the examination on the saliva sample and liquid blood sample indicated that she also is a Type O non-secreater. So, those blood group factors found in the panties, in the crotch of the panties, could also not be from her, being that she is a non-secreater.

1	Q Okay, let me get this straight, Mr. McNamara.
2	What you're saying is, two spots on the pajama top and two
3	spots on the panties are consistent, at least, consistent
4	with the secretions of Mr. Bosquette; is that a fair
5	statement?
6	A That is a fair statement. Again, a the
7	finding of no blood group factors on those stains, it
8	could not be said with certainty that the individual who
9.	placed those semen stains there is a non-secreater; but,
10	yes, that is a likely or possible explanation.
11	Q And I think it's also correct me if I'm
12	wrong fair to say that the other two cuts that were
13	tested on the panties that I believe you were said
14	were A and O factor?
15	A That's correct.
16	Q Are inconsistent with Mr. Bosquette; is that a
17	fair statement?
18	A That's correct. That's a fair statement.
19	MR. SMITH: Mo further questions at this time,
20	Judge.
21	THE COURT: Cross examination,
22	CROSS EXAMINATION
23	BY MR. MORGENSTERM:
24	Q Mr. McNamara, I want to thank you for coming
25	down here and testifying today.

A You're welcome.

Now, when you say cuttings -- spots was Mr. Smith's word, you said cuttings -- you don't mean that these were separate areas. You just took different samples of the same -- emplain a little bit more about what you mean by that.

A Will, the term cuttings that I would rather use, or tested areas, is used 'y bound', indicate that I'm not saying these are definite, separate stains. There was very much similar staining to the -- on both items, actually, but especially the ponties, on both the hylon portion or the backing of the panties, in addition to the cotton crotch. The panel crotch area of the penties, also, where they were one continuous large stain or several small stains, I couldn't say with certainty. They appeared to me and were marked and circled by me as being separate individual stains; obay? But, the tested cuts were taken from some of those circled areas and I cannot be certain that the entire thing was not one, continuous stain.

- Q Do you remember having a telephone conversation with me about this -- about this report some time in the last two weeks?
  - A Yes, I think we've had several.
  - Q Okay. Do you remember telling me that on the

1	panties, there was a continuous and large stain on the
2	panties?
3	A Well, there was a large, stained area. If I
4	could see the item, I could show you.
5	Q Can we look at it? Can you tell at this point?
6	A Sir?
7	Q Are they marked?
8	A They should be marked, yes.
9	Q I don't what number would that be?
10	THE COURT: Clerk keeps that.
11	MR. MORGENSTERN: Number 5.
12	BY MR. MORGENSTERM:
13	Q Can you tell from this bag whether this is the
14	panties that we're talking about (tendering exhibit to
15	the witness)?
16	A Yes, it is.
17	Q Okay. Now, we can't we can't really see right
18	here, can we, the actual staining here. Can you pick it
19	out better than I can? Was it the actual staining
20	clear at the time you did the tests?
21	A Mo. The first test done in identifying the
22	semenal stain is just simply touch or feel and also a
23	visual test for crusty or stiff, sometimes yellowish-
24	colored stains. In addition, we can use a UV light, an
25	ultraviolet light to detect the presence of those stains

Seminal fluids contain some consistencies that fluoresce under lighting. That also will aid us.

In the crotch area, there is one continuous stain that I have sampled and marked as Cutting No. 3 or Tested Area No. 3, with a small gap between that and a smaller stain, which I have marked as No. 4, both of those being in the cotton crotch area of the panties. Here and in the nylon portion of the back panel being there, I regard them as separate stains (indicating).

The discoloring is invisible. They were also tested and found to contain semen.

Q Okay. This does appear to be -- so, you're not saying that there was no semen in the space -- they seem to be in a long, straight line here (indicating).

A That's correct.

Q And --

A That's probably why I had said it was one continuous stain. They are all pretty much in the same area.

Q And all in a pretty much straight line, too; right?

A That's correct. But, they are separate areas.

Q You're not saying -- did you test the in-between area? You don't know whether this was really continuous or not; right?

•	A The only test on the in-between area was visual
2	and touch, along with the UV.
3	Q Okay. Thank you. Is that the bag?
4	A Yes, sir.
5	Q Now, when you say that that in two of those
6	areas, the A and O blood groups were found and in two of
7	the areas, the A and O blood groups are not found, you're
8	not saying that you can tell from that that these are
9	from different sources; you're
10	A Mo, sir.
11	Q You just it could you can tell that A and O
12	group stain definitely did not come from somebody like
13	Mr. Bosquette that's A and O non-secreater; right?
14	A That's correct.
15	Q But, you can't say the other way around, that
16	the that the the fact that the two other areas did
17	not happen to have A and O in them, did not come from the
18	same person, source and time. It could very well have
19	come from the same person, source and time and you just
20	didn't find any.
21	In other words, A and O blood groups are not
22	rampant all through there. You wouldn't be sure to find
23	them. It could easily be the same source and time and you
24	not have found them in one of the cuttings; right?
25	The statement is basically correct. Finding no

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

blood group factors or negative results is not used as a strong or positive indication of what you're dealing with, whereas finding the blood group factors, the A and O -would indicate the secretions being from a secreater. was A/O non-secreater, as was Mr. Bosquette. So, those findings of the A and O factors, a positive result is a good result and enables you to make a call as to a possible source.

What you're saying, I think, is where a negative source would not enable you to say that it's definitely from a non-secreater.

But, you can say the A and O definitely is not from a non-secreater?

That's correct.

Also, likewise, the stain on the -- the pajama finding that -- in fact, that you didn't find in the two areas that you cut any A and O groups does not mean that that was not semen from somebody in an A and O group. It could have come from the same person from the spots on the panties that he had A and O group; right?

Yes, sir, correct. That is a possibility. is also a possibility that the opposite is true and they were from a non-secreater.

But, you wouldn't consider it proof one way or another in a court of law.

1	A No, sir, no, sir.
2	Q So, at least some of those semen stains could
3	not possibly have come from Mr. Bosquette; right?
4	A In my opinion, that's correct.
5	Q Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Redirect?
7	MR. SMITH: Yes, sir, Judge.
8	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
9	BY MR. SMITH:
10	Q Mr. McNamara, on the other hand, at least three
11	of those stains that you examined could have come from
12	Mr. Bosquette; is that not true?
13	A That's correct, yes, sir.
14	MR. SMITH: No further questions, Judge.
15	THE COURT: Recross?
16	MR. MORGENSTERM: No, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Witness, step down. Thank you.
18	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: Call your next witness.
20	MR. SMITH: Your Honor, at this time, the State
21	would rest.
22	THE COURT: Jury out?
23	MR. MORGENSTERN: May we approach the bench?
24	THE COURT: All right, sir.
25	(At a side bar conference, the following further