



**Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry**

**Degree of MSc Forensic Science**

**FS934 Essentials of Forensic Science**

**6<sup>th</sup> December 2023      Time: 14:00 – 15:40**  
**Duration: 1 hour 40 minutes**

**You must answer BOTH questions.**

**Each question is worth a maximum of 20 marks**

**Please write clearly in ink.**

**Answer each question in a separate book**

**Ensure you write your name and registration number on the front of each  
book**



## THEME FOUR: INTERPRETATION AND EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE

1. Answer **BOTH** parts (a) and (b).

(a) Describe how a forensic scientist uses the Hierarchy of Propositions when investigating a sexual assault. Illustrate your answer with an example for each level of the Hierarchy [6]

(b) In relation to **Scenario 1.1**:

(i) Justify why you should always choose to switch your pick to B. [7]

(ii) Discuss why a forensic scientist should understand the reasoning behind this example. [7]

### Scenario 1.1

You are the participant in a game show. There are three individuals (A, B and C) in front of you. One is the “banker”, two are “impostors”, and your goal is to identify the “banker”. You pick A, after which the presenter tells you that C was an “impostor”. Note that the presenter would never identify the “banker”. Now, the presenter asks you to confirm whether you want to stick with A or switch to B.

**PLEASE TURN OVER**

## THEME THREE: FORENSIC POLICIES AND PRACTICES

2. Answer **ALL SIX** parts (a) to (f).

With reference to **Scenario 2.1**:

- (a) State the relevant legal and court systems. [1]
- (b) State one strict liability offence and one other possible offence under Scots Law, including the actus reus and mens rea. [2]
- (c) Explain how the Accident Investigator has failed in their duty to the court and state two potential outcomes for the accused. [2]
- (d) Evaluate the appropriateness of the testimony given by both witnesses. [6]
- (e) Discuss whether the use of the Accident Investigator meets UK admissibility rules and/or what further details might be required. [6]
- (f) Evaluate whether, in your opinion, the provision of forensic science would have been better if the incident had occurred in London. [3]

Question 2 cont/d overleaf

**PLEASE TURN OVER**

Question 2 cont/d.....

### **Scenario 2.1**

Ms Potts was walking across Buchanan Street, Glasgow, when she saw Peter riding a bicycle through a red stop light followed by sounds of a crash. Later that evening she saw mobile phone footage of the incident on social media showing the bicycle hit a pedestrian. The pedestrian died.

Peter claims that the brakes on his bike were faulty and it was an accident.

Strathclyde University Police Service hired an experienced independent Accident Investigator to examine media footage, tyre marks, the bicycle and road conditions.

At Court Ms Potts and the Accident Investigator both gave testimony saying:

- "The cyclist was travelling too fast"
- "The bicycle did not stop at a red light"
- "In my opinion, the bicycle crashing into the pedestrian killed them"

**END OF PAPER**

LJR, FC