memo to NAVY

[redacted] I

Date of Report: 15 Jan 1971

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 NO. 41442

H [redacted] CASE: 12,516

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: 9.12.70)

yes a. Please compare the attached 9 pre-capture photographs of PATTERSON, JAMES with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA ____ USN 411 USAF ____.

b. See attached overlay for exact location of image to be compared.

2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:

a. The following frames were chosen for comparison with the photographs submitted: F 6536, 6544, 65 6560, 6568

b. 2 technicians working independently of each other analyzed the identifiable features listed below.

I [redacted] 3. Results of analysis:

a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: (Adequate) inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

b. (U) Quality of frames in Christmas film: (Adequate) inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

I [redacted] c. The following features were considered similar

(1) Car left and stand - man behind

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

I [redacted]

21008

H [redacted] CASE: 12,516

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: 9.12.70)

a. Please compare the attached 9 pre-capture photographs of PATTERSON, JAMES with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA ____ USN 414 USAF ____.

b. See attached overlay for exact location of image to be compared.

2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:

a. The following frames were chosen for comparison with the photographs submitted: F 6536, 6544, 6560, 6568

b. 2 technicians working independently of each other analyzed the idertifiable features listed below.

I [redacted] 3. Results of analysis:

a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: (Adequate) inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

b. (U) Quality of frames in Christmas film: (Adequate) inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

c. I [redacted] The following features were considered simila

(1) Car left and stand - very likely

(2) _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

I [redacted] 21008

APPROVED FOR RELEASE
DATE 1 MAY 1987

(2)

I [redacted]

(5) _____

(6) _____

(7) _____

(8) _____

(9) _____

d. I [redacted] The following features were considered dissimilar:

(1) Cranial Shape

(2) Zygomatic Structure

(3) Facial Detail

(4) _____

(5) _____

e. I [redacted] Conclusion:

(1) In view of the similarity in general appearance and significant number of similar features, _____ could be the subject of the questioned photographs.

(2) In view of the significant number of differences in distinguishable features. PATTERSON probably is not the subject of the questioned photographs.

(3) In view of the quality of photography and the small number of distinguishable features which could be compared, no conclusion can be reached.

f. (U) The same image has been compared with pre-capture photographs of ____ Air Force, ____ Navy, ____ Marine, ____ Army, and ____ civilian personnel.

I [redacted]

(7) _____

(8) _____

(9) _____

d. [redacted] The following features were considered dissimilar:

(1) Cranial shape

(2) Zygomatic structure

(3) Facial details

(4) _____

(5) _____

e. [redacted] Conclusion:

(1) In view of the similarity in general appearance and significant number of similar features, _____ could be the subject of the questioned photographs.

(2) In view of the significant number of differences in distinguishable features. PATTERSON probably is not the subject of the questioned photographs.

(3) In view of the quality of photography and the small number of distinguishable features which could be compared, no conclusion can be reached.

f. (U) The same image has been compared with precapture photographs of ____ Air Force, ____ Navy, ____ Marine, ____ Army, and ____ civilian personnel.

[redacted]

[redacted]

4. [redacted] WARNING: This photo comparison analysis was performed utilizing the best available techniques, however, the quality of the photographs in question precluded positive identification. There may be other overriding factors concerning the individual's case which could confirm or invalidate the photo comparison analysis.

Attachments:
(a) Overlay or questioned photo
(b) Precapture photo