

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on the Forensic use of bioinformation: ethical issues between November 2006 to January 2007. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

Bob Horner

## List of questions

### 1. The interpretation of bioinformation

- a. In your view, is the SGM Plus<sup>®</sup> system, which uses ten STR markers, sufficiently reliable for use in ascertaining the identity of suspects in criminal investigations and/or criminal trials?

So far it seems reliable

### 2. Sampling powers

- a. From whom should the police be able to take fingerprints and DNA samples? At what stages in criminal investigations and for what purposes? Should the police be able to request further information from DNA analysts, such as physical characteristics or ethnic inferences?

Yes

- b. Should police expenditure on bioinformation collection and analysis be given priority over other budgetary demands?

No

- c. Do you consider the current criteria for the collection of bioinformation to be proportionate to the aims of preventing, investigating, detecting and prosecuting criminal offences? In particular: is the retention of bioinformation from those who are not convicted of an offence proportionate to the needs of law enforcement?

No too much information can be lost to outside sources

- d. Is it acceptable for bioinformation to be taken from minors and for their DNA profiles to be put on the NDNAD?

Only if an offence has been committed

### 3. The management of the NDNAD

- a. Is it proportionate for bioinformation from i) suspects and ii) volunteers to be kept on forensic databases indefinitely? Should criminal justice and elimination samples also be kept indefinitely? How should the discretion of Chief Constables to remove profiles and samples from the NDNAD be exercised and overseen?

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on the Forensic use of bioinformation: ethical issues between November 2006 to January 2007. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

- b. Is the ethical oversight of the NDNAD adequate? What, if any, research on NDNAD profiles or samples should be permitted? Who should be involved in the oversight of such databases and granting permission to use forensic DNA profiles or samples for research?

Only the police should hold any dna database .It should not be available to anybody else

- c. Who should have access to information on the NDNAD and IDENT1 databases and how should bioinformation be protected from unauthorised uses and users? Should forensic databases ever be made available for non-criminal investigations, such as parental searches, or the identification of missing or deceased persons?

Only the police should have access to this database /search for missing persons or identification should only be done by the police/ only the police should have access to this information

- d. What issues are raised by the transfer of bioinformation between agencies and countries? How should such transfers be facilitated and what safeguards should be in place for the storage and use of transferred data?

The transfer of any of this information should only be done on grounds of national security or known criminals . countries who have private companies involved in the storage of this type of information should be refused any of this information from our database .

#### **4. Ethical issues**

- a. Is the use of DNA profiles in 'familial searching' inquiries proportionate to the needs of criminal investigations? Do you consider the use of familial searching may be an unwarranted invasion of family privacy?

No,it`s ok

- b. Certain groups, such as ethnic minorities and young males, are disproportionately represented on forensic databases. Is this potential for bias within these databases acceptable? .

no ,this is being politically correct and has no relevance to this subject.

- c. Is it acceptable that volunteers (such as victims, witnesses, mass screen volunteers) also have their profiles retained on the NDNAD? Should consent be irrevocable for individuals who agree initially to the retention of samples voluntarily given to the police? Are the provisions for obtaining consent appropriate? Should volunteers be able to withdraw their consent at a later stage?

There should be a cut off limit for volanteers retention /no retraction should be permissable .

This response was submitted to the consultation held by the Nuffield Council on Bioethics on the Forensic use of bioinformation: ethical issues between November 2006 to January 2007. The views expressed are solely those of the respondent(s) and not those of the Council.

- d. Would the collection of DNA from everyone at birth be more equitable than collecting samples from only those who come into contact with the criminal justice system? Would the establishment of such a population-wide forensic database be proportionate to the needs of law enforcement? What are the arguments for and against an extension of the database?

This is a can of worms , I would never trust any part of any society from holding such dangerous information on anyone as it can be and would be easily abused by any future government

## 5. The evidential value of bioinformation

- a. What should be done to ensure that police, legal professionals, witnesses and jury members have sufficient understanding of any forensic bioinformation relevant to their participation in the criminal justice system?  
jury and police should be fully informed about dna evidence. Legal professionals ? just who is this ?
- b. How much other evidence should be required before a defendant can be  
01/11/2006ever be taken to be sufficient to prove guilt in the absence of other evidence?

other evidence of a sorts should be available

## 6. Other issues

- a. Are there any other issues, within our terms of reference, which we should consider?  
Yes . this information of a persons DNA is the Holy Grail to all insurance companies and private companies . It should Never under ANY circumstances be made available to them for ANY reason whatsoever . the holding of any dana of any UK citizen by any company in any form should be a criminal offence . with massive financial penalties enough to bankrupt any company immediately, also all senior members of said companies should immediately be arrested and held without bail and steps taken to sieze all worldwide assets of the offenders immediately on arrest .