


- 2 -

Rankin papers
Box 33 Folder
436

We should review the above circumstances at our conference with Agent Latona and Inspector Malley. The configuration of the palm print should be reviewed to determine, if possible, whether or not it was removed from a cylindrical surface. The possibility that the palm print or evidence of the lift was destroyed while the rifle was in transit should be reviewed with them. The exact condition of the rifle at the time it was turned over to the FBI Dallas office should be ascertained. Agent Latona should be asked if he can think of any explanation for the apparent conflict in the above testimony.

We should also:

- 1) Determine whether or not Lt. Day had assistance when he worked with the prints on the rifle. If he did, we should obtain statements from those who assisted him.
- 2) Lt. Day should be asked why he preserved the fingerprints on the rifle, which were not sufficiently clear to make positive identification, and yet did not preserve the palm print, which was clear enough for that purpose.
- 3) Lt. Day should also be asked why he removed only the palm print and should be questioned again concerning his recollection that he saw the palm print still on the rifle after he made the lift.
- 4) Lt. Day should be asked if he took any photographs of the palm print on the rifle after the lift. He may have done so, since he did photograph the less valuable fingerprints, and the palm print on the rifle, according to his testimony, was still the "best bet" for identification. It is also significant that Lt. Day stated that he was going to attempt to get a better print through use of photography.



Wesley J. Liebeler

Case of
Chapman
attachment