

tape (brown and transparent, 48 mm × 50 m, 3 M, Korea), aluminum foil tape (40 mm × 5 m, Okong, Korea), clear tape (18 mm × 30 m, 3 M, Korea), electrical tape (19 mm × 10 m, Okong, Korea) and semi-transparent tape (18 mm × 15 m, 3 M, Korea) were purchased from a local market.

Un-Du Original Sticker, Tape & Label Remover (Un-Du Inc, USA) was used as an adhesive neutralizer. ACry-Ac-3 (Brymill, USA) cryogun with a nozzle diameter of 0.031 mm was also used.

The latent fingerprints which were deposited on the adhesive side of duct tape, packing tape, aluminum foil tape were developed with the DARK Adhesive-Side Developer (SIRCHIE, Cat. No. ASD7D, USA). Electrical tape was treated with the WHITE Adhesive-Side Developer (SIRCHIE, Cat. No. ASD7L, USA). Clear tape and the semi-transparent tape was treated with the phase transfer catalyst solution which was formulated with 0.01 M tetrabutylammonium iodide (Acros Organics, USA) and 0.01 M Rose Bengal (Junsei, Japan) [15].

Preparation of tapes

Before the experiment, the ends of all the tapes adhesive surfaces were manually folded in order to facilitate the separation. Latent fingerprints were collected from a 27-year-old female donor. The donor pre-touched her forehead and nose three times with the tip of her right thumb and deposited her right thumb fingerprint by 3 consecutive natural touches of the adhesive side of the tapes.

Adhesive-side to adhesive-side adhered tape (A-A tape) was prepared by adhering the latent fingerprint bearing adhesive-side and untouched adhesive-side of a tape. Adhesive-side to non-adhesive-side adhered tape (A-N tape) was prepared by adhering the latent fingerprint-bearing adhesive-side and untouched non-adhesive-side (backing plastic layer) of the tapes. Adhesive-side to paper adhered tape (A-P tape) was prepared by adhering the fingerprint-bearing adhesive side and neat A4 paper. After a period of 24 hours, three separation methods were used to separate the tapes.

Separation of tapes and development of fingerprints

In the case of a dipping method, after dipping the samples into the liquid nitrogen for a given time, it was separated by pulling two ends of the sample by hand. In the case of the cryogun method, after spraying liquid nitrogen from the corner of the sample for a given time, it was separated by pulling two ends of the sample by hand. In the case of Un-Du method, the Un-Du was dropped on the corner of the sample, and it was separated by pulling two ends of tapes by hand. Immediately after the separation, the latent fingerprints were developed by an Adhesive Side developer or Rose Bengal dye. All the separation and fingerprint development experiments were repeated 10 times.

Results

Change of the tape according to the liquid nitrogen exposing time

The change of tapes as a function of time after the contact with liquid nitrogen (dipping and cryogun methods) was observed. In the case of duct tapes, the ends of the tape started rolling up immediately after contact with liquid nitrogen in both methods. The brittle and fracture features of the backing plastic layer during bending of the samples were observed after 10 sec of contact, and breaking of the adhesive material was observed after 20 sec of contact. In the case of packing tape and clear tape, the ends of the tapes started rolling up immediately after the contact with the liquid nitrogen in both methods. However, in the

case of drawing out from liquid nitrogen or discontinuing the cryogun spray the dried tape returned quickly to its original state. Unlike to the duct tape, with simple exposure to the liquid nitrogen, brittleness and fracture of the adhesive and backing plastic layer were not observed. However, the tapes were torn by applying a pulling force to separate the adhered tapes. More than 30 sec of contact with liquid nitrogen did not cause brittleness or fracturing of the aluminum foil tape. In the case of electrical tape and semi-transparent tape, brittleness and fracture

| Tapes | Separation methods | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|
| | Dipping | Cryogun | Un-Du |
| Duct (green) | | | |
| Duct (grey) | | | |
| Packing (brown) | | | |
| Packing (transparent) | | | |
| Aluminum foil | | | |
| Clear | | | |
| Electrical | | | |
| Semi-transparent | | | |

Figure 1: Separation results of A-A tapes.

| Separation methods | Observed features | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------|---------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Tapes | Brittleness | Tearing | Irregular separation of adhesive material | Transfer of the adhesive material to the facing tape | Development of the whole fingerprint |
| Dipping | Duct (green) | X | X | O | X | impossible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | 4/10 | O | X | |
| | Aluminum foil | X | X | X | O | |
| | Clear | X | O | X | X | |
| | Electrical | O | X | X | X | |
| Cryogun | Duct (blue) | X | X | O | X | impossible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | 7/10 | O | X | |
| | Aluminum foil | X | 6/10 | X | O | |
| | Clear | X | X | X | O | |
| | Electrical | O | X | X | X | |
| Un-Du | Duct (blue) | X | X | X | X | possible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | X | X | but the quality is reduced |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Aluminum foil | X | X | X | X | |
| | Clear | X | O | X | X | |
| | Electrical | X | X | X | X | |
| Semi-transparent | X | X | X | X | | |

*O: Observed, X: Not observed, Numbers in the table: number of observation out of 10 trials

Table 1: \$ V X P P D U \setminus R I O D W H Q W \setminus Q J H U P D U N G H Y H O R S P H Q W U H V X O W V I U R P W K H D G K H V

were observed from 5 sec contact with liquid nitrogen. Therefore, in Separation of A-P tapes and development of latent fingerprints the following experiments, the time interval of both the liquid nitrogen and A-P tapes were separated by three methods, and the separation result is summarized in Table 3. The contact time with liquid nitrogen cooling methods was limited to 5 sec. As shown in Table 3, when using liquid nitrogen cooling methods, successful separation and development of latent fingerprints were not accomplished because of the occurrence of the peeling of paper or peeling of adhesive material from the backing plastic layer. Successful separation was achieved by using Un-Du, but the fingerprint quality was decreased.

Separation of A-A tapes and development of latent fingerprints: Separation of A-A tapes were separated by three separation methods, and the result was compared. The cooling time with liquid nitrogen was limited to 5 sec. Figure 1 shows the deleteriously-separated tapes, and the phenomenon observed from the tapes were summarized in Table 1. In Figure 1, the separation result of aluminum foil tape using dipping and cryogun methods looks successful but actually it was not. The adhesive material in one tape transferred to the facing adhesive side of the tape, but it is not readily apparent on the photograph. As shown in the Figure 1 and Table 1, both the cooling methods were not successful in separating the A-A tapes. The Un-Du method was successful in separating A-A tapes. However, the quality of developed latent fingerprints was reduced (Figure 2).

Separation of A-N tapes and development of latent fingerprints: A-N tapes were separated by three methods, and the separation result is summarized in Table 2. The contact time with liquid nitrogen was limited to 5 sec. The adhesion of aluminum foil tape was separated irregularly by using cooling methods while the separation of the other tapes was successful. When using Un-Du method, all tapes were separated successfully, but the quality of developed latent fingerprints was reduced. Figure 2 shows the reagent developed latent fingerprints which were deposited on the surface of the adhesive side of the tape. Decreased quality of latent fingerprints is seen in the Un-Du treated tapes comparing to the liquid nitrogen treated tapes.

Discussion: Bergeron conducted the 'adhesive-side to adhesive-side attached tape-separation' experiment with liquid nitrogen dipping and concluded that the 10 sec dipping was not sufficient for the separation. Bergeron also mentioned that dipping for more than 30 sec did not have a detrimental effect on the tape [7]. However, in the present study, brittleness and fracture of tapes was observed from 5 sec contact with liquid nitrogen (dipping and cryogun spraying), and it produced a deleterious effect on the latent fingerprint development. Many forensic scientists have reported successful separation of A-A tapes by cooling method using liquid nitrogen [2,3,7,14]. However, while applying liquid nitrogen, the occurrence of an irregular (asymmetric) or total transfer of adhesive material to the facing adhesive material phenomenon shown in the Figure 1 has not been reported. More research is required to find the reason for this phenomenon. The Un-Du method was free from this deleterious phenomenon but decrease in the quality of the developed fingerprint was observed by the action of the solvents [2,4,9].

| Methods | Observed features | | | | | |
|---------|-----------------------|-------------|---------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | Tapes | Brittleness | Tearing | Irregular separation of adhesive material | Transfer of the adhesive material to the facing tape | Development of whole fingermarks |
| Dipping | Duct (green) | X | X | X | X | Possible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Aluminum Foil | X | X | O | X | Impossible |
| | Clear | X | X | X | X | Possible |
| | Electrical | O | X | X | X | |
| | Semi-transparent | O | X | X | X | |
| Cryogun | Duct (green) | X | X | X | X | Possible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Aluminum Foil | X | X | O | X | Impossible |
| | Clear | X | X | X | X | Possible |
| | Electrical | O | X | X | X | |
| | Semi-transparent | O | X | X | X | |
| | | | | | | |
| Un-Du | Duct (green) | X | X | X | X | Possible but reduced quality |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Aluminum Foil | X | X | X | X | |
| | Clear | X | X | X | X | |
| | Electrical | X | X | X | X | |
| | Semi-transparent | X | X | X | X | |

* O: Observed, X: Not observed

Table 2: \$ V X P P D U \ R I O D W H Q W \ Q J H U P D U N G H Y H O R S P H Q W U H V X O W V I U R P W K H D G K H V

| Methods | Tapes | Brittleness | Tearing | Transfer of paper peel to the adhesive material | Separation of adhesive material from the plastic layer | Fingermark development |
|---------|-----------------------|-------------|---------|---|--|------------------------------|
| Dipping | Duct (green) | X | X | O | X | impossible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | O | O | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Aluminum Foil | X | X | O | X | |
| | Clear | X | X | O | X | |
| | Electrical | O | X | O | X | |
| | Semi-transparent | O | X | O | X | |
| Cryogun | Duct (green) | X | X | O | X | impossible |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | O | O | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | O | X | |
| | Aluminum Foil | X | X | O | X | |
| | Clear | X | X | O | X | |
| | Electrical | O | X | O | X | |
| | Semi-transparent | O | X | O | X | |
| Un-Du | Duct (green) | X | X | X | X | Possible but reduced quality |
| | Duct (grey) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (brown) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Packing (transparent) | X | X | X | X | |
| | Aluminum Foil | X | X | X | X | |
| | Clear | X | X | X | X | |
| | Electrical | X | X | X | X | |
| | Semi-transparent | X | X | X | X | |

Table 3: \$ V X P P D U \ R I O D W H Q W \ Q J H U P D U N G H Y H O R S P H Q W U H V X O W V I U R P W K H \ S D S H U W R

| Tapes | Separation methods | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|
| | Dipping | Cryogun | Un-Du |
| Duct tape (blue) | | | |
| Duct tape (grey) | | | |
| Packing tape (brown) | | | |
| Packing tape (transparent) | | | |
| Aluminum Foil tape | | | |
| Clear tape | | | |
| Electrical tape | | | |
| Semi-transparent tape | | | |

Figure 2: Comparison of separation methods for various tapes.

and cryogun spraying method. Both the freezing methods had induced the same separation behaviors of A-N tapes.

Both the dipping in liquid nitrogen and cryogun spraying methods are not successful in the separation of A-P tape. However, Un-Du method was successful in the A-P tape separation, but the quality of the developed ngermark was decreased by the action of the solvents [2].

The present study shows that separation features of A-A, A-N and A-P tapes are identical (brittleness and fracture, transferring adhesive material to the facing adhesive side of the tape, separation of tape plastic backing layer from adhesion). We believe that the same separation features are obtained from the two freezing methods because both the methods accompany the physical contact with liquid nitrogen except for the contacting manner.

As mentioned previously, the phenomena observed in this study differ with the phenomena observed in other studies in many aspects [7,14,15]. The liquid nitrogen dipping time necessary for the successful separation of tapes, and the differences in features of the tapes after liquid nitrogen treatment are the examples. The materials used in the making, manufacturing methods, storage conditions, etc., vary for different types of tapes. Hence, the tapes used in the present study do not represent all the tapes. Therefore, it is recommended to perform preliminary experiments with the suggested methods on similar tapes, before processing the real evidence acquired from the crime scene. Therefore, it is recommended to carry out a preliminary examination with the similar tapes to the evidence material before separating evidence tapes using cooling methods such as liquid nitrogen dipping and cryogun spraying.

Conclusion

The separation feature of adhesive-side to adhesive-side adhered tape, adhesive-side to non-adhesive-side adhered tape, adhesive-side to A4 paper adhered tape were studied using duct tape, packing tape, aluminum foil tape, clear tape, electrical tape and semi-transparent tape. No difference between liquid nitrogen dipping and cryogun spraying methods in the tape separation features such as, brittleness and fracture of the tape, transferring adhesive material to the facing adhesive side of the tape, separation of adhesive material from the plastic layer of the tape. On the contrary, Un-Du method was successful in separating adhesive-side to adhesive-side adhered tape, adhesive-side to non-adhesive-side adhered tape, adhesive-side to A4 paper adhered tape. But the decrease of ngermark quality when using Un-Du method was confirmed. The results obtained from the present study does not coincide with the results of previous studies, and it indicates the importance of preliminary examination with the tape similar to the evidence material, before separating the evidence tape using cooling methods such as liquid nitrogen dipping and cryogun spraying.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Soonchunhyang University Research Fund.

References

1. Siegel JA, Saukko PJ (2012) Encyclopedia of Forensic Sciences. (2nd edtn), Academic Press, US.

2. Bailey JA, Crane JS (2011) Use of nitrogen cryogun for separating duct tape. J Forensic Sci Int 210: 170-173.

3. Stephens BG, Nazareno G, Block M, Hnатов P (1999) Use of liquid nitrogen to remove duct tape from a homicide victim. Am J Forensic Med Pathol 20: 154-157.

In A-N tape separation, all tested tapes except aluminum foil tape were successfully separated by cooling methods (liquid nitrogen dipping and cryogun spraying). The quality of the latent ngermark developed from the A-N tape separated by the cooling method was not decreased. Un-Du was also successful in the A-N tapes, but the quality of latent ngermark was decreased because of the solvents [2]. Therefore, it is seen that cooling methods (liquid nitrogen dipping or cryogun spraying) are better than Un-Du method when separating A-N tapes, except the aluminum foil tape.

Bailey pointed out the possibility of brittleness and fracture of the tapes while applying liquid nitrogen dipping method for the A-N tape separation, and Bailey recommended the use of a cryogun spray method instead of a liquid nitrogen dipping method [2]. However, we could not find any difference between the performance of liquid nitrogen dipping

4. Choudhry MY, Whritenour RD (1990) A new approach to unraveling tangled adhesive tape for potential detection of latent prints and recovery of trace evidence. J Forensic Sci 35: 1373-1383.
5. Di Vella G, Neri M, Belviso M (2002) Unusual suicidal smothering by means of multiple loops of adhesive gummed tape. J Forensic Sci 47: 645-647.
6. Kapila T, Katherine H (2012) Methods for Separating Duct Tape. J Forensic Ident 62: 215-226.
7. Bergeron JW (2009) Use of liquid nitrogen to separate adhesive tapes. J Forensic Ident 59: 7-25.
8. Wilson A, Rushton C, Cathcart K (2011) Separation of Adhesive Tapes from Surfaces Using Three Different Techniques. Poster presentation, Marshall university of Forensic Sciences.
9. Molina D (2007) The use of Un-Du to separate adhesive materials. J Forensic Ident 57: 688-696.
10. Stimac JT (2000) Adhesive tape separation with Un-Du®. Fingerpr Whorld 26: 153-157.
11. Stimac JT (2000) Un-Du-Adhesive Tape Separation. Forensic-tech.
12. Campbell BM (1991) Separation of adhesive tapes. J Forensic Ident 41: 102-106.
13. <https://www.un-du.com/About-Us.html>
14. Barker DA (1998) Liquid nitrogen for separating tapes from surfaces. FDIAI News 1: 14-15.
15. Smith JM (2006) Polarized Light Microscope Examinations Of Oriented Polymer Films. Pressure Sensitive Tape Council.

Citation: Kim S, Hong S (2016) A Comparison of Adhesive Tape-Separation Methods from Surfaces; Dipping in Liquid Nitrogen, Liquid Nitrogen Spray and an Adhesive Neutralizer Method. J Forensic Res 7: 346. doi: 10.4172/2157-7145.1000346

OMICS International: Open Access Publication Benefits & Features

Unique features:

- Increased global visibility of articles through worldwide distribution and indexing
- Showcasing recent research output in a timely and updated manner
- Special issues on the current trends of scientific research

Special features:

- 700+ Open Access Journals
- 50,000+ editorial team
- Rapid review process
- Quality and quick editorial, review and publication processing
- Indexing at PubMed (partial), Scopus, EBSCO, Index Copernicus and Google Scholar etc
- Sharing Option: Social Networking Enabled
- Authors, Reviewers and Editors rewarded with online Scientific Credits
- Better discount for your subsequent articles

Submit your manuscript at: www.omicsonline.org/submission/