

LITIGATION INTELLIGENCE SERVICES, LLC
76 PLEASANT POND RD
WARNER, NH 03278
603-746-4994

REPORT OF CONFIDENTIAL POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION

DATE: 05-01-2012

REFERENCE: Polygraph Examination: Chad Evans

CONFIDENTIAL TO: Bonpasse Exoneration Services, Mr. Morrison Bonpasse

ARRANGEMENTS:

At your request, as Chad's advocate, Chad Evans volunteered to be examined on the polygraph, a psycho physiological detection of deception technique. The purpose of the examination was to assess this individual's truthfulness in reference to the death of Kassidy Bortner, which took place on November 9, 2000 and to assist in the request that the investigation into her death be re-opened.

Prior to the examination, I reviewed pertinent reports; the original complaint prepared by Sgt. White and spoke with you several times.

PROCEDURE:

Chad Evans consented to the videotaped recording of the examination. He further verbally and by signature acknowledged the polygraph consent form. I examined Chad on 04/30/2012 beginning at 9:00 AM in the polygraph suite at the New Hampshire State Prison. The examination concluded at 1:00 PM.

An extensive, three hour, pretest interview was conducted with Chad. Based on my training and experience I noted no common indicators of verbal or physical deception.

Throughout the entire polygraph procedure, I found him to be attentive and co-operative. He seemed intent on being able to show his truthfulness to the relevant issues under consideration.

When asked to give his version of the events of Nov 8, 9, 2000, he gave a lengthy and detailed statement. I detected no linguistic signs of deception or editing.

I asked Mr. Evans a series of questions to determine if there was any reason that he should not undergo polygraph testing. After asking him these questions, I was of the opinion that there was nothing that would prevent Mr. Evans from being able to produce physiological tracings that would be reliable for interpretation purposes.

During the pre-test interview, I emphasized to Mr. Evans that the relevant test questions that I was going to ask him were confined to the events that occurred on November 8, 9 in the year 2000, when he was with Kassidy Bortner.

LITIGATION INTELLIGENCE SERVICES, LLC
76 PLEASANT POND RD
WARNER, NH 03278
603-746-4994

Following the pretest examination, an intest phase of the examination was then initiated. The examination utilized a Lafayette Polygraph Instrument, which recorded physiological responses into software designed by the manufacturer.

Relative changes in blood pressure, rate, and strength of pulse rate, electro dermal activity, and respiratory inhalation and exhalation patterns were recorded for analysis. .

It is equipped with a motion sensor that is designed to detect any physical countermeasures that a subject may attempt to employ in order to defeat the polygraph examination or any incidental movements that could create physiological reactions.

The following relevant questions were asked during the examination:

Between Nov 8, and Nov 9, 2000, did you hit, punch, kick, or strike Kassidy Bortner?

Are you the one who caused those injuries to Kassidy Bortner between Nov. 8 and Nov 9, 2000?

Between Nov 8 and Nov 9, 2000 did you inflict those injures to Kassidy Bortner?

Prior to the intest phase of the examination all questions were reviewed with the subject in complete detail. The questions were based on the investigative information and reports and my interview with Chad.

The testing format that I used was a multi-faceted test of a single issue employing the three question Utah Zone Comparison Technique. The procedure that I followed to present the polygraph test to Mr. Evans was the procedure taught by the New England Polygraph Institute of Moultonborough, NH and the Canadian Police College, Polygraph Training School. The protocol that I used to interpret the polygrams was the Utah Scoring System.

CONCLUSION:

Following Mr. Evans polygraph examination, I applied the Utah Scoring System to the physiological tracings that he produced. The Utah Scoring System involves assigning numeric values to the physiological reactions dependent upon their strength and characteristics. If each of the relevant question spot score totals are on the plus or minus side, the +/-6 rule applies. The +/- 6 rule means that an aggregate numeric total when the individual relevant question scores are combined that is +6 or greater indicates truthful answers were given to the relevant questions, a total of -6 or less indicates that the answers given to the relevant questions were deceptive and a total value ranging from +5 to -5 renders the test results inconclusive.

LITIGATION INTELLIGENCE SERVICES, LLC
76 PLEASANT POND RD
WARNER, NH 03278
603-746-4994

The aggregate numeric value produced was +15.

After careful analysis of this subjects physiological data, and procedural review of the subject's examination, based on the accepted criteria for numerical analysis, it is the opinion of this examiner that he was not reacting strongly to any of the relevant questions on this examination, and that no deception was indicated when he answered "NO" to the relevant questions.

Very Truly Yours,

John M. Healy

John M. Healy