

# Laboratory Report

## CIS2381 Spring

Laboratory Number: ATC 206

Date: 2/03/2012

Examiner's Name: xxxxxx

Number: Lab #1



### **Examination or Validation Tasking:**

Officer P. Frampton of the Volusia County Sheriff's office brought me a 16mb flash drive. I was then asked to create a forensic copy of the flash drive, and to provide confirmation that the forensic copy of the evidence and the original evidence were the same. The flash drive was delivered to me in a sealed plastic evidence bag with tape over the opening with the initials PF written on the tape. The bag also had the date 12/23/2012 and the words 'living room table' as well as '123 ABC St, Daytona Beach, FL' written on it.

### **Forensic Question(s):**

1. What color is the flash drive?
2. Does the flash drive have a serial number?
3. What condition is the flash drive in?
4. Is the forensic copy a match of the original evidence?
5. Does the digital finger print of the forensic copy match that of the original evidence?

### **Steps Taken:**

1. I first calculated the digital fingerprint of the original evidence with md5sum so that it could later be compared against the forensic copy. The fingerprint being '9939b8da015f8d33b8bec531faf8255'.
2. I then applied the data dump command to create the forensic image of the evidence.
3. Once the forensic copy had been created I ran md5sum to calculate its digital fingerprint. The fingerprint was '9939b8da015f8d33b8bec531faf8255'.
4. My final step was to compare the original fingerprint I obtained in step 1, to the fingerprint of the forensic image with the data dump and md5sum commands.

**Results:**

A forensic image of the evidence on the 16mb flash drive provided to me was successfully created.

**Conclusions:**

The digital finger prints of the original evidence, and the forensic copy were both verified using md5sum – a well-known program widely used for verifying digital fingerprints by calculating their MD5 hashes, as it is incredibly unlikely that any two non-identical files in the real world will ever have the same MD5 hash. Both the original evidence and the forensic copy had a fingerprint of ‘9939b8da015f8d33b8bec531faf8255’. The data shows that the digital fingerprints of both the original evidence and the forensic copy matched.

**Opinions:**

Based on the data obtained during my investigation, I am of the opinion that the forensic copy created is a perfect match of the original evidence.

**Certification:**

I hereby certify that the work presented above was personally performed by me and the opinions and conclusions stated are my own and based upon the work that I performed.

XXXXXXXXXX

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature