

# **Lucero Professional Services, Ltd.**

---

forensic polygraph examinations . criminal justice consultant . certified instructor

May 10, 2018

**Ms. Molly Schmidt-Nowara  
Attorney at Law  
20 First Plaza Center NW #700  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102-5802**

**Re: Polygraph Examination of *Mr. Carl Patrick Trujillo***

**Dear Ms. Schmidt-Nowara:**

**On May 10, 2018, at approximately 8:24 a.m., Mr. Carl Patrick Trujillo submitted to a polygraph examination in Albuquerque, New Mexico.**

**It was my understanding that the primary purpose of the examination was to determine the truthfulness of Mr. Trujillo's statement regarding whether or not he ever had sexual contact with Ms. Laura Bonar, and/or if he stalled her legislation because she rejected his sexual advances, as alleged.**

**The background information was provided by you during conference and contained in a case information report. Additionally, Mr. Trujillo stated he never had sexual contact with Laura Bonar, nor did he stall her legislation, directly or indirectly (Refer to Audio/Video CD for specific details).**

**Before the polygraph examination, Mr. Trujillo assured all concerned he was taking the examination on a voluntary basis. No disqualifying mental or physical conditions were reported or discerned, and Mr. Trujillo appeared to be a suitable candidate to take a polygraph test.**

**The examination utilized equipment that indicated and recorded on a moving chart, relative changes in blood pressure, electro dermal activity, and changes in breathing pattern.**

**The polygraph examination administered to Mr. Trujillo was a Specific/Issue test using the Utah Zone Comparison Test Format, which has been scientifically tested, evaluated, and validated in numerous high quality field studies and laboratory experiments. The ZCT has demonstrated an accuracy rate of 91%.**

- *Krapohl, D. (2006). Validated Polygraph Techniques. Polygraph, 35(3), 149-155*
- *Raskin, D. C. (1986). The polygraph in 1986: Scientific, professional and legal issues surrounding application and acceptance of polygraph evidence. Utah Law Review, 1986, 29-74.*
- *Meta-Analytic Survey of Criterion Accuracy of Validated Polygraph Techniques. Polygraph, 40(4), 194-203.*

**The comparison questions in this examination were non-exclusionary, which have been shown through research to render stronger average scores in the correct direction for both the innocent and guilty (Amsel 1999); had higher accuracy and produced fewer false positives (Palmatier 1991); and detected accuracies that were not significantly different than exclusive PLCs and produced fewer errors with both innocent and guilty (Horvath 1988).**

- *Podlesney, J.A., & Raskin, D.C. (1978). Effectiveness of techniques and physiological measures in detection of deception. Psychophysiology, 15(4), 344-359.*
- *Amsel, T. T. (1999). Exclusive or Nonexclusive comparison questions: A comparative field study. Polygraph, 28(4), 273-283.*
- *Horvath, F. (1988). The utility of control questions and effects of two control question types in field polygraph techniques. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 16(3), 198-209.*
- *Palmatier, J. J. (1991). Analysis of Two Variations of Control Question Polygraph Testing Utilizing Exclusive and Nonexclusive Controls. Unpublished master's degree thesis, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan.*
- *Krapohl, D. Stern, B. & Ryan, A. (2003) Exclusionary vs. Nonexclusionary: A review of the evidence. Polygraph, 32(4), 146-149.*

**The following relevant questions were asked during this examination:**

- R1 Did you ever have sexual contact with that woman's (Laura Bonar) private parts (breasts/buttocks/vagina)? Answer: No**
- R2 Concerning that woman, did you ever have sexual contact with her private parts? Answer: No**
- R3 Was that woman's legislation stalled because she rejected your sexual advances? Answer: No**

Data were scored using the Empirical Scoring System (ESS), an evidence-based, standardized, and norm-reference protocol for test data analysis. The grand total score of +9 equals or exceeds the cut-score of 2 for truthful classifications.

- *Nelson, R. & Handler, M. (2010). Empirical Scoring System. Lafayette Instrument Company.*

To augment my own evaluation of the physiological data, I used a computerized scoring algorithm with the following results:

Objective Scoring System-Version 3      No Significant Reactions

**There is less than 0.1% probability this result was produced by a deceptive person.**

- Nelson, R., Handler, M. & Krapohl, D. (2007, August). *Development and validation of the Objective Scoring System, version 3.*

If you have any questions regarding this matter, feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

*Eric W. Lucero*

Eric W. Lucero  
*Certified Polygraph Examiner*  
Employer ID No.: 74-2809140