


INTERNATIONAL ASSESSMENT CENTRE T/A
PISA INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT CENTRE
2018/298462/07



INTEGRITY ASSESSMENT CENTRE ASSESSMENT REPORT:



Ms [REDACTED]

ID number: [REDACTED]

Company: N/A

Status: N/A

Reference Number:	GA31-A8977.20	Annexure A
Client:	Forensics for Justice	
Contact:	Ms Ashley Brosnan (CFE)	
Type of Assessment:	Polygraph	WRAS Profile Assessment Verification
Date of Assessment:	10 June 2020	
Purpose of Assessment:	Specific: Verification of Statement	
Admissions / Confessions:	None	
Result of Assessment:	No Deception Indicated	
Comments:	It is the opinion of the polygraph examiner that Ms [REDACTED] had been truthful on her written statement.	

CONTACT INFORMATION

Tel: +27 (0)12 765 2800
Cell: +27 (0)82 461 5279
Fax: +27 (0)12 765 2801
Email: info@polyinstitute.co.za

www.polyinstitute.co.za
www.polysa.co.za

Range of services:

Polygraph assessments nationwide and on the African continent (specific/diagnostic/routine/pre-employment)

Psychometric, integrity & competence assessments
Comprehensive pre-employment assessment models

Personal Information Verification
Investigations (via reputable and competent investigators)

Background Verification for pre-employment screenings

MANDATE:

The examination was administered on request of Ms Ashley Brosnan (CFE) on behalf of Forensics for Justice. The purpose of the examination was to verify Ms [REDACTED]'s written statement pertaining to allegations made by herself.

CASE FACTS:

Ms Ashley Brosnan (CFE) provided the following case facts in writing prior to the examination:

Ms [REDACTED] wrote a statement detailing allegations she had made against Mr Anthony Kilroy Beamish. The statement is attached as Annexure A. Ms [REDACTED] was requested to voluntarily undergo a polygraph examination in order to determine whether she had deliberately lied, or falsified any information, on her written statement.

FITNESS OF THE SUBJECT FOR A POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION:

There were no significant and visible physiological problems that could have had a negative influence on the responses of the examinee.

The polygraph examination process was explained to the examinee. The examinee was warned that agreeing to the examination when involved in the matter under investigation could have negative consequences.

The examinee agreed to the examination and signed a statement to the effect that the examination was being taken voluntarily. This statement is on record at our office.

PRE-EXAMINATION INTERVIEW:

Ms [REDACTED] confirmed that she was aware of the reason for the examination. She read and confirmed that she was the author of the statement for which the examination was conducted. She confirmed the authenticity of the written statement and the veracity of the information included in the statement. She confirmed that she was aware of the fact that the interview and examination was recorded on audio and video and that the recording would be made available to the investigating team.

Ms [REDACTED] denied that she lied on the written statement or falsified any of the information as presented on the statement. She denied that she deliberately withheld relevant information or misrepresented any of the information as provided by her on the statement.

Ms [REDACTED] insisted that she was being completely truthful and that she was not withholding any information pertinent to the matter under investigation.

Ms [REDACTED] agreed to answer the questions as indicated below during the polygraph examination.

EXAMINATION

Ms [REDACTED] was examined in accordance with the US Air Force Modified General Question Technique. It is generally accepted as a reliable question technique. An acquaintance test was conducted prior to the examination in keeping with the standards of practice of the American Polygraph Association and the Southern African Polygraph Federation.

The Limestone Computerised Polygraph System was used. The system records physiological responses using four channels and recorded the responses in the cardio-vascular system, skin activity and breathing patterns. Before the examination, a routine functionality check was performed on the equipment to ensure that it is in proper working order.

The examination was conducted in English. It was done in accordance with the prescribed code of conduct of the Southern African Polygraph Federation in keeping with internationally accepted standards.

The following relevant questions were asked:

1. Did you falsify any information on this statement? (No)
2. Did you lie on any part of this written statement? (No)
3. Is any of the information on this statement not true? (No)

Ms [REDACTED] answered the questions as indicated above.

Five charts were recorded during the examination.

FINDING:

A careful review of the recorded physiological activity of the examinee took place subsequent to the completion of the tests. It is the opinion of this Institute that Ms [REDACTED] displayed **no indication of deception to any of the questions** indicated above.

In view of the case facts supplied, it is the opinion of the polygraph examiner that the examinee **had been truthful** when answering the questions indicated above.

Assessment result: NO DECEPTION INDICATED

POST-EXAMINATION INTERVIEW:

Ms [REDACTED] did not reveal anything during the post examination interview that would further assist in the investigation.

written



Are you experiencing employee theft and fraud in your company? You can manage it proactively. Call PISA for more information about our Integrity Management Program.

Visit our facebook page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/PISA-Integrity-Assessment-Centre>

For any further information regarding the use of the polygraph, visit our website at www.polvinstitute.co.za

- Law & CCMA (Balance of Probability)
- Services (Pre-employment Examinations / Screenings / Specific Examinations)
- Centurion Team (Profile of Examiners)
- Company Background
- Valid Tests (Minimum Requirements for a Polygraph Examination)
- Physiology
- FAQ
- Links (APA / SAPFED)

