Jeff

Reviewed 11-26-02 D

Will need another reg. poly if all else OK

JEFF

Collier County Sheriff Office
Professional Responsibility Bureau
Polygraph Report

Subject: Marceno, Carmine Date: 11/19/02
PF# Marceno, Carmine 2K2-2117-PE-2151

Examiner: D/S Scott Walters #2151 PRB / Polygraph Section

Purpose of Examination: Pre Employment Polygraph Examination / LEO Applicant

Results: No Opinion

Details: Examinee was scheduled for a pre employment polygraph examination. A pre test interview was conducted and the examinee admitted the following:

(1) [redacted]

(2) [redacted]

No further Admissions.

A pre employment examination was conducted on this date. During the entire examination the examinee engaged in deep breaths distortions / movement distortions / and long delays between questions and answers. No opinion regarding his truthfulness.

During the examination process, the examinee was given numerous instructions regarding his actions. He made apologies, indicating that he was aware that he was engaging in the distortions. Examinee cited being nervous as a reason for his actions.

The subject received a polygraph examination on the date indicated above, resulting in the following **Final Call**: No Opinion. Admin decision.

Comments / Recommendations:

Admin Decision. Second Polygraph examination should be scheduled with a different examiner.

Signature of Examiner: Scott A Walters
ID#2151 Scott Walters

Gail

Reviewed 12-10-02 D

SCAN/FILE

Collier County Sheriff Office
Professional Responsibility Bureau
Polygraph Report

Subject: Marceno, Carmine
Date: 12/5/02
PF: Marceno, Carmine 2K2-638-PE

Purpose of Examination: Pre-Employment Polygraph Exam

Results: No Opinion

Details: This is the second pre-employment polygraph exam conducted on this applicant. The first exam was conducted on 11/19/02, the examinee engaged in deep breath distortion, movement distortions and long delays between the question and answer. It was the examiner's opinion of No Opinion and Admin Decision. The examinee advised that he was nervous that caused his reactions.

On this date the applicant was scheduled for the second PE Exam. A pre-test interview was conducted and the examinee advised the following:

1. [redacted]

- [redacted]
- [redacted]

2. [redacted]

3. [redacted]

4. [redacted]

The exam was conducted and there were reactions to questions, however they were not of significant magnitude or consistent in nature to render an opinion to this truthfulness. This second polygraph exam was with similar responses to the first polygraph exam. No further testing required for this applicant.

The subject received a polygraph examination on the date indicated above, resulting in the following **Final Call**: No Opinion and Admin Decision

Signature of Examiner: