

045 PCT
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
11/30/2009

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	07:58EST
INTERNAL 1	.100	07:58EST
INTERNAL 2	.191	07:58EST
INTERNAL 3	.291	07:58EST
AIR BLANK	.000	07:58EST

Internal Std Before Calibration

o/p/s For Julee Diagnostic

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

045 PCT
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
11/30/2009

DIAGNOSTIC TEST 09:28 EST

PROM CHECK	PASSED
Z80 VER - G1776.12	
SLAVE 75_2240	
RAM CHECK	PASSED
TEMP CHECK	PASSED
PROCESSOR CHECK	
MOTOR CHECK	PASSED
EEPROM CHECK	PASSED
SERIAL NO. MATCH	PASSED
RANGE/STABILITY	PASSED
AUTO CAL STATUS	PASSED

RTC CHECK	PASSED
INTERNAL STD	PASSED

DIAGNOSTIC	PASSED
------------	--------

PRINTER CHECK	
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ	
0123456789	

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Solution Data

Sol value = 0 (bac*1000) *****
Fit value = 0 (mg/l * 10000) %%%%

Channel Num 0

(Sample #1 = -0.22)

Sample #2 = 0.53

Sample #3 = 0.18

Sample #4 = 0.90

Avg sum diff = 0.538900

Sample Std Dev = 0.357082

Relative Std Dev = 66.261220

Channel Num 1

(Sample #1 = 2.02)

Sample #2 = 2.53

Sample #3 = 0.59

Sample #4 = 1.19

Avg sum diff = 1.437581

Sample Std Dev = 0.996550

Relative Std Dev = 69.321260

Channel Num 2

(Sample #1 = 6.79)

Sample #2 = 6.97

Sample #3 = 5.43

Sample #4 = 5.83

Avg sum diff = 6.073405

Sample Std Dev = 0.798188

Relative Std Dev = 13.142350

Channel Num 3

(Sample #1 = 1.67)

Sample #2 = 1.98

Sample #3 = 0.88

Sample #4 = 0.75

Avg sum diff = 1.204020

Sample Std Dev = 0.674643

Relative Std Dev = 56.032550

Channel Num 4

(Sample #1 = 27.28)

Sample #2 = 28.36

Sample #3 = 27.37

Sample #4 = 26.97

Avg sum diff = 27.568690

Sample Std Dev = 0.717045

Relative Std Dev = 2.600941

H2O Subt value Ch0 = 0.54

H2O Subt value Ch1 = 1.44 ✓

H2O Subt value Ch2 = 6.07 ✓

H2O Subt value Ch3 = 1.20 ✓

H2O Subt value Ch4 = 27.57 ✓

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 1002202012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Solution Data

Sol value = 40 (bac*1000) *****
Fit value = 1904 (mg/l * 10000) %%%

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = -0.81)
Sample #2 = -0.43
Sample #3 = -0.12
Sample #4 = -0.89
Avg sum diff = -0.479818
Sample Std Dev = 0.388193
Relative Std Dev = -80.904330

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 69.10)
Sample #2 = 69.93
Sample #3 = 69.90
Sample #4 = 69.31
Avg sum diff = 69.712650
Sample Std Dev = 0.347017
Relative Std Dev = 0.497781 ✓

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 87.56)
Sample #2 = 88.24
Sample #3 = 88.40
Sample #4 = 88.29
Avg sum diff = 88.313720
Sample Std Dev = 0.081083
Relative Std Dev = 0.091813 ✓

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 29.79)
Sample #2 = 29.87
Sample #3 = 30.12
Sample #4 = 29.54
Avg sum diff = 29.843590
Sample Std Dev = 0.288332
Relative Std Dev = 0.966142 ✓

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 111.15)
Sample #2 = 113.55
Sample #3 = 114.16
Sample #4 = 114.52
Avg sum diff = 114.079800
Sample Std Dev = 0.492026
Relative Std Dev = 0.431300 ✓

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Solution Data

Sol value = 80 (bac*1000) *****
Fit value = 3809 (mg/l * 10000) %%%%

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = -0.84)
Sample #2 = -0.42
Sample #3 = -0.70
Sample #4 = -0.87
Avg sum diff = -0.663900
Sample Std Dev = 0.225123
Relative Std Dev = -33.909140

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 145.09)
Sample #2 = 145.49
Sample #3 = 145.31
Sample #4 = 145.52
Avg sum diff = 145.442600
Sample Std Dev = 0.115808
Relative Std Dev = 0.079625 ✓

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 183.45)
Sample #2 = 183.54
Sample #3 = 183.59
Sample #4 = 184.06
Avg sum diff = 183.729300
Sample Std Dev = 0.291037
Relative Std Dev = 0.158405 ✓

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 61.37)
Sample #2 = 61.05
Sample #3 = 61.15
Sample #4 = 61.04
Avg sum diff = 61.081620
Sample Std Dev = 0.061750
Relative Std Dev = 0.101095 ✓

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 236.17)
Sample #2 = 236.79
Sample #3 = 237.45
Sample #4 = 238.12
Avg sum diff = 237.454000
Sample Std Dev = 0.666530
Relative Std Dev = 0.280699 ✓

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Solution Data

Sol value = 100 (bac*1000) *****
Fit value = 4761 (mg/l * 10000) %%%%

Channel Num 0

(Sample #1 = -0.86)
Sample #2 = -0.58
Sample #3 = -0.36
Sample #4 = -0.84
Avg sum diff = -0.595378
Sample Std Dev = 0.239868
Relative Std Dev = -40.288370

Channel Num 1

(Sample #1 = 182.72)
Sample #2 = 182.20
Sample #3 = 182.93
Sample #4 = 183.93
Avg sum diff = 183.019700
Sample Std Dev = 0.868137
Relative Std Dev = 0.474341 ✓

Channel Num 2

(Sample #1 = 230.10)
Sample #2 = 230.14
Sample #3 = 230.64
Sample #4 = 232.24
Avg sum diff = 231.005300
Sample Std Dev = 1.096150
Relative Std Dev = 0.474513 ✓

Channel Num 3

(Sample #1 = 77.21)
Sample #2 = 76.61
Sample #3 = 77.36
Sample #4 = 78.62
Avg sum diff = 77.527760
Sample Std Dev = 1.014311
Relative Std Dev = 1.308320 ✓

Channel Num 4

(Sample #1 = 296.06)
Sample #2 = 297.17
Sample #3 = 298.10
Sample #4 = 299.73
Avg sum diff = 298.333100
Sample Std Dev = 1.296023
Relative Std Dev = 0.434422 ✓

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Solution Data

Sol value = 200 (bac*1000) *****
Fit value = 9523 (mg/l * 10000) %%%%

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = -0.01)
Sample #2 = -0.77
Sample #3 = -0.69
Sample #4 = -0.56
Avg sum diff = -0.674235
Sample Std Dev = 0.103674
Relative Std Dev = -15.376490

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 364.95)
Sample #2 = 366.38
Sample #3 = 365.30
Sample #4 = 365.97
Avg sum diff = 365.882900
Sample Std Dev = 0.541303
Relative Std Dev = 0.147944 ✓

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 461.02)
Sample #2 = 461.74
Sample #3 = 460.47
Sample #4 = 461.82
Avg sum diff = 461.345700
Sample Std Dev = 0.756758
Relative Std Dev = 0.164033 ✓

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 153.98)
Sample #2 = 155.14
Sample #3 = 154.24
Sample #4 = 154.10
Avg sum diff = 154.492200
Sample Std Dev = 0.565472
Relative Std Dev = 0.366020 ✓

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 593.00)
Sample #2 = 596.43
Sample #3 = 593.77
Sample #4 = 595.70
Avg sum diff = 595.298500
Sample Std Dev = 1.377954
Relative Std Dev = 0.231473 ✓

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2017 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Solution Data

Sol value = 300 (bac*1000) *****
Fit value = 14285 (mg/l * 10000) %%%%

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = -0.36)
Sample #2 = -0.59
Sample #3 = -0.45
Sample #4 = -1.02
Avg sum diff = -0.685710
Sample Std Dev = 0.294572
Relative Std Dev = -42.958680

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 535.68)
Sample #2 = 538.58
Sample #3 = 539.58
Sample #4 = 537.61
Avg sum diff = 538.589400
Sample Std Dev = 0.982925
Relative Std Dev = 0.182500 ✓

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 674.35)
Sample #2 = 677.73
Sample #3 = 678.51
Sample #4 = 677.20
Avg sum diff = 677.812900
Sample Std Dev = 0.660069
Relative Std Dev = 0.097382 ✓

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 226.07)
Sample #2 = 227.04
Sample #3 = 227.60
Sample #4 = 226.44
Avg sum diff = 227.026000
Sample Std Dev = 0.581968
Relative Std Dev = 0.256344 ✓

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 866.27)
Sample #2 = 871.84
Sample #3 = 873.91
Sample #4 = 871.62
Avg sum diff = 872.456500
Sample Std Dev = 1.264396
Relative Std Dev = 0.144924 ✓

***** Curve Fit Data

***** Channel Number 0 *****

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = -0.479818
Std Dev = 0.388193

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = -0.663900
Std Dev = 0.225123

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = -0.595378
Std Dev = 0.239868

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = -0.674235
Std Dev = 0.103674

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 10022002012 (City S. Ct.). WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Acetone Subtract

CHANNEL 1

Sample #1 = 25.00
Sample #2 = -11.00
Sample #3 = -49.00
Sample #4 = -20.00
Avg sum of diff = -13.75
Sample Std Dev = 30.50
REL STD DEV = -221.82 %

CHANNEL 2

Sample #1 = -13.00
Sample #2 = -45.00
Sample #3 = -65.00
Sample #4 = -47.00
Avg sum of diff = -42.50
Sample Std Dev = 21.63
REL STD DEV = -50.88 %

CHANNEL 3

Sample #1 = -1.00
Sample #2 = -5.00
Sample #3 = -79.00
Sample #4 = -62.00
Avg sum of diff = -36.75
Sample Std Dev = 39.62
REL STD DEV = -107.80 %

CHANNEL 4

Sample #1 = -69.00
Sample #2 = -65.00
Sample #3 = -81.00
Sample #4 = -71.00
Avg sum of diff = -71.50
Sample Std Dev = 6.81
REL STD DEV = -9.52 %

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = -0.685710
Std Dev = 0.294572
Slope = -42277.750000
Y intercept = -19347.690000
Correlation Coef r = -0.723648

***** Channel Number 1 *****

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 69.712650
Std Dev = 0.347017

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 145.442600
Std Dev = 0.115808

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 183.019700
Std Dev = 0.868137

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 365.882900
Std Dev = 0.541303

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 538.589400
Std Dev = 0.982925
Slope = 26.406510 (12-22) X
Y intercept = -23.273930
Correlation Coef r = 0.999848 ✓

***** Channel Number 2 *****

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 88.313720
Std Dev = 0.081083

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 183.729300
Std Dev = 0.291037

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 231.005300
Std Dev = 1.096150

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 461.345700
Std Dev = 0.756758

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 677.812900
Std Dev = 0.660069
Slope = 20.999480 (12-18) X
Y intercept = -40.697760
Correlation Coef r = 0.999828 ✓

***** Channel Number 3 *****

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 29.843590
Std Dev = 0.288332

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 61.081620
Std Dev = 0.061750

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 77.527760
Std Dev = 1.014311

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 154.492200
Std Dev = 0.565472

Obtained by Perlmutter & McQuinn, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 109226 (N.Y. City S. Ct.) WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 227.026000
Std Dev = 0.581968
Slope = 62.710160 (20-65)
Y intercept = -41.355470
Correlation Coef r = 0.999837 ✓

***** Channel Number 4 *****

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 114.079800
Std Dev = 0.492026

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 237.454000
Std Dev = 0.666530

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 298.333100
Std Dev = 1.296023

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 595.298500
Std Dev = 1.377954

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 872.456500
Std Dev = 1.264396
Slope = 16.321620 (5-18) ✓
Y intercept = -56.205080
Correlation Coef r = 0.999793 ✓

CH 0 A/D 3458.190000
CH 0 D/A 123 (20-254)
DVM Constant = -4.365379
Voltage = -5.274610 ✓

CH 1 A/D 3464.959000
CH 1 D/A 17 → (low)
DVM Constant = -1.462482
Voltage = -2.373492

CH 2 A/D 3380.573000
CH 2 D/A 19 ← (low)
DVM Constant = -1.517254
Voltage = -2.406077

CH 3 A/D 3460.357000
CH 3 D/A 37
DVM Constant = -2.010198
Voltage = -2.919999

CH 4 A/D 3396.633000
CH 4 D/A 29 ✓
DVM Constant = -1.791112
Voltage = -2.684158

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 10022012 (N.Y. City, S. Ct.). WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

CHANNEL 1
Sample #1 = 2799.00
Sample #2 = 2769.00
Sample #3 = 2782.00
Sample #4 = 2786.00
Avg sum of diff = 2784.00
Sample Std Dev = 12.36
REL STD DEV = 0.44 %

CHANNEL 2
Sample #1 = 7813.00
Sample #2 = 7762.00
Sample #3 = 7749.00
Sample #4 = 7757.00
Avg sum of diff = 7770.25
Sample Std Dev = 29.00
REL STD DEV = 0.37 %

CHANNEL 3
Sample #1 = 3965.00
Sample #2 = 3888.00
Sample #3 = 3882.00
Sample #4 = 3911.00
Avg sum of diff = 3911.50
Sample Std Dev = 37.79
REL STD DEV = 0.97 %

CHANNEL 4
Sample #1 = 8632.00
Sample #2 = 8616.00
Sample #3 = 8596.00
Sample #4 = 8620.00
Avg sum of diff = 8616.00
Sample Std Dev = 14.97
REL STD DEV = 0.17 %

AFFECT of ACETONE (MG/L)

348 = 2797.750000

339 = 7812.750000

ACETONE CONSTANT = 1.792512

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

Auto cal data print 90
Serial 779 11/30/09 10:04

Channel 0

A/D 3458 D/A 123
DVM Constant = -4.37
Voltage = -5.27

Meas. Channel 1

Slope = 26.41
Y intercept = -23.27
H2O subtract = 1.44

A/D 3465 D/A 17
DVM Constant = -1.46
Voltage = -2.37

Channel 2

Slope = 21.00 (8-18)
Y intercept = -40.70
H2O subtract = 6.07

A/D 3381 D/A 19
DVM Constant = -1.52
Voltage = -2.41

Channel 3

Slope = 62.71 ✓
Y intercept = -41.36
H2O subtract = 1.20

A/D 3460 D/A 37
DVM Constant = -2.01
Voltage = -2.92

Channel 4

Slope = 16.32
Y intercept = -56.21
H2O subtract = 27.57

A/D 3397 D/A 29
DVM Constant = -1.79
Voltage = -2.68
acetone subtr = 1.792512

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

IDTU
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
11/30/2009

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	10:20EST
INTERNAL 1	.099	10:20EST
INTERNAL 2	.200	10:20EST
INTERNAL 3	.299	10:20EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:21EST

Internal Std after Calibration

ch 0

DVM:

Noise.

1

3453

10

2

3467

5

3

3397

4

4

3464

5

3384

5

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. City Ct.). WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

IDTU
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
11/30/2009

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	10:11EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:11EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:12EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:12EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:12EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:13EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:13EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:13EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:14EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:14EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:14EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:14EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:15EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:15EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:15EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:16EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:16EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:16EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:17EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:17EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:17EST
NO. OF SAMPLES:	10	
MEAN:	.0996	
STD. DEVIATION:	.0005097	

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (N.Y. Cty. S. Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALHELP.COM - (212) 679-1990

IDTU
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
11/30/2009

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	10:27EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:28EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:28EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:28EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:28EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:29EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:29EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:29EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:30EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:30EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:30EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	10:31EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:31EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:31EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:31EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:32EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:32EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:32EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:33EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:33EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:33EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:34EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:34EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:34EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:34EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:35EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:35EST
CAL. CHECK	.098	10:35EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:36EST
CAL. CHECK	.098	10:36EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:36EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:37EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:37EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	10:37EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:37EST
CAL. CHECK	.098	10:38EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:38EST
CAL. CHECK	.098	10:38EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:39EST
CAL. CHECK	.098	10:39EST
AIR BLANK	.000	10:39EST
NO. OF SAMPLES:	20	
MEAN:	.0989	
STD. DEVIATION:	.0006855	

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Office of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 100220/2012 (NY City Ct.). WWW.NEWYORKLEGALSERVICES.COM - (212) 679-1990