

IDTU
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
02/17/2010

DIAGNOSTIC TEST 08:23 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
ABCDEFGHIJKLMNQPQRSTUVWXYZ
0123456789

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

***** Solution Data

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

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = 0.27)
Sample #2 = 0.46
Sample #3 = 0.34
Sample #4 = 0.51
Avg sum diff = 0.436768
Sample Std Dev = 0.087616
Relative Std Dev = 20.060070

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 3.91)
Sample #2 = 2.47
Sample #3 = 2.31
Sample #4 = 2.34
Avg sum diff = 2.374512
Sample Std Dev = 0.085588
Relative Std Dev = 3.604457

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 9.41)
Sample #2 = 8.75
Sample #3 = 8.36
Sample #4 = 7.96
Avg sum diff = 8.355794
Sample Std Dev = 0.395885
Relative Std Dev = 4.737845

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 3.74)
Sample #2 = 2.17
Sample #3 = 2.41
Sample #4 = 2.72
Avg sum diff = 2.435872
Sample Std Dev = 0.277958
Relative Std Dev = 11.411020

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 33.75)
Sample #2 = 32.22
Sample #3 = 32.61
Sample #4 = 33.25
Avg sum diff = 32.694500
Sample Std Dev = 0.516554
Relative Std Dev = 1.579942

H2O Subt value Ch0 = 0.44 ✓
H2O Subt value Ch1 = 2.37 ✓
H2O Subt value Ch2 = 8.36 ✓
H2O Subt value Ch3 = 2.44 ✓
H2O Subt value Ch4 = 32.69 ✓

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

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = -0.48)
Sample #2 = -1.14
Sample #3 = -0.74
Sample #4 = -0.40
Avg sum diff = -0.760824
Sample Std Dev = 0.374050
Relative Std Dev = -49.163880

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 76.77)
Sample #2 = 76.63
Sample #3 = 75.78
Sample #4 = 77.09
Avg sum diff = 76.496830
Sample Std Dev = 0.664520
Relative Std Dev = 0.868690 ✓

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 96.23)
Sample #2 = 96.53
Sample #3 = 96.17
Sample #4 = 97.13
Avg sum diff = 96.611170
Sample Std Dev = 0.481368
Relative Std Dev = 0.498253 ✓

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 32.29)
Sample #2 = 31.47
Sample #3 = 30.79
Sample #4 = 31.71
Avg sum diff = 31.320960
Sample Std Dev = 0.479427
Relative Std Dev = 1.530690 ✓

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 125.12)
Sample #2 = 125.89
Sample #3 = 125.63
Sample #4 = 126.76
Avg sum diff = 126.092900
Sample Std Dev = 0.588231
Relative Std Dev = 0.466506 ✓

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 = -0.43)

Sample #2 = -0.96

Sample #3 = -0.31

Sample #4 = -0.06

Avg sum diff = -0.441895

Sample Std Dev = 0.463710

Relative Std Dev = -104.936800

Channel Num 1

(Sample #1 = 150.61)

Sample #2 = 150.18

Sample #3 = 150.81

Sample #4 = 150.44

Avg sum diff = 150.473600

Sample Std Dev = 0.317050

Relative Std Dev = 0.210701 ✓

Channel Num 2

(Sample #1 = 190.34)

Sample #2 = 190.17

Sample #3 = 190.55

Sample #4 = 190.01

Avg sum diff = 190.244300

Sample Std Dev = 0.276064

Relative Std Dev = 0.145110 ✓

Channel Num 3

(Sample #1 = 62.58)

Sample #2 = 61.36

Sample #3 = 62.29

Sample #4 = 61.26

Avg sum diff = 61.635260

Sample Std Dev = 0.569859

Relative Std Dev = 0.924566 ✓

Channel Num 4

(Sample #1 = 247.53)

Sample #2 = 248.59

Sample #3 = 249.61

Sample #4 = 249.38

Avg sum diff = 249.195800

Sample Std Dev = 0.533624

Relative Std Dev = 0.214138 ✓

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 = -0.25)
Sample #2 = -0.56
Sample #3 = -0.89
Sample #4 = -0.62
Avg sum diff = -0.690999
Sample Std Dev = 0.177412
Relative Std Dev = -25.674730

Channel Num 1

(Sample #1 = 185.66)
Sample #2 = 187.13
Sample #3 = 186.05
Sample #4 = 187.00
Avg sum diff = 186.722700
Sample Std Dev = 0.588302
Relative Std Dev = 0.315067 ✓

Channel Num 2

(Sample #1 = 234.78)
Sample #2 = 235.75
Sample #3 = 234.75
Sample #4 = 236.48
Avg sum diff = 235.660900
Sample Std Dev = 0.867883
Relative Std Dev = 0.368276 ✓

Channel Num 3

(Sample #1 = 76.00)
Sample #2 = 76.51
Sample #3 = 75.41
Sample #4 = 76.78
Avg sum diff = 76.234460
Sample Std Dev = 0.723734
Relative Std Dev = 0.949353 ✓

Channel Num 4

(Sample #1 = 305.47)
Sample #2 = 307.69
Sample #3 = 307.61
Sample #4 = 309.15
Avg sum diff = 308.152000
Sample Std Dev = 0.869226
Relative Std Dev = 0.282077 ✓

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 = -0.06
Sample #3 = -0.58
Sample #4 = 0.15
Avg sum diff = -0.166748
Sample Std Dev = 0.376921
Relative Std Dev = -226.042400

Channel Num 1

(Sample #1 = 368.10)
Sample #2 = 368.86
Sample #3 = 368.16
Sample #4 = 368.91
Avg sum diff = 368.645800
Sample Std Dev = 0.417433
Relative Std Dev = 0.113234 ✓

Channel Num 2

(Sample #1 = 465.51)
Sample #2 = 466.84
Sample #3 = 465.79
Sample #4 = 467.09
Avg sum diff = 466.574000
Sample Std Dev = 0.687367
Relative Std Dev = 0.147322 ✓

Channel Num 3

(Sample #1 = 152.49)
Sample #2 = 152.10
Sample #3 = 151.93
Sample #4 = 152.60
Avg sum diff = 152.207500
Sample Std Dev = 0.346177
Relative Std Dev = 0.227438 ✓

Channel Num 4

(Sample #1 = 605.39)
Sample #2 = 607.98
Sample #3 = 606.97
Sample #4 = 608.66
Avg sum diff = 607.867700
Sample Std Dev = 0.850550
Relative Std Dev = 0.139923 ✓

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

Channel Num 0
(Sample #1 = -0.86)
Sample #2 = -0.40
Sample #3 = -0.75
Sample #4 = -0.23
Avg sum diff = -0.461100
Sample Std Dev = 0.267372
Relative Std Dev = -57.985640

Channel Num 1
(Sample #1 = 539.92)
Sample #2 = 540.31
Sample #3 = 542.38
Sample #4 = 540.63
Avg sum diff = 541.107200
Sample Std Dev = 1.117161
Relative Std Dev = 0.206458 ✓

Channel Num 2
(Sample #1 = 680.12)
Sample #2 = 682.21
Sample #3 = 684.14
Sample #4 = 682.33
Avg sum diff = 682.890900
Sample Std Dev = 1.082648
Relative Std Dev = 0.158539 ✓

Channel Num 3
(Sample #1 = 223.81)
Sample #2 = 224.33
Sample #3 = 225.75
Sample #4 = 224.34
Avg sum diff = 224.808100
Sample Std Dev = 0.816913
Relative Std Dev = 0.363382 ✓

Channel Num 4
(Sample #1 = 882.60)
Sample #2 = 885.38
Sample #3 = 889.23
Sample #4 = 887.32
Avg sum diff = 887.309200
Sample Std Dev = 1.928485
Relative Std Dev = 0.217341 ✓

***** Curve Fit Data

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

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = -0.760824
Std Dev = 0.374050

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = -0.441895
Std Dev = 0.463710

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = -0.690999
Std Dev = 0.177412

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = -0.166748
Std Dev = 0.376921

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

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = -0.461100
Std Dev = 0.267372
Slope = 12218.350000
Y intercept = 13018.280000
Correlation Coef r = 0.572140

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

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 76.496830
Std Dev = 0.664520

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 150.473600
Std Dev = 0.317050

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 186.722700
Std Dev = 0.588302

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 368.645800
Std Dev = 0.417433

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 541.107200
Std Dev = 1.117161
Slope = 26.623860 (12-22)
Y intercept = -190.649900
Correlation Coef r = 0.999906 ✓

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

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 96.611170
Std Dev = 0.481368

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 190.244300
Std Dev = 0.276064

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 235.660900
Std Dev = 0.867883

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 466.574000
Std Dev = 0.687367

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 682.890900
Std Dev = 1.082648 (8-12) High
Slope = 21.085380
Y intercept = -194.472200
Correlation Coef r = 0.999876 ✓

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

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 31.320960
Std Dev = 0.479427

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 61.635260
Std Dev = 0.569859

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 76.234460
Std Dev = 0.723734

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 152.207500
Std Dev = 0.346177

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGinness, P.C. in Law Offices of Adam D. Perlmutter, P.C. v. NYPD, et al.,
Case No. 1002207072 (N.Y. Cty. Ct.). WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 224.808100
Std Dev = 0.816913
Slope = 63.875660 (60-65) ✓
Y intercept = -121.458500
Correlation Coef r = 0.999955 ✓

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

Sol Val = 1904 Diff = 126.092900
Std Dev = 0.588231

Sol Val = 3809 Diff = 249.195800
Std Dev = 0.533624

Sol Val = 4761 Diff = 308.152000
Std Dev = 0.869226

Sol Val = 9523 Diff = 607.867700
Std Dev = 0.850550

Sol Val = 14285 Diff = 887.309200
Std Dev = 1.928485
Slope = 16.249190 (5-18) ✓
Y intercept = -223.755900
Correlation Coef r = 0.999839 ✓

CH 0 A/D 3457.979000 ✓
CH 0 D/A 123 (20-254)
DVM Constant = -4.365379
Voltage = -5.274554 ✓

CH 1 A/D 3468.297000 ✓
CH 1 D/A 19 (Low)
DVM Constant = -1.517254
Voltage = -2.429142

CH 2 A/D 3543.360000 ✓
CH 2 D/A 19 (Low)
DVM Constant = -1.517254
Voltage = -2.448877

CH 3 A/D 3513.245000 ✓
CH 3 D/A 37
DVM Constant = -2.010198
Voltage = -2.933904

CH 4 A/D 3473.256000 ✓
CH 4 D/A 31 ✓
DVM Constant = -1.845883
Voltage = -2.759075

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. Ct.). WWW.NEYORKLEGALDEFENSE.COM - (212) 679-1990

***** Acetone Subtract

CHANNEL 1

Sample #1 = -179.00
Sample #2 = -180.00
Sample #3 = -195.00
Sample #4 = -179.00
Avg sum of diff = -183.25
Sample Std Dev = 7.85
REL STD DEV = -4.28 %

CHANNEL 2

Sample #1 = -189.00
Sample #2 = -184.00
Sample #3 = -198.00
Sample #4 = -191.00
Avg sum of diff = -190.50
Sample Std Dev = 5.80
REL STD DEV = -3.05 %

CHANNEL 3

Sample #1 = -130.00
Sample #2 = -88.00
Sample #3 = -125.00
Sample #4 = -85.00
Avg sum of diff = -107.00
Sample Std Dev = 23.79
REL STD DEV = -22.23 %

CHANNEL 4

Sample #1 = -239.00
Sample #2 = -209.00
Sample #3 = -216.00
Sample #4 = -212.00
Avg sum of diff = -219.00
Sample Std Dev = 13.64
REL STD DEV = -6.23 %

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

CHANNEL 1
Sample #1 = 2537.00
Sample #2 = 2529.00
Sample #3 = 2513.00
Sample #4 = 2503.00
Avg sum of diff = 2520.50
Sample Std Dev = 15.35
REL STD DEV = 0.61 %
CHANNEL 2
Sample #1 = 7244.00
Sample #2 = 7218.00
Sample #3 = 7208.00
Sample #4 = 7193.00
Avg sum of diff = 7215.75
Sample Std Dev = 21.45
REL STD DEV = 0.30 %
CHANNEL 3
Sample #1 = 3667.00
Sample #2 = 3671.00
Sample #3 = 3656.00
Sample #4 = 3669.00
Avg sum of diff = 3665.75
Sample Std Dev = 6.70
REL STD DEV = 0.18 %
CHANNEL 4
Sample #1 = 8083.00
Sample #2 = 8063.00
Sample #3 = 8066.00
Sample #4 = 8057.00
Avg sum of diff = 8067.25
Sample Std Dev = 11.15
REL STD DEV = 0.14 %
AFFECT of ACETONE (MG/L)
348 = 2703.750000
339 = 7406.250000
ACETONE CONSTANT = 1.739251

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 02/17/10 08:54

Channel 0

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

Meas. Channel 1 *Failed*
Slope = 26.62
Y intercept = -190.65
H2O subtract = 2.37

A/D 3468 D/A 19
DVM Constant = -1.52
Voltage = -2.43

Channel 2

Slope = 21.09
Y intercept = -194.47
H2O subtract = 8.36

A/D 3543 D/A 19
DVM Constant = -1.52
Voltage = -2.45

Channel 3

Slope = 63.88
Y intercept = -121.46
H2O subtract = 2.44

A/D 3513 D/A 37
DVM Constant = -2.01
Voltage = -2.93

Channel 4

Slope = 16.25
Y intercept = -223.76
H2O subtract = 32.69

A/D 3473 D/A 31
DVM Constant = -1.85
Voltage = -2.76
acetone subt = 1.739251

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
02/17/2010

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	09:00EST
INTERNAL 1	.099	09:00EST
INTERNAL 2	.200	09:00EST
INTERNAL 3	.300	09:00EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:01EST

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

IDTU
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
02/17/2010

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	14:28EST
INTERNAL 1	.100	14:28EST
INTERNAL 2	.199	14:28EST
INTERNAL 3	.299	14:28EST
AIR BLANK	.000	14:28EST

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

IDTU
INTOXILYZER - ALCOHOL ANALYZER
MODEL 5000EN SN 68-010779
02/17/2010

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	08:11EST
INTERNAL 1	.100	08:11EST
INTERNAL 2	.200	08:11EST
INTERNAL 3	.300	08:11EST
AIR BLANK	.000	08:11EST

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
02/17/2010

TEST	%BrAC	TIME
AIR BLANK	.000	09:02EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:02EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:03EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	09:03EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:03EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:04EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:04EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:04EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:04EST
CAL. CHECK	.100	09:05EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:05EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:05EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:06EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:06EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:06EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:07EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:07EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:07EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:07EST
CAL. CHECK	.099	09:08EST
AIR BLANK	.000	09:08EST
NO. OF SAMPLES:	10	
MEAN:	.0992	
STD. DEVIATION:	.0004121	

Obtained by Perlmutter & McGuinness, P.C. in Law Office 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