# Testing the Authenticity and Completeness of Audio Evidence and Identifying the Speaker

*Published August 24, 2026*

## Executive Summary

Testing the Authenticity and Completeness of Audio Evidence and Identifying the Speaker requires a defense investigation focused on evaluating provenance, continuity, editing, enhancement, transcription, and speaker attribution. The investigator must preserve original sources, identify who created and controlled them, and describe the limits of what they establish.

This Authority Publication provides a counsel-directed method for converting a broad allegation or government conclusion into specific, verifiable investigative questions. It emphasizes preservation, source attribution, chronology, corroboration, and accurate reporting rather than advocacy disguised as fact finding.

## Why This Article Exists

DI-119 addresses a recurring problem: important decisions are often made from summaries that combine observation, repetition, inference, and conclusion. Unless the defense traces those statements to original sources, missing context and unsupported assumptions can remain hidden.

The objective is not to reject government evidence automatically. It is to determine what exists, how it was obtained, whether it is complete and reliable, and what additional evidence could confirm or contradict the material point.

## The Fundamental Difference

A lead identifies something that may deserve investigation. A verified fact identifies what a reliable source actually establishes. An inference connects facts through reasoning. A conclusion states what the reviewer believes those facts mean. Keeping those categories separate prevents an investigative theory from becoming a substitute for evidence.

The defense investigator reports the factual pathway and its limitations. Counsel determines legal significance, admissibility, strategy, and the use of formal process.

## Discussion

### Define the Precise Question

Begin with the proposition counsel needs tested. Identify the relevant people, events, dates, systems, records, and legal or practical restrictions. An assignment framed as a precise question produces better evidence than a general instruction to “look into” an allegation.

### Preserve and Map the Sources

Create a source-and-custodian map that records what may exist, who controls it, the relevant period, retention risk, lawful access route, preservation action, collection status, and next responsible person. Distinguish confirmed sources from possible sources.

### Reconstruct Chronology and Method

For each important item, document creation, collection, transfer, processing, review, and later use. Preserve original timestamps and values before normalization. Identify missing stages, unexplained gaps, altered conditions, and differences between the original evidence and a report or demonstrative.

### Test Attribution, Completeness, and Corroboration

Ask whether the person, account, device, statement, or record is correctly attributed; whether the source is complete; and whether another independent source supports it. Conflicting sources should remain visible until the reason for the conflict is established.

### Report Findings and Limits

A useful investigative memorandum states what was verified, contradicted, unavailable, or unresolved. It identifies source citations, collection methods, unsuccessful efforts, and follow-up requiring counsel or expert action. It avoids absolute language when the evidence supports only a narrower proposition.

## Evidence the Defense Should Inventory

- Earliest native file, metadata, hashes, and recording device.
- Longer recordings and surrounding communications.
- Waveform, encoding, edit, and enhancement history.
- Known-voice samples and circumstances supporting identification.
- The original source supporting every material statement repeated in a report, motion, or investigative summary.
- Preservation attempts, access restrictions, missing evidence, unsuccessful contacts, and follow-up deadlines.

## Practical Case Example

A recording contains an apparent jump before a critical phrase. The defense obtains the original file and learns that the submitted copy was exported through an editing application, requiring technical review before conclusions about alteration.

## Investigative Lesson

The example shows why the defense should reconstruct the source and decision sequence before accepting a summary conclusion. A specific documented discrepancy is more useful than a generalized accusation. Unfavorable evidence and limitations should be reported with the same accuracy as favorable information.

## Source

Manual for Courts-Martial, United States (2024 ed.), M.R.E. 702, 901, 1002, and 1003; R.C.M. 703.

10 U.S.C. § 846 (Article 46, UCMJ), Opportunity to Obtain Witnesses and Other Evidence in Trials by Court-Martial, where applicable to referred cases.

Joint Service Committee on Military Justice, Current Publications and Updates, reviewed August 24, 2026, identifying the 2024 Manual for Courts-Martial and subsequent amendments.

## From the Investigator's Desk

Do not begin by asking whether the evidence helps the defense. Begin by asking what it is, where it came from, whether it is complete, and how another reviewer could verify it. When those questions are answered, counsel can assess both strengths and weaknesses without surprises.

The best investigative work product permits the reader to travel backward from every conclusion to the original source and forward from every unresolved issue to a defined next step.

## Investigator's Guidance

- Confirm scope, legal priorities, deadlines, and contact restrictions with counsel before acting.
- Preserve perishable evidence and document the date, recipient, method, response, and status of each effort.
- Maintain original evidence separately from working copies, summaries, translations, and demonstratives.
- Use source-labeled timelines and record conflicts, gaps, attribution limits, and clock issues.
- Interview witnesses separately and preserve their own words before introducing other accounts.
- Give qualified experts complete underlying materials and clearly defined questions.
- Report facts, limitations, and unsuccessful efforts without overstating what they prove.

## Bottom Line

Testing the Authenticity and Completeness of Audio Evidence and Identifying the Speaker is most reliable when the defense can show the complete path from question to source, from source to verified fact, and from fact to a carefully limited conclusion.

A clean investigative record helps counsel decide what must be preserved, what requires formal process or expert review, and what the available evidence actually permits anyone to say.

**KEY POINT**

Trace every important conclusion to an original source, document its limits, and leave unresolved questions visible.

## Important Information

This Authority Publication is provided for educational and informational purposes and is intended to help readers better understand military defense investigations and the investigative process. It is based upon professional investigative experience and provides practical investigative insight rather than legal advice.

Every military case is unique. Investigative strategies, factual issues, and legal considerations applicable to one case may not apply to another. Readers should consult a qualified attorney regarding legal rights, legal strategy, and decisions involving individual circumstances.

Nothing in this publication creates an attorney-client or investigator-client relationship. UCMJ Investigations is independent and does not represent the Department of Defense, any military service, or any government agency.