


IPACO expert report

<i>Expert name</i> Antoine COUSYN	<i>Report date</i> June 18, 2012	<i>Last update</i> February 08, 2015	
<i>Type</i> IFO	<i>Class</i> A	<i>Explanation</i> Fake	<i>Complement</i>
<i>Document</i> Photo	<i>Imaging location</i> "New Forest, Hampshire, UK"	<i>Imaging date</i> "May 08, 2006 02h20'PM Local time"	



I. Imaging circumstances

In September 2006, UFO Data Magazine received an email from a lady (they have her name, but she preferred to remain anonymous) along with a photograph of a mysterious figure apparently strolling in the Hampshire countryside.

Here's the email content:

"I am writing in the hope that you will be able to help me and also take me seriously. I am 46 years old, I have never had any kind of UFO experience, I am not mentally ill, I don't use drink and drugs and I am not a liar. The following letter is 100% true, although I would not blame you if you did not believe me."

"I recently moved to a new area because of a job opportunity and one of the big attractions to the area was all the green land and woods as I love the outdoors, especially as I have a large dog which needs a lot of exercise. On Monday the 8th May, 2006, I had been out for several hours with my dog and throughout the afternoon I took a series of photographs of the area to send to my sister who lives abroad."

"Later that evening I was down loading the images from my mobile phone to the PC [and] when I looked through the photos, I was very shocked to see that on one of the images there was what appeared to be a greyish figure either running or walking through the shot, all the other images were fine except this one. "

"The photo I have sent you is the original photo down loaded straight from my phone; the phone is a Motorola Razr with a VGA camera."

"The photo is very low resolution (160X120, 4.40kb) this is because the camera was set to full zoom (4X) when I took the photo. The photo was taken at 2:20p.m on the afternoon of Monday 08/05/06. I showed the photo to my husband and asked him for his opinion. He said that the photo is a digital fault and shows nothing more than either a small child or a jogger and, because of the fault, this makes the figure look unusual."

"This is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard from my husband. I pointed out that it took me about 2 seconds to take the photo and if anyone such as a child or jogger was in the area I would have seen them. I have very good eyesight and I can clearly say without any doubt that there was no-one there when I took the photo, plus I pointed out to my husband that the figure does not look anything like a child or a jogger or neither does it look anything like a human."

"I haven't shown the photo to anyone except my husband because I don't think anyone would believe me, plus I don't want to be the subject of ridicule. It was my husband's sarcastic comments about "the aliens coming to get me" that sparked my interest in the unexplained, and over the last few months I have become very interested in the subject and carried out some extensive reading."

"A single day has not passed since I took the photo that I haven't looked at the image. I look at the photo on a daily basis and I am just as baffled as to what the figure is in the photo. I am sending you

the image to ask if it would be possible for you to carry out some analysis of it to see if you can extract some information from it.

Under no circumstances am I trying to say that the figure is an alien, but I know 100% in my own mind that no one was visible when I took the photo and it does not show a child or a jogger. If the photo is nothing more than a digital fault then that's fair enough, but even that explanation sounds utterly ridiculous as the figure is too well defined in my opinion, and also I have taken hundreds of photos with my phone and never once have I had any faults or errors show up."

II. Camera settings

According to the testimony, the camera model that was used was a cellphone "Motorola Razr", most likely the "V3" model, which is the only one who has a VGA camera with a 640 x 680 pixels resolution and a x4 zoom max, released in 2004.

Full specifications can be seen [here](#).



III. Data examination

The photo submitted by *UFO Data Magazine* is useless since a text was added at the bottom of it; moreover, the original photo is not available.

However, a search using the Google Image Search feature comes up with some results showing the exact same background landscape, with a greater resolution, and without the "creature":




(1)

The two photographs show exactly the same landscape, with the same detail and from the same perspective.

It is then possible to state with certainty that the photograph with the "*creature*" is a cropped or cut version, deliberately degraded, from another Internet version, by the faker.

A composition of the two photographs also shows that the photograph with the "*creature*" overlaps the left of the original, which means that it is not the latter that was used, but rather a larger version, not yet found and certainly prior to 2006.



IV. Conclusion

Given both the objective data provided by the examination of the photographic document and subsequent research, we can conclude that the photo, object of this study, is a fake made from an original photograph taken on the Internet.

V. Sources – Photo credits

UFO Data Magazine issue (n°10 of July-August 2007) taken from the [whole "UFO Data" magazine collection \(2006 to 2008\) online - free PDF download](#).

Thanks to IsaacKoi for the online collection.