

the features about the crime from the witness and comparing them with that of the available from the data base. and if there is a map, the criminal can be identified. If the data available from the witness is not sufficient, the forensics reports are also considered that are available, and correlate this report with the report of the witness to ratify criminal. Using the methodology a criminal is identified and for the uniqueness, this data is given as input to the Generalized Gaussian mixture model to identify a unique criminal. From the above table, 1013 is identified as the criminals

6. Conclusion:

This paper presents a novel methodology of identifying a criminal, in the presence of witness or any clue by the forensic experts. In these situations, in this paper we have tried to identify the criminal by mapping the criminal using the Generalized Gaussian mixture model.

References:

1. Carlie of Berriew Q.C “Data mining: The new weapon in the war on terrorism” retrived from the Internet on 28-02-2011
2. Cate H. Fred “Legal Standards for Data Mining” retrieved from the internet on 12-03-2011
http://www.hunton.com/files/tbl_s47Details/FileUpload265/1250/Cate_Fourth_Amendment.pdf
3. Clifton Christopher (2011). “Encyclopedia Britannica: data mining”, Retrieved from the web on 20-01-2011
4. Jeff and Harper, Jim “Effective Counterterrorism and the Limited Role of Predictive Data Mining” retrieved from the web 12-02-2011
5. U.M. Fayyad and R. Uthurusamy, “Evolving Data Mining into Solutions for Insights,” Comm. ACM, Aug. 2002, pp. 28-31.
6. W. Chang et al., “An International Perspective on Fighting Cybercrime,” Proc. 1st NSF/NIJ Symp. Intelligence and Security Informatics, LNCS 2665, Springer-Verlag, 2003, pp. 379-384.
7. H. Kargupta, K. Liu, and J. Ryan, “Privacy-Sensitive Distributed Data Mining from Multi-Party Data,” Proc. 1st NSF/NIJ Symp. Intelligence and Security Informatics, LNCS 2665, Springer-Verlag, 2003, pp. 336-342. April 2004
8. M. Chau, J.J. Xu, and H. Chen, “Extracting Meaningful Entities from Police Narrative Reports, Proc. Nat’l Conf. Digital Government Research, Digital Government Research Center, 2002, pp. 271-275.
9. A. Gray, P. Sallis, and S. MacDonell, “Software Forensics: Extending Authorship Analysis Techniques to Computer Programs,” Proc. 3rd Biannual Conf. Int’l Assoc. Forensic Linguistics, Int’l Assoc. Forensic Linguistics, 1997, pp. 1-8.
10. R.V. Hauck et al., “Using Coplink to Analyze Criminal-Justice Data,” Computer, Mar. 2002, pp. 30-37.
11. T. Senator et al., “The FinCEN Artificial Intelligence System: Identifying Potential Money Laundering from Reports of Large Cash Transactions,” AI Magazine, vol. 16, no. 4, 1995, pp. 21-39.
12. W. Lee, S.J. Stolfo, and W. Mok, “A Data Mining Framework for Building Intrusion detection Models,” Proc. 1999 IEEE Symp. Security and Privacy, IEEE CS Press, 1999, pp. 120-132. 10. O. de Vel et al., “Mining E-Mail Content for Author Identification Forensics,” SIGMOD Record, vol. 30, no. 4, 2001, pp. 55-64.
13. G. Wang, H. Chen, and H. Atabakhsh, “Automatically Detecting Deceptive Criminal Identities,” Comm. ACM, Mar. 2004, pp. 70-76.
14. S. Wasserman and K. Faust, Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications, Cambridge Univ. Pr is available as a Word file, <copyright.doc>.