

# Assessment of the Case 01 Js 1337/25

## I. Case Overview

### A. Victim and Incident Details

- Victim: Carina Bandorf, who suffered a fatal stab wound to the neck resulting in exsanguination.
- Location: The murder occurred in a forest near Schweinfurt at coordinates 50.058852 (latitude) and 10.259366 (longitude).
- Time Details:
  - Forensic Estimation of the Crime: Approximately 10:58 a.m. on 4 April 2025
  - Official Time of Death: 11:03 a.m. on 4 April 2025

### B. Suspect and Evidence

- Suspect: Hans Glueck, residing at Höllental 24a, 97422 Schweinfurt
- Observational Evidence: Witnesses placed Mr. Glueck leaving the forest between 11:05 and 11:15 a.m. at coordinates 50.056081 (latitude) and 10.260027 (longitude).
- Digital Evidence: Analysis of the suspect's Garmin vivoactive 4s smartwatch and Google Pixel 7A mobile device—seized on 7 April 2025—reveals a conspicuous gap in tracking data during the critical period coinciding with the estimated time of the murder.
- Social Connection Information: Records show that Mr. Glueck and the victim were connected on Facebook, and Mr. Glueck placed a telephone call to Carina Bandorf three days prior to the murder. Despite this, Mr. Glueck contends that he met the victim in a club and only subsequently exchanged contact details.

## II. Timeline of Events

- 1 April 2025:
  - Mr. Glueck is documented as having engaged in a phone conversation with Carina Bandorf, reinforcing their social connection via Facebook.
- 4 April 2025:
  - Approximately 10:58 a.m.: Forensic evidence estimates that Carina Bandorf sustained the fatal neck wound at this time.
  - 11:03 a.m.: Official time of death recorded.
  - 11:05–11:15 a.m.: Witnesses observed Mr. Glueck leaving the forest near the crime scene (coordinates 50.056081, 10.260027).
  - 16:37: The Body of Carina Bandorf, wearing a Garmin Venu 3 smartwatch, was found by a local forester.
- 5 April 2025:
  - Carina Bandorf's smartwatch was analyzed and the data extracted.
- 7 April 2025:

- Mr. Glueck’s Garmin vivoactive 4s smartwatch and Google Pixel 7A mobile phone were seized; subsequent data analysis identified a significant gap in GPS tracking during the critical time frame.
- 9 April 2025:
  - An interrogation was conducted with Mr. Glueck to address discrepancies in his digital data and to obtain clarifications regarding his conflicting account of his relationship with the victim.

### **III. Detailed Assessment of the Interrogation and Evidentiary Findings**

#### **A. Analysis of Digital and Witness Evidence**

The evidence clearly positions Mr. Glueck in close proximity to the scene of the crime at the critical time period. The gap in the digital tracking data from both his smartwatch and mobile phone is particularly alarming as it directly coincides with the estimated time of the murder. It is my professional opinion that the likelihood of these discrepancies being solely the result of technical malfunctions or GPS inaccuracies in a forested area is very low under the circumstances.

#### **B. Evaluation of the Suspect’s Account**

During the interrogation, Mr. Glueck repeatedly asserted that he had taken a “break” in the forest and that he deliberately set down his devices — resulting in the gap in the recorded data. Furthermore, his account regarding his relationship with Carina Bandorf is inconsistent. Although he claims to have met the victim in a club, the established history of connection through Facebook and his recent telephone call contradict this narrative. Such inconsistencies undermine the credibility of his version of events.

#### **C. Officer’s Personal Opinion and Conclusion on Guilt**

Based on the convergence of all available evidence—witness observations, digital tracking analysis, and the suspect’s conflicting statements — I firmly believe that Mr. Hans Glueck is guilty of the murder of Carina Bandorf. The digital records leave little room for alternative explanations, and the suspect’s repeated evasions during interrogation further reinforce my conclusion. My line of questioning and overall investigative approach have been predicated on this belief in his culpability. I maintain that the evidence directly implicates Mr. Glueck, and any claim that the data gaps are coincidental or solely due to technical faults is implausible given the totality of the circumstances.

### **IV. Conclusion**

In summary, the case against Mr. Hans Glueck rests on robust and converging lines of evidence that include a clearly documented timeline, reliable witness accounts, and consistent forensic and digital data. The noticeable gap in the

digital tracking records precisely aligns with the estimated time of the murder, while the suspect's contradictory explanations regarding his relationship with the victim further detract from his credibility. Accordingly, I conclude that Mr. Glueck's explanations fail to account for the physical and digital evidence, and I am convinced of his guilt in the murder of Carina Bandorf.

Chief Inspector Christina Müller  
Schweinfurt, 10. April 2025