
Assessment of the Case 02 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 18:59 on 13 April 2025
 - Official Time of Death: 19:04 on 13 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 10:05 and 10:15 a.m. at coordinates 50.056081 (latitude) and 10.260027 (longitude).
- Digital Evidence: Analysis of the suspect's digital devices—a Garmin vivoactive 4s smartwatch and a Google Pixel 7A mobile phone, both seized on 16 April 2025—revealed an anomaly in the GPS data. Specifically, the data indicates that Mr. Glueck appears to have walked the same route several times during the period in question.
- 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

- 10 April 2025:
 - Mr. Glueck is documented as having engaged in a phone conversation with Carina Bandorf, reinforcing their social connection via Facebook.
- 13 April 2025:
 - Approximately 18:59: Forensic evidence estimates that Carina Bandorf sustained the fatal neck wound at this time.
 - 19:04: Official time of death recorded.
 - 19:05–19:15: Witnesses observed Mr. Glueck leaving the forest near the crime scene (coordinates 50.056081, 10.260027).
 - 22:37: The Body of Carina Bandorf, wearing a Garmin Venu 3 smartwatch, was found by a local forester.

-
- 14 April 2025:
 - Carina Bandorf’s smartwatch was analyzed and the data extracted.
 - 16 April 2025:
 - Mr. Glueck’s Garmin vivoactive 4s smartwatch and Google Pixel 7A mobile phone were seized and analyzed.
 - 18 April 2025:
 - An interrogation was conducted where Mr. Glueck was questioned about discrepancies in the GPS data and inconsistencies in his account, including his explanation regarding a lost item.

III. Detailed Assessment of the Interrogation and Evidentiary Findings

A. Analysis of Digital and Witness Evidence

The available evidence places Mr. Glueck in the vicinity of the crime scene at a time consistent with the witness reports. The GPS data anomaly—a repeated route—initially raises questions; however, Mr. Glueck’s explanation that he dropped an item and retraced his steps to retrieve it is both plausible and supported by the nature of the data. Although he cannot recall precisely what the item was, the behavior described is consistent with a person acting in a state of momentary distraction rather than as part of a premeditated crime.

B. Evaluation of the Suspect’s Account

During the interrogation, Mr. Glueck provided explanations for both his digital footprint and his social connection to the victim. Regarding the repeated route in the GPS data, he attributed this to having dropped something and running back to retrieve it. His account, while containing minor hesitations, is coherent and aligns reasonably with the timing observed by eyewitnesses. Similarly, although there is a discrepancy in how he described his initial encounter with Carina Bandorf (stating a club meeting versus ongoing Facebook interactions), such inconsistencies can occur in informal recollections rather than definitive evidence of guilt.

C. Officer’s Personal Opinion and Conclusion on Suspect’s Guilt

Based on my overall evaluation of the evidence and the suspect’s account during interrogation, I firmly believe that Mr. Hans Glueck is not guilty of the murder of Carina Bandorf.

* The critical GPS anomaly is explainable by an innocuous incident—a dropped item—that prompted brief, unintentional retracing of his steps.

* Witness observations and digital tracking are consistent with his account of routine activity in the forest, rather than a deliberate attempt to obscure his location.

* The discrepancies in his narrative regarding his social connection with the victim, while noted, are not sufficient to implicate him, as informal social interactions may naturally yield imperfect recollections.

In my professional view, the collected evidence does not establish a direct link between Mr. Glueck and any homicidal intent or activity. Instead, the data aligns with a scenario where Mr. Glueck happened upon circumstances that, while unfortunate, do not encode his guilt. I remain convinced of his innocence based on the current body of evidence and his cooperative demeanor during the interrogation. This assessment will be supported by further analyses, but at this stage, the evidence does not support an accusation against him.

IV. Conclusion

In summary, the convergence of witness testimony, digital data, and Mr. Glueck's explanations provide a cohesive picture that does not indicate his involvement in Carina Bandorf's murder. The anomaly observed in the GPS data is consistent with the suspect's account of having dropped and then retrieved an item, and any minor discrepancies in his recollection can be reasonably attributed to stress or the passage of time. I am convinced that Mr. Glueck is innocent of the charges related to this case, and I will continue to review all evidence with the aim of ensuring that the investigation remains thorough and just.

Chief Inspector Christina Müller
Schweinfurt, 19. April 2025