

---

## 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 15:06 on 19 April 2025
  - Official Time of Death: 15:11 on 19 April 2025

#### B. Suspect and Evidence

- Suspect: Hans Glueck, residing at Höllental 24a, 97422 Schweinfurt
- Observational Evidence: Witnesses placed Mr. Glueck leaving the forest on 19 April 2025 between 15:10 and 15:20 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 22 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

- 16 April 2025:
  - Mr. Glueck is documented as having engaged in a phone conversation with Carina Bandorf, reinforcing their social connection via Facebook.
- 19 April 2025:
  - Approximately 15:06: Forensic evidence estimates that Carina Bandorf sustained the fatal neck wound at this time.
  - 15:11: Official time of death recorded.
  - 15:10–15:20: Witnesses observed Mr. Glueck leaving the forest near the crime scene (coordinates 50.056081, 10.260027).
  - 19:58: The Body of Carina Bandorf, wearing a Garmin Venu 3 smartwatch, was found by a local forester.

- 
- 20 April 2025:
    - Carina Bandorf’s smartwatch was analyzed and the data extracted.
  - 22 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.
  - 24 April 2025:
    - An interrogation of Mr. Glueck was conducted, during which he was questioned regarding the GPS anomalies and discrepancies in his account, including his inconsistent narrative concerning how he met the victim.

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

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

The evidence situates Mr. Glueck in the vicinity of the crime scene around the critical time window. The digital records, specifically the GPS data, show an anomaly in the form of a spike directed toward the crime scene. Although some technical inaccuracies are known to occur in forested environments, the directional spike stands out as an unexplained deviation from his usual route. This data is a point of concern; however, it is counterbalanced by witness observations which merely indicate that Mr. Glueck was seen leaving the forest without establishing deliberate movement toward the scene at any other time.

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

During interrogation, Mr. Glueck explained the GPS anomaly by attributing it to general inaccuracies of the devices when used in forested areas. He was unable to account definitively for the directional spike and his recollection remains vague and marked by hesitations. Additionally, his account regarding how he established contact with the victim is partially inconsistent; while he claims to have met the victim in a club, the digital record shows a prior history on Facebook and a phone call three days ago. These discrepancies, while notable, do not by themselves confirm either guilt or innocence.

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

Given the convergence of both supporting and ambiguous evidence, I remain currently undecided regarding Mr. Glueck’s guilt. On one hand, the GPS data anomaly—particularly the spike toward the direction of the crime scene—raises unresolved questions. On the other hand, Mr. Glueck’s explanations, though not completely clear, are plausible when accounting for known issues with device accuracy in dense forest environments and human error under stress. His cooperative behavior during the interrogation and lack of a definitive contradictory narrative leave open the possibility that the observed discrepancies could be attributed to innocent circumstances rather than a deliberate attempt to obscure his involvement.

---

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In summary, while certain elements of the evidence—particularly the directional GPS spike—demand further scrutiny, there is insufficient evidence at this time to conclusively determine Mr. Glueck's guilt in the murder of Carina Bandorf. The witness accounts, digital tracking data, and inconsistencies in his narrative create a mixed picture. As such, it is my current position that Mr. Glueck remains a person of interest with unresolved issues that warrant additional investigation. Further analysis of the digital data and a deeper review of all witness statements will be necessary to resolve these uncertainties and reach a conclusive judgment regarding his involvement.

Chief Inspector Christina Müller  
Schweinfurt, 25. April 2025