

reaching the truth in criminal cases is one of the most important issues that trouble the criminal judge he always strives to make his judgment based on assertion and certainty, not on conjecture and probability, and to reach these the purpose requires establishing evidence of the perpetration of the crime and attributing it to the accused with the identification of the perpetrator and his eligibility to receive punishment and the extent of his criminal seriousness. and if the classic evidence for proof in the penal articles is still used, and it is the dominant one in the field of forensic proof, its validity is no longer absolute in the face of the tremendous development of scientific research methods and their harnessing in the justice service to search for forensic evidence by fingerprint, and by that we mean the scientific technical expertise that is associated with objectivity in all cases, in contrast to other classic evidence that accompanies subjectivity and is likely to diverge from the truth. it is known that the criminal judge by virtue of the fact that the criminal incident continues in its details and circumstances has a positive role in collecting the means of reviving it and proving it, which requires him to strive seriously to search for forensic evidence closest to certainty and from this the ear print in the forensic medicine may reveal some actions the culprit in the cases