



THE JOURNAL OF  
**DIGITAL FORENSICS,  
SECURITY AND LAW**

**Journal of Digital Forensics,  
Security and Law**

---

Volume 9 | Number 3

Article 1


---

2014

## FROM THE EDITOR

Ibrahim Baggili  
*JDFSL*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/jdfsl>

 Part of the [Computer Engineering Commons](#), [Computer Law Commons](#), [Electrical and Computer Engineering Commons](#), [Forensic Science and Technology Commons](#), and the [Information Security Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Baggili, Ibrahim (2014) "FROM THE EDITOR," *Journal of Digital Forensics, Security and Law*: Vol. 9 : No. 3 , Article 1.  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15394/jdfsl.2014.1184>  
Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/jdfsl/vol9/iss3/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Digital Forensics, Security and Law by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@erau.edu](mailto:commons@erau.edu).

**EMBRY-RIDDLE**  
Aeronautical University<sup>™</sup>

SCHOLARLY COMMONS

(c)ADFSL





This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

## FROM THE EDITOR

Welcome to JDFSL's third issue for 2014!

In this issue we have three papers that have made the cut. The first paper titled "The Cost of Privacy: Riley v. California's Impact on Cell Phone Searches" is timely. In 2014 there was a unanimous decision that requires a warrant for all cell phone searches. This has some strong implications on the forensic analysis of mobile phones, and to that end, this article discusses and summarizes this legal precedent with its practical implications.

The second paper titled "Quantifying the Relevance of Mobile Digital Evidence as They Relate to Case Types: A Survey and a Guide for Best Practices" is also a timely article. In this paper the researchers surveyed experts in the field, and using statistical analysis they rated the top type of evidence as they relate to case types. For example, the results showed that in drug cases, Short Message Service (SMS) is the most important type of evidence on average that an investigator should look for on a phone. The results from this work can be integrated in a mobile forensic triage tool.

The third paper is titled "A Study of Forensic Imaging in the Absence of Write-Blockers". This is both an interesting and timely topic – because one assumes that evidence may not be submitted to the court because change was made to it. The study concludes that no changes were made to the user files when a write-blocker was not used – which begs to question on whether or not evidence acquired without a write-blocker could be admitted in court.

Overall, the papers in this issue are multidisciplinary and timely. We hope that our readers enjoy them.

Sincerely,

Dr. Ibrahim Baggili PhD

Editor-in-Chief

