

MPI

METRO PARANORMAL INVESTIGATIONS

Dewitt Jailhouse Investigation
Final Report
Submitted by: Chris Forsythe

Location:

Private Residence, Dewitt MI

Date:

May 5th 2007

Source:

Referred by Jo G. (case manager)

Investigation Duration:

4 Hours (20:30- 24:00)

Investigators Present:

Chris F. (*Lead Investigator*)
Wayne M. (*Lead Investigator*)
Deana M.
Wendy F.
Kyle B.
Jo G.
Russ G.
Tim F.

Location Condition:

Suburban residential, with basement and outlying barn. Historical records indicate it was the old county seat building as well as a jail. Recorded in the Clinton county historical registry. (See attached historical documentation and notation)

Location Weather:

Heavy winds and dropping temperatures all day; cold, dark and cloudy at the time of the investigation.

Location Weather (Cont.):

Moon Phase: Waning Crescent
Solar X-Rays: Normal
Geomagnetic Field: Quiet
Temperature: 25°F
Visibility: 2.5 mi
Pressure: 40.12" steady
Dew Point: 51°F
Humidity: 79%
UV Index: 0 Low
Wind: SSW 12MPH

Reported Activity:

Apparitions; footsteps; feelings of being watched; doors slamming; general uneasy feeling in basement.

Equipment on Hand:

Laptop
Digital Cameras (assorted)
Digital Recorders (assorted)
Micro Cassette Recorders
External Microphones
Flashlights
Hi-8 Video Camera
Mini-DV Camera (with night shot)
Digital Video Camera
Tripods
2-Way Radios

Evidence Review and Findings

EVP:

Digital – Both mobile and stationary recorders were used. Upon review of all submitted files no audio evidence was captured on the devices present.

Micro Cassette – Two mobile units were used, no audio evidence captured on either device.

Video:

Mini DV – (Stationary position upstairs) No physical evidence captured on this device. Approximately 3 hours 12 minutes recorded to disc for review.

Hi-8 – (Stationary position on main floor) No physical evidence captured on this device. Roughly 2 hours of recorded video for review.

Digital – (Stationary position in basement “cell area”) No physical evidence captured on this device. Roughly 3 hours of recorded video for review.

Photographs:

As is standard practice all photographs were submitted to HQ for review. Over 400 pictures were taken at this location by the investigative team present. Upon analysis only a small number of photographs showed anomalies; all of these photographs were taken in the basement area in the new section. Strange light anomalies that cannot be explained were captured in that area. This area was noted by several investigators to have an uneasy feeling about it. (See attached photographs)

EMF:

Not used due to old and exposed wiring at this location.

Thermal:

An ambient mobile unit (ladybug) was used in this location but no major temperature changes were noted by the investigative team. This location was of old construction with a Michigan basement. Several of the windows had drafts as well as holes leading to the outside. In addition, holes were noted in the basement foundation that can account for “cold spots” in that area of the home.

Investigator Feeling / Experiences:

(Note: Personal experiences cannot in itself determine paranormal activity in a location, unless documented by video or audio equipment)

Chris F. – No personal experiences to report

Wayne M. – No personal experiences to report

Deana M. – No personal experiences to report

Wendy F. – Possible sighting of a black shadowy figure cross the dining room. Not recorded on the video device present in that area.

Kyle B. – Heard a distinct tapping noise in the kitchen that could not be explained. Not recorded on the audio device present.

Jo G. – Uneasy feelings in the new section of the basement.

Russ G. – No personal experiences to report

Tim F. – General uneasy feelings in the new section of the basement.

Final:

Upon review of all submitted evidence gathered by the MPI staff we can say at this time that several unexplainable anomalies were captured on film at the time of our visit. We were unable to capture any of the “physical” activity that the homeowner had reported; however, several of the personal experiences that were noted by the investigative team while in certain areas of the home do match what the homeowner had described to us during the initial consultation interview.