

## Deduction Mysteries

### CASE 01

A signed manuscript was taken from the restoration lab of Argent Gallery during the overnight window between 01:00 and 05:15. The operation required specific qualifications, access, and timing. 7 suspects are under investigation: Tariq (security guard), Arjun (docent), Daphne (night security), Saoirse (janitor), Hasan (gift shop manager), Akhil (art restorer), Nadia (exhibition designer). Several have strong-looking motives.

#### Q Who took the signed manuscript?

1. However: Daphne is cleared – but their keycard was revoked the day before – confirmed in the security audit.
2. Saoirse has possession of the specific tool used and clean-room or vault clearance – initial suspicion was high.
3. The theft involved a foam replica skillfully painted with restoration-grade spray paint.
4. Akhil has possession of the specific tool used and advanced restoration training – initial suspicion was high.
5. Arjun has only advanced restoration training of the four requirements.
6. Hasan has all four requirements: advanced restoration training, clean-room or vault clearance, possession of the specific tool used, and meets the temporal requirement (presence between 01:00 and 05:15).
7. However: Saoirse is cleared – but two independent witnesses confirm a video call with them throughout the window.
8. But: however DHCP log records show they re-authenticated from an internal network at 2:40.
9. Initial assumption pointed to Daphne because of public friction with management, but this has been independently ruled out.
- 10 Saoirse filed a grievance two weeks ago – appears to have motive.

### CASE 02

A final exam answer sheet was taken from the science lab of Saint-Clair School during the overnight window between 01:30 and 05:45. The operation required specific qualifications, access, and timing. 7 suspects are under investigation: Hadley (principal), Magnus (teacher), Amelia (student council president), Dario (janitor), Bjorn (secretary), Zara (coach), Emiko (substitute teacher). Several have strong-looking motives.

#### Q Who took the final exam answer sheet?

1. However: Zara is cleared – but they were on a documented overnight flight, verified by airline records.
2. Emiko had financial pressure – appears to have motive.
3. Dario's hallway camera shows them off-site the entire window.
4. Amelia's keycard log shows them off-site the entire window.
5. Hadley has clean-room or vault clearance and authorization to handle the item – initial suspicion was high.
6. The trace at the scene (a network certificate signed by senior staff) ties directly to inventory or systems uniquely accessible to Bjorn.
7. Bjorn was officially signed out at 22:55 via the front-desk register.
8. Bjorn has all four requirements: elevated system privileges, clean-room or vault clearance, authorization to handle the item, and meets the temporal requirement (presence between 01:30 and 05:45).
9. Initial assumption pointed to Zara because of public friction with management, but this has been independently ruled out.
- 10 But: however the unsecured service entrance doesn't require a badge to re-enter.

## Deduction Mysteries

### CASE 03

A science project was taken from the exam preparation room of Brierfield Prep during the overnight window between 01:00 and 04:30. The operation required specific qualifications, access, and timing. 8 suspects are under investigation: Ramona (coach), Hakim (librarian), Xiomara (teacher), Gisela (secretary), Xanthe (principal), Esme (student council president), Juno (substitute teacher), Jian (janitor). Several have strong-looking motives.

#### Q Who took the science project?

1. Juno lacks a master key issued only to senior staff – confirmed by personnel records.
2. Gisela has a master key issued only to senior staff and documented hands-on history with the item – initial suspicion was high.
3. Esme has documented hands-on history with the item and familiarity with the security routing – initial suspicion was high.
4. However: Gisela is cleared – but their master key was revoked the day before – confirmed in the security audit.
5. Hakim lacks documented hands-on history with the item – security audit confirms.
6. However: Jian is cleared – but their master key was revoked the day before – confirmed in the security audit.
7. Jian clashed publicly with management – appears to have motive.
8. The theft involved a foam replica skillfully painted with restoration-grade spray paint.
9. Xanthe's witness statement shows them off-site the entire window.
- 10 Xiomara has all four requirements: a master key issued only to senior staff, documented hands-on history with the item, familiarity with the security routing, and meets the temporal requirement (presence between 01:00 and 04:30).
- 11 Esme had financial pressure – appears to have motive.

### CASE 04

A catering payment was taken from the front register of Saint-Clair Café during the overnight window between 00:30 and 03:00. The operation required specific qualifications, access, and timing. 7 suspects are under investigation: Eitan (manager), Yvonne (host), Vera (server), Meriel (dishwasher), Mikael (sommelier), Bjorn (pastry chef), Zinnia (head chef). Several have strong-looking motives.

#### Q Who took the catering payment?

1. However: Vera is cleared – but they were on a documented overnight flight, verified by airline records.
2. Bjorn filed a grievance two weeks ago – appears to have motive.
3. Meriel's witness server shows them off-site the entire window.
4. The theft involved a seal cut with a serial pattern from a specific supply.
5. Yvonne has all four requirements: clearance to the restricted archive, a verified relationship with the donor, authorization to handle the item, and meets the temporal requirement (presence between 00:30 and 03:00).
6. Zinnia filed a grievance two weeks ago – appears to have motive.
7. Zinnia has authorization to handle the item and clearance to the restricted archive – initial suspicion was high.
8. But: however the unsecured service entrance doesn't require a badge to re-enter.
9. Vera had financial pressure – appears to have motive.
- 10 Four independent requirements: clearance to the restricted archive, a verified relationship with the donor, presence between 00:30 and 03:00, and authorization to handle the item.
- 11 Mikael's front-of-house camera shows them off-site the entire window.

## Deduction Mysteries

### CASE 05

An encrypted hard drive was taken from the records vault of Cedarstone Inc during the overnight window between 00:30 and 03:15. The operation required specific qualifications, access, and timing. 8 suspects are under investigation: Finnegan (security officer), Ramona (senior engineer), Wren (HR director), Kenji (legal counsel), Roksana (facilities coordinator), Elara (intern), Galina (IT administrator), Olive (executive assistant). Several have strong-looking motives.

#### Q Who took the encrypted hard drive?

1. The trace at the scene (an encryption signature tied to the internal training network) ties directly to inventory or systems uniquely accessible to Finnegan.
2. Finnegan was officially signed out at 23:35 via the front-desk register.
3. Ramona filed a grievance two weeks ago – appears to have motive.
4. Galina has documented hands-on history with the item and specialized engineering certification – initial suspicion was high.
5. However: Galina is cleared – but two independent witnesses confirm a video call with them throughout the window.
6. However: Roksana is cleared – but two independent witnesses confirm a video call with them throughout the window.
7. But: however the VPN session record shows their vehicle remained in the lot until well after 00:30.
8. Roksana has familiarity with the security routing and specialized engineering certification – initial suspicion was high.
9. Initial assumption pointed to Kenji because of proximity to the scene earlier, but this has been independently ruled out.
- 10 Ramona has familiarity with the security routing and documented hands-on history with the item and specialized engineering certification – initial suspicion was high.

### CASE 06

A production database was extracted from the SOC operations center of Velocity Networks during the overnight window between 00:15 and 03:00. The operation required specific qualifications, access, and timing. 8 suspects are under investigation: Suri (support lead), Ula (contractor), Fenella (senior engineer), Rhys (intern), Leila (CTO), Jacinta (security analyst), Octavia (data scientist), Olive (product manager). Several have strong-looking motives.

#### Q Who extracted the production database?

1. However: Fenella is cleared – but their badge was revoked the day before – confirmed in the security audit.
2. Leila has only elevated system privileges of the four requirements.
3. The data theft involved an encryption signature tied to the internal training network.
4. However: Octavia is cleared – but two independent witnesses confirm a video call with them throughout the window.
5. Initial assumption pointed to Fenella because of proximity to the scene earlier, but this has been independently ruled out.
6. Rhys lacks documented hands-on history with the item – security audit confirms.
7. Four independent requirements: elevated system privileges, documented hands-on history with the item, presence between 00:15 and 03:00, and possession of the specific tool used.
8. Octavia has possession of the specific tool used and documented hands-on history with the item and elevated system privileges – initial suspicion was high.
9. The trace at the scene (an encryption signature tied to the internal training network) ties directly to inventory or systems uniquely accessible to Jacinta.
- 10 But: however the parking-lot camera shows their vehicle remained in the lot until well after 00:15.

## Answer Key – Deduction Mysteries

Solve before peeking. Correct suspect and key reasoning steps below.

---

### Case 01 A) Hasan

- Four requirements (advanced restoration training, clean-room or vault clearance, presence between 01:00 and 05:15, possession of the specific tool used) plus a unique technical trace narrow the case.
  - Daphne appears guilty (has multiple requirements, has motive) but is cleared by an independent verification.
- 

### Case 02 F) Bjorn

- Four requirements (elevated system privileges, clean-room or vault clearance, presence between 01:30 and 05:45, authorization to handle the item) plus a unique technical trace narrow the case.
  - Emiko appears guilty (has multiple requirements, has motive) but is cleared by an independent verification.
- 

### Case 03 undefined) Xiomara

- Four requirements (a master key issued only to senior staff, documented hands-on history with the item, presence between 01:00 and 04:30, familiarity with the security routing) plus a unique technical trace narrow the case.
  - Esme appears guilty (has multiple requirements, has motive) but is cleared by an independent verification.
- 

### Case 04 A) Yvonne

- Four requirements (clearance to the restricted archive, a verified relationship with the donor, presence between 00:30 and 03:00, authorization to handle the item) plus a unique technical trace narrow the case.
  - Vera appears guilty (has multiple requirements, has motive) but is cleared by an independent verification.
- 

### Case 05 undefined) Finnegan

- Four requirements (specialized engineering certification, documented hands-on history with the item, presence between 00:30 and 03:15, familiarity with the security routing) plus a unique technical trace narrow the case.
  - Roksana appears guilty (has multiple requirements, has motive) but is cleared by an independent verification.
- 

### Case 06 D) Jacinta

- Four requirements (elevated system privileges, documented hands-on history with the item, presence between 00:15 and 03:00, possession of the specific tool used) plus a unique technical trace narrow the case.
  - Octavia appears guilty (has multiple requirements, has motive) but is cleared by an independent verification.
-