



Ohio Attorney General's Office
Bureau of Criminal Investigation
Investigative Report



2022-0727

Officer-Involved Critical Incident - 914 Salt Springs Road, Youngstown,
Ohio 44509

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: August 26, 2022

Activity Location: BCI Youngstown Office

Authoring Agent: Special Agent Al Banský #115

Narrative:

On August 25, 2022, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Al Banský (Banský) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on April 19, 2022, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number: 22-33458). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Michael Roberts. The items relevant to this report, which had previously been submitted, were as follows:

1. Item #21: 9mm Taurus firearm, serial #ABG663394
2. Item #20: 9mm Glock firearm, serial # [REDACTED]
3. Items #1-17 & 22-36: fired cartridges

SA Banský reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

1. Item #20: Glock firearm cartridge casings recovered were matched to Officer Tom Schneeman.
2. Item #21: Taurus firearm (pistol discovered in the tan Chevrolet Malibu) was operable.

A copy of the Ohio BCI Laboratory report is attached to this Investigative Report. Please refer to the attachment for further details.



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office
Dan Boerner
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-33458

Analysis Date:
July 07, 2022

Issue Date:
August 12, 2022

Agency Case Number:
BCI Agent:

2022-0727
Dan Boerner

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer
Subject(s):
Victim(s):

Submitted on April 19, 2022 by Dan Boerner:

1. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS1)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
2. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS3)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
3. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS4)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
4. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS5)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
5. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS6)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
6. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS7)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
7. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS8)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
8. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS9)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
9. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS10)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
10. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS11)

Please address inquiries to the office indicated, using the BCI case number.

BCI -Bowling Green Office
750 North College Drive
Bowling Green, OH 43402
Phone:(419)353-5603

BCI -London Office
1560 St Rt 56 SW P.O. Box 365
London, OH 43140
Phone:(740)845-2000

BCI -Richfield Office
4055 Highlander Pkwy. Suite A
Richfield, OH 44286
Phone:(330)659-4600

11. *-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
Envelope containing cartridge case (CS12)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
12. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS13)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
13. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS14)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
14. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS16)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
15. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS17)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
16. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS19)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
17. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS20)
-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
20. One box containing firearm (Serial# [REDACTED] cartridge and magazine (CS28)
-One (1) Glock 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model 45, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) magazine and seventeen (17) 9mm Luger cartridges.
21. One box containing firearm (Serial# ABG663394) with cartridge and magazine recovered from the scene (CS30)
-One (1) Taurus 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model G2c, serial number ABG663394, one (1) magazine and twelve (12) 9mm Luger cartridges.
22. Envelope containing bullet (ME014)
-One (1) fired bullet and one (1) bullet fragment.
24. Envelope containing bullet (ME020)
-One (1) fired bullet.
25. Envelope containing bullet (ME021)
-One (1) fired bullet.
26. Envelope containing bullet (ME022)
-One (1) fired bullet.
27. Envelope containing bullet (ME023)
-One (1) fired bullet.
28. Envelope containing bullet (ME024)
-One (1) fired bullet.
29. Envelope containing bullet (ME025)
-One (1) fired bullet.
30. Envelope containing bullet (ME026)
-One (1) fired bullet.
31. Envelope containing bullet (ME027)
-One (1) fired bullet.
32. Envelope containing bullet (ME028)
-One (1) fired bullet.
33. Envelope containing bullet (ME029)
-One (1) fired bullet.
34. Envelope containing bullet (VP08)
-One (1) fired bullet.

- 35. Envelope containing bullet (VP10)
-One (1) fired bullet.
- 36. Envelope containing bullet (VP11)
-One (1) fired bullet.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #20-Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items #1-17, each containing one (1) fired cartridge case.	Source Identification
	Items #22-36, each containing one (1) fired bullet.	Source Identification
Item #21-Taurus pistol	N/A	Operable

Remarks

Item #21 was found to have damage to the trigger assembly and surrounding area. As a result, the magazine would not stay in place; therefore, the cartridges were hand fed into the chamber for test firing.

Two (2) submitted cartridges in Item #20 were used for testing.

Four (4) submitted cartridges in Item #21 were used for testing.

One (1) of the test fired cartridge cases from Item #21 was entered and searched in the NIBIN database. If any investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

The bullet fragment in Item #22 was not examined.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

Analytical findings offered above were determined using visual and microscopic examinations / comparisons.



Michael E. Roberts
Forensic Scientist
(234) 400-3652
michael.roberts@OhioAGO.gov

%"\$"!."*%!)%ff%ff")ff!*!)'!"!."f#')!1

Based on scientific analyses performed, this report contains opinions and interpretations by the analyst whose signature appears above. Examination documentation and any demonstrative data supporting laboratory conclusions are maintained by BCI and will be made available for review upon request.

Your feedback is important to us! Please complete our Laboratory Satisfaction Survey at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q9VQHL5>



Comparison Conclusion Scale

The following lists the conclusions a Forensic Scientist may reach when performing comparisons. In reaching a conclusion, a Forensic Scientist considers the similarities and dissimilarities and assesses the relative support of the observations under the following two propositions: the evidence originated from the same source or from a different source.

A Forensic Scientist may utilize their knowledge, training, and experience to evaluate how much support the observed similarities or dissimilarities provide for one conclusion over another. A conclusion shall not be communicated with absolute certainty. It is an interpretation of observations made by the Forensic Scientists and shall be expressed as an expert opinion.

1	Source Identification	The observations provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the evidence originated from the same source and the likelihood for the proposition that the evidence arose from a different source is so remote as to be considered a practical impossibility.
2	Support for Same Source	The observations provide more support for the proposition that the evidence originated from the same source rather than different sources; however, there is insufficient support for a Source Identification. The degree of support may range from limited to strong or similar descriptors of the degree of support. Any use of this conclusion shall include a statement of the factor(s) limiting a stronger conclusion.
3	Inconclusive	The observations do not provide a sufficient degree of support for one proposition over the other. Any use of this conclusion shall include a statement of the factor(s) limiting a stronger conclusion.
4	Support for Different Source	The observations provide more support for the proposition that the evidence originated from different sources rather than the same source; however, there is insufficient support for a Source Exclusion. The degree of support may range from limited to strong or similar descriptors of the degree of support. Any use of this conclusion shall include a statement of the factor(s) limiting a stronger conclusion.
5	Source Exclusion	The observations provide extremely strong support for the proposition that the evidence originated from a different source and the likelihood for the proposition that the evidence arose from the same source is so remote as to be considered a practical impossibility; or the evidence exhibits fundamentally different characteristics

We invite you to direct your questions to:
Abby Schwaderer, Quality Assurance Manager
(740) 845-2517
abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov