

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

PHORNEY CRARRAL BC1

2022-0001 Officer Involved Critical Incident - 2307 10th Street SW, Canton, Ohio

Investigative Activity:	Lab Report Received and Reviewed
Activity Date:	March 15, 2022
Activity Location:	BCI - Richfield
Authoring Agent:	SA Matthew Armstrong #146

Narrative:

On March 15, 2022, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Matthew Armstrong (Armstrong) received an Ohio BCI Laboratory report for evidence items submitted on January 20, 2022 (laboratory case number 22-30659). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Dylan Matt. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were:

- Smith & Wesson M&P 40, SN: NJM0654 (Matrix Evidence Item #19)
- Smith & Wesson M&P 9, SN: HMU4213 (Matrix Evidence Item #21)
- Smith & Wesson M&P 45, SN: DVY9139 (Matrix Evidence Item #22)
- Charles Daly AR12S, SN: 20CH-05227 (Matrix Evidence Item #24)
- Mossberg 590, SN: V1151482 (Matrix Evidence Item #28)
- Ruger AR-556, SN: 853-79714, with Drum Magazine and one cartridge from chamber (Matrix Evidence Item #27)
- 55 fired cartridge cases .223 (Matrix Evidence Item #29)
- Glock, Inc., Model 17, SN: (Matrix Evidence Item #45)
- Fired projectile from North Fence (Matrix Evidence Item #38)
- Five Projectiles (Matrix Evidence Items #53 #57)
- Seven fired 9mm cartridge cases (Matrix Evidence Items #1 #7)
- Add magazines submitted

SA Armstrong reviewed the analysis report and learned all the firearms submitted were determined to be operable. Furthermore, Officer Huber's Glock, Model 17, SN: (Matrix Evidence Item #45), was responsible for firing seven of the submitted cartridge casings (Matrix Evidence Items #1 - #7) and the five submitted projectiles (Matrix Evidence Items #53 - #57). A copy of the analysis has been attached to this report.

Attachments:

2022-03-15 BCI Firearms Lab Report 22-30659

This document is the property of the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation and is confidential in nature. Neither the document nor its contents are to be disseminated outside your agency except as provided by law - a statute, an administrative rule, or any rule of procedure.





Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report Firearms

To:	Ohio Attorney General's Office	BCI Laboratory Number:	22-30659
	S/A Matt Armstrong		
	30 E. Broad Street	Analysis Date:	Issue Date:
	Columbus, OH 43215	February 11, 2022	February 23, 2022
		Agency Case Number:	2022-0001 Charles Maren
		BCI Agent:	Charles Moran

Offense: Homicide

Subject(s):

Victim(s):

Submitted on January 20, 2022 by S/A Matt Armstrong:

- One box containing firearm (Serial#: NJM0654) (Matrix Evidence Item #19)
 -One (1) Smith & Wesson 40 S&W semi-automatic pistol, model M&P40 M2.0, serial number NJM0654.
 One box containing firearm (SN: DVX0130) (Matrix Evidence Item #22)
- One box containing firearm (SN: DVY9139) (Matrix Evidence Item #22)
 -One (1) Smith & Wesson 45 Auto semi-automatic pistol, model M&P45, serial number DVY9139.
- 3. One box containing firearm (SN: HMU4213) (Matrix Evidence Item #21) -One (1) Smith & Wesson 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model M&P9c, serial number HMU4213.
- 4. One box containing firearm (SN:20CH-05227) (Matrix Evidence Item #24) -One (1) Charles Daly 12 Gauge semi-automatic shotgun, model AR-12S, serial number 20CH-05227 and one (1) magazine.
- 5. One box containing firearm (SN: V1151482) (Matrix Evidence Item #28) -One (1) Mossberg 12 Gauge pump action shotgun, model 590 Shockwave, serial number V1151482.
- 6. One box containing firearm (SN: 853-79714) with magazine and cartridge (Matrix Evidence Item #27)
 -One (1) Ruger 5.56x45mm semi-automatic pistol, model AR-556, serial number 853-79714, one (1) magazine and eleven (11) 223 Remington cartridges.

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

[] BCI -Bow ling Green Office 750 North College Drive Bow ling 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 [X] BCI -Richfield Office 4055 Highlander Pkw y. Suite A Richfield, OH 44286 Phone:(330)659-4600

Page 1 of 5

- 7. Brown paper bag containing cartridge casings (Matrix Evidence Item #29) -*Fifty-five* (55) 223 *Remington fired cartridge cases*.
- 8. One box containing firearm (SN: Matrix Evidence Item #45) -One (1) Glock 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model 17 Gen5, serial number
- 9. Brown paper bag containing bullet (Matrix Evidence Item #38) -One (1) fired bullet.
- 10. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Evidence Item #53) -One (1) fired bullet.
- 11. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Evidence Item #54) -One (1) fired bullet.
- 12. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Evidence Item #55) -One (1) fired bullet.
- 13. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Evidence Item #56) -One (1) fired bullet.
- 14. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Evidence Item #57) -One (1) fired bullet.
- 15. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #1) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
- 16. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #2) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
- 17. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #3) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
- 18. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #4) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
- 19. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #5) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
- 20. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #6) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
- 21. Brown paper bag containing cartridge case (Matrix Evidence Item #7) -One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.

Submitted on February 17, 2022 by S/A Matt Armstrong:

- 22. Brown paper bag containing Magazine (Matrix Evidence Item #8) -One (1) magazine and ten (10) 45 Auto cartridges.
- 23. Brown paper bag containing Magazine (Matrix Evidence Item #11) -Four (4) magazines, twenty-three (23) 40 S&W cartridges and twenty-four (24) 9mm Luger cartridges.
- 24. Envelope containing Magazine (Matrix Evidence Item #46) -One (1) magazine and nine (9) 9mm Luger cartridges.

Findings

omparison	Conclusion
Ϋ́Α	Operable
Ά	•

Lab Case: 22-30659 Agency Case: 2022-0001

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #2: Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
Item #3: Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
Item #4: Charles Daly shotgun	N/A	Operable
Item #5: Mossberg shotgun	N/A	Operable
Item #6: Ruger pistol	N/A	Operable
Item #8: Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items #9-14: six (6) fired bullets	Source Identification
	Items #15-21: seven (7) 9mm	Source Identification
	Luger fired cartridge cases	

Remarks

Two (2) BCI supplied cartridges and a magazine from Item #23 were used for testing Item #1.

Two (2) BCI supplied cartridges and Item #22 (magazine) were used for testing Item #2.

Two (2) BCI supplied cartridges and a magazine from Item #23 were used for testing Item #3.

Two (2) BCI supplied cartridges were used for testing Item #6.

A test fired cartridge case from Items #1-3 and 6 have been entered and searched in the NIBIN database. If investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

Two (2) BCI supplied shotshells were used for testing Item #4.

Two (2) BCI supplied shotshells were used for testing Item #5.

A test fired shotshell from Items #4 and 5 have been entered and searched in the NIBIN database. If investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

Four (4) submitted cartridges and magazine from Item #24 were used for testing Item #8.

Test fired specimens from law enforcement firearms are not entered into the NIBIN database.

A triage of the submitted cartridge cases from Item #7 and test fires from Item #6 was performed. This process includes assessing cartridge cases and test fires to determine the best representative sample from those having similar firearm produced markings for NIBIN entry. This is not, nor should it be, interpreted as a comparative examination to the fired cartridge cases or as to determine how many firearms may have been responsible for firing the cartridge cases.

There were no pertinent findings with regard to the cartridges from Items #6, 22 and 23.

There were no pertinent findings with regard to the other two (2) magazines from Item #23.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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

Dylum C. Mudd

Dylan Matt Forensic Scientist 234-400-3648 dylan.matt@OhioAGO.gov

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: <u>https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q9VQHL5</u>

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

dylan.matt@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Education

• Bachelor of Science in Forensic Science. December 2015. Waynesburg University. Waynesburg, PA.

Professional Experience

• Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist. 2016 - present

Selected Specialized Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Operability Training. 2016
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. NIBIN Training. 2017
- Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. National Firearms Examiner Academy. 2017