



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



2022-1734
Officer Involved Critical Incident – 27724 Zuck Road, Howard,
Ohio 43028

Investigative Activity: Information Provided/Obtained
Involves: Elizabeth Ann Delano (S)
Date of Activity: 09/09/2022
Activity Location: Ohio BCI&I Richfield, Northeast Regional Office – 4055 Highlander Parkway, Richfield, OH 44286, Summit County
Author: SA Eric Lehnhart, #84

Narrative:

On Friday, September 09, 2022, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Eric Lehnhart (SA Lehnhart) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on August 23, 2022, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 22-17891). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Andrew McClelland. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. One cardboard box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with sight, magnifier, magazine, and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P-15, 5.56mm NATO semi-automatic rifle, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine, twenty-eight (28) unfired 223 REM cartridges, scope, and magnifier.*
2. White box containing firearm (serial #183323K)
 - *One (1) Stevens model 320, 20-gauge slide action (pump action) shotgun, serial number 183323K.*
3. One manila envelope containing fired shotgun shell (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 20-gauge shotgun shell.*
4. One manila envelope containing fired shotgun shell (BCI #6, Scene #1)

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.

- *Four (4) fired 20-gauge shotgun shells.*

SA Lehnhart reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

According to Forensic Scientist Andrew McClelland, both Item #1 and Item #2 were determined to be “operable.” Item #2 was determined to be “source identification,” when compared to Item #3 and Item #4. Source Identification is defined as “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.

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

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: 2022-09-09 Delano, Elizabeth Lab Report #22-17891



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report
Firearms

To: BCI / Madison
S/A Lehnhart
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-17891

Analysis Date:
August 25, 2022

Issue Date:
September 02, 2022

Agency Case Number: 2022-1734
BCI Agent: Aja Chung

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer
Subject(s): N/A
Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on August 23, 2022 by Aja Chung:

1. One cardboard box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with sight, magnifier, magazine, and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #1)
 - One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P-15, 5.56mm NATO semi-automatic rifle, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine, twenty-eight (28) unfired 223 REM cartridges, scope, and magnifier.
2. White box containing firearm (serial #183323K)
 - One (1) Stevens model 320, 20-gauge slide action (pump action) shotgun, serial number 183323K.
3. One manila envelope containing fired shot shell (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 20-gauge shot shell.
4. One manila envelope containing fired shot shell (BCI #6, Scene #1)
 - Four (4) fired 20-gauge shot shells.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 1: Smith & Wesson rifle	N/A	Operable

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

[X] 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

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 2: Stevens shotgun	N/A	Operable
	Items 3 and 4: Five (5) fired 20-gauge shot shells	Source Identification

Remarks

Three (3) of the twenty-eight (28) submitted cartridges from item 1 were used for test firing.

No fired cartridge cases or shot shells were entered into the NIBIN database.

The remaining submitted items from item 1 were not examined at this time.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Andrew McClelland
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2089
andrew.mcclelland@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: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q7V2N6H>



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