



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



2025-0883
Officer Involved Critical Incident – I-75 NB / Mile Marker 14,
Evendale, Ohio (Hamilton County) (L)

Investigative Activity: Information Provided/Obtained

Involves: [REDACTED]

Date of Activity: 05/16/2025

Author: SA David Hornyak, #112

Narrative:

On May 16, 2025, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent Dave Hornyak, received from the BCI Firearms Lab, the laboratory report on the analysis of the duty pistol, cartridge casings, and projectiles. The report stated that the firearm was operable and was also verified to be the source of casings collected from the scene.

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: 25-18574 FA report

References:

No references.

Exhibit 1



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: BCI / Madison
David Hornyak
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 25-18574

Analysis Date:
May 06, 2025

Issue Date:
May 13, 2025

Agency Case Number: 2025-0883
BCI Agent: Amy Gill

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

Submitted on 03/19/2025 by Amy Cruvey

1. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing (Scene #1, item#1)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
2. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing (Scene #1, item#2)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
3. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing (Scene #1, item#3)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
4. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing (Scene #1, item#4)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
5. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing (Scene #1, item#5)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
7. White box containing firearm with magazine and cartridges (Serial # [REDACTED]) (Scene #2, item#1)
 - *One (1) Glock model 17 Gen4, 9mm Luger, semi-automatic pistol, serial number: [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and thirteen (13) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges*
8. One manila envelope containing projectiles recovered from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] during autopsy (Scene#3, item #6)
 - *Three (3) fired bullets*

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

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 7: Glock pistol SN: [REDACTED]	N/A	Operable
	Items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5: Five (5) cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 8: Three (3) fired bullets	

Remarks

The remaining submitted items from Item 7 were not examined/compared at this time.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Kelsey Cramer, FA-AFTE
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845 - 2627
Kelsey.Cramer@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. Results relate only to the items tested.

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

Kelsey Cramer
Statement of Qualifications
Kelsey.Cramer@OhioAGO.gov

Education

- Bachelor of Science, Forensic and Investigative Science, Minors in Anthropology and Biology.
May 2013. West Virginia University. Morgantown, West Virginia

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation. Firearm and Tool Mark Examiner. Firearm Section. October 2022 – Present.
- Hamilton County Coroner’s Office Crime Laboratory. Firearm and Tool Mark Examiner. Firearm Section. August 2019 – October 2022.
- Arkansas State Crime Laboratory. Firearm and Tool Mark Examiner. Firearm Section. January 2014 – August 2019.
- San Francisco Police Department Crime Laboratory. Firearm and Tool Mark Intern. Firearm Section. May 2012 – August 2012.

Required Technical Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation. Firearm Training. 2022.

Memberships

- Association of Firearms and Tool Mark Examiners. Regular Member. June 2018 – Present.
- Association of Firearms and Tool Mark Examiners. Provisional Member. 2014 – June 2018.

Certifications

- Association of Firearms and Tool Mark Examiners (AFTE). Firearm Evidence Examination and Identification (FA-AFTE).
November 2024 – Present.

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated 11/04/2024