



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



2021-2286

Officer-Involved Critical Incident- 2249 Kimberly Pkwy

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: 10/13/2021

Activity Location: BCI

Authoring Agent: SA Matt Collins, #151

Narrative:

On Wednesday, October 13, 2021, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Matt Collins (SA Collins) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on October 1, 2021, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 21-110670). The report originated from the Firearms Section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Heather Zollman. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. One fired 9mm Luger cartridge case- CSU #6, Scene 1
2. Two fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases- CSU #7, Scene 1
3. Firearm; Smith and Wesson Model M&P 9mm (Serial # [REDACTED] - CSU #10, Scene 1
4. Bullets; recovered from the body of Kyle Veyon- CSU #2, Scene 2

SA Collins reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

Item 3, the Smith and Wesson firearm possessed by CPD Ofc. Andrew Hawkins, was found to be operable. The weapon was further linked to the two fired bullets recovered from the body of Kyle Veyon.

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: BCI / Madison
SA Matt Collins
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 21-110670

Analysis Date: October 06, 2021

Issue Date: October 08, 2021

Agency Case Number: 2021-2286

BCI Agent: Aja Chung

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): N/A

Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on October 01, 2021 by Aja Chung:

1. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI#6, Scene1)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge casing from roadway ((BCI#7, scene 1)
 - *Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases*
3. One cardboard box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazines and rounds (BCI#10, scene 1)
 - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial # [REDACTED] with three (3) magazines and forty-nine (49) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges*

Submitted on October 06, 2021 by Aja Chung:

4. Brown paper bag containing bullets recovered from the body of Kyle Veyon (BCI item #2, Scene #2)
 - *Two (2) fired jacketed bullets*
 - *One (1) lead fragment*

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

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

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
#3: Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
	#1, #2: three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	#4: two (2) fired jacketed bullets	Source Identification
#4: one (1) lead fragment	N/A	Unsuitable^

^Insufficient class and/or individual characteristics present.

Remarks

Three (3) of the forty-nine (49) submitted cartridges from item #3 were used for test firing.

No fired cartridge cases were entered into the NIBIN database.

The remaining submitted items from item #3 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.



Heather A. Zollman
Forensic Scientist
740-845-2536
heather.zollman@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