



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



2024-0431

Officer Involved Critical Incident – 6042 Huntley Rd, Columbus,
OH

Investigative Activity: Document Review
Date of Activity: 06/03/2024
Author: SA Matthew Collins, #151

Narrative:

On Monday, June 03, 2024, 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 February 9, 2024, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 24-11408). The report originated from the Firearms Section of the Laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Daniel Steiner. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. White Box containing a Smith and Wesson model M&P 2.0, 9mm, semi-automatic pistol (serial# [REDACTED])
- 2-12. Are multiple fired cartridge casings recovered from Scene #1.
- 14-21. Are multiple fired projectiles recovered from the subject vehicle and the body of Holly Graham.

SA Collins reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

Items 2-12 and 14-21 were all found to have been fired from Item #1, the Smith and Wesson pistol ([REDACTED]).

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: Firearms Report

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.



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: 24-11408

Analysis Date: February 22, 2024

Issue Date: March 04, 2024

Agency Case Number: 2024-0431

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

Submitted on February 09, 2024 by Amy Gill:

1. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with light, magazines, and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #1)
 - One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial # [REDACTED] with light, two (2) magazines, and thirty-five (35) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #2, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
4. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #4, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #5, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
6. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases located on ground (BCI #6, Scene #1)
 - Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases
7. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #7, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
8. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #8, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case

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

9. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #9, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
10. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #10, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
11. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #11, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
12. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case located on ground (BCI #12, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
13. One manila envelope containing magazine with cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #2)
 - One (1) magazine and five (5) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
14. Brown paper bag containing fired projectile from Holly Graham (BCI #1.1, Scene #3)
 - One (1) fired bullet
15. One manila envelope containing fired projectile located on front driver floorboard (BCI #2, Scene #4)
 - One (1) fired bullet
16. One manila envelope containing fired projectile located on front driver seat (BCI #3, Scene #4)
 - One (1) fired bullet
17. One manila envelope containing fired projectile located on rear driver floorboard (BCI #4, Scene #4)
 - One (1) fired bullet
18. One manila envelope containing fired projectile located on driver's seat (BCI #5, Scene #4)
 - One (1) fired bullet
19. One manila envelope containing fired projectile recovered from BE 14.0 - interior front driver door jamb (BCI #6, Scene #4)
 - One (1) fired bullet
20. One manila envelope containing fired projectile located on interior front driver door jamb (BCI #7, Scene #4)
 - One (1) fired bullet

Submitted on February 21, 2024 by Amy Gill:

21. One manila envelope containing fired projectile recovered from right buttock during autopsy of Holly Graham (Scene #5, Item #2)
 - One (1) fired bullet

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 1: Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 2 – 12: Twelve (12) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Items 14 – 21: Eight (8) fired bullets	Source Identification

Remarks

Six (6) of the thirty-five (35) submitted cartridges from item 1 were used for test firing.

The remaining submitted items from items 1 and 13 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.



Daniel Steiner
Forensic Scientist
740-845-2619
daniel.steiner@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