



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



2023-2057

Officer-Involved Critical Incident- 6900 Block S. High St, Columbus

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: 10/30/2023

Activity Location: BCI

Authoring Agent: SA Matt Collins, #151

**Narrative:**

On Monday, August 21, 2023, 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 August 7, 2023, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 23-17518). 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. Three (3) fired 9mm cartridge casings (**BCI CSU#2; Scene #1**)
2. Smith & Wesson model M&P9 2.0 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol (██████████) with one (1) magazine and fifteen (15) unfired 9mm luger cartridges (**BCI CSU#1; Scene#2**).
3. One (1) fired projectile (**BCI CSU# 1; Scene #3**) with two (2) bullet jacket petals.
4. One (1) fired projectile recovered from the body of Zachary Bryson (**BCI CSU#1; Scene #4**)

SA Collins reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

The report indicated the Smith & Wesson 9mm, possessed by ██████████ was determined to be operable. It further indicated, the items identified by the above listed numbers, #1, #3, and #4 were compared and the Smith and Wesson (above listed item #4; **BCI CSU#1; Scene #2**) was identified as the source.

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: 23-17518

Analysis Date:  
August 15, 2023

Issue Date:  
August 18, 2023

Agency Case Number: 2023-2057

BCI Agent: Amy Gill

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

**Submitted on August 07, 2023 by Amy Gill:**

1. One manila envelope containing cartridge casings (Scene#1, item#2)
  - *Three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
2. White box containing firearm (Serial# [REDACTED], magazine, and cartridges (Scene#2, item#1)
  - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and fifteen (15) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.*
3. One manila envelope containing fired projectile (Scene#3, item#1)
  - *One (1) fired jacketed bullet with two (2) bullet jacket petals.*

**Submitted on August 10, 2023 by Amy Gill:**

4. One manila envelope containing fired projectile recovered during the autopsy of Zachary Bryson (BCI #1, Scene #4)
  - *One (1) fired jacketed bullet.*

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 2: Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item 1: Three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridges	Source Identification
	Items 3 and 4: Two (2) fired jacketed bullets	Source Identification

**Remarks**

While cleaning the one (1) fired jacketed bullet, item 3, two (2) additional jacket petals separated from the main bullet. The four (4) total jacket petals were not examined / compared at this time.

Six (6) of the fifteen (15) submitted cartridges from item 2 were used for test firing.

The remaining submitted items from item 2 were not examined at this time.

No fired cartridge cases were entered into the NIBIN database.

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](mailto:abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)