



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



2023-2080

Officer Involved Critical Incident - 45 Great Southern Blvd., Columbus,
OH 43207

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: 9/25/2023

Activity Location: BCI Offices, London, Ohio

Authoring Agent: Special Agent Chad Holcomb, #61

Narrative:

On Monday, September 25, 2023, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Chad Holcomb (SA Holcomb) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report for items of evidence submitted on August 10, 2023 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 23-17665). The evidence was submitted as a result of an Officer-Involved Critical Incident involving the Columbus Division of Police and Austin Huntzinger (Huntzinger). The report originated from the Firearms Section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Andrew McClelland.

The laboratory report confirmed that all submitted firearms were operable. Furthermore, two (2) fired 9mm casings recovered were source identified to the non-law enforcement Taurus, G2c (slide), PT111 G2 A (frame) with serial number ADC045839. The Taurus firearm was recovered on the ground near Huntzinger.

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
S/A Chad Holcomb
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 23-17665

Analysis Date:
September 13, 2023

Issue Date:
September 22, 2023

Agency Case Number: 2023-2080

BCI Agent: Amy Gill

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

Submitted on August 10, 2023 by Amy Gill:

1. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #1, Scene #1)
 - *Seventeen (17) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - *Three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #4, Scene #1)
 - *Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
4. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #6, Scene #1)
 - *Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #8, Scene #1)
 - *Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
6. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #10, Scene #1)
 - *Eight (8) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
7. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazine (BCI #11, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine.*
8. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #12, 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. White box containing firearm (serial #ADC045839) with magazine and cartridges (BCI #14, Scene #1)
 - One (1) Taurus model G2c (slide) / PT111 G2 A (frame), 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number ADC045839, with one (1) magazine and ten (10) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.
10. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #15, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
11. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #17, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
12. One manila envelope containing fired projectile (BCI #20, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired jacketed bullet.
13. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #21, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
14. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazines and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #3)
 - One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with two (2) magazines and thirty-four (34) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.
15. One manila envelope containing fired projectiles recovered during autopsy of Austin Huntzinger (BCI #7, Scene #4)
 - Two (2) fired jacketed bullets.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 7: Smith & Wesson pistol (SN: [REDACTED])	N/A	Operable
	Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8: Eighteen (18) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 15: Two (2) fired jacketed bullets	Source Identification

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 14: Smith & Wesson pistol (SN: [REDACTED])	N/A	Operable
	Items 1 and 13: Eighteen (18) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 12: One (1) fired jacketed bullet	Source Identification

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 9: Taurus pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 10 and 11: Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification

Remarks

Twelve (12) of the thirty-four (34) submitted cartridges from item 14 were used for test firing. Six (6) were used for test firing in item 7 and six (6) were used for test firing in item 14.

A test fired cartridge case from item 9 was previously entered and searched in the NIBIN database at the London laboratory. If investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

The remaining submitted items from item 9 and 14 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