



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



2022-1139
Officer Involved Critical Incident – 947 SR-28 Business, Milford,
Ohio (L)

Investigative Activity: Records Received, Review of Records
Involves: Camille Artice Weems (S)
Date of Activity: 07/01/2022
Activity Location: Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation – 1560 SR-56 SW, London,
OH 43140, Madison County
Author: SA Steven Seitzman

Narrative:

On July 1, 2022, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent Steven Seitzman (SA Seitzman) received the BCI Firearms Laboratory Report relative to the Officer-Involved Critical Incident on May 20, 2022, in Miami Township, Clermont County, Ohio.

SA Seitzman reviewed the BCI Firearms Lab report and noted the following:

- Ms. Weems' Taurus 9mm weapon was operable.
- The 9mm casing located in the mulch landscaping near the entrance to Building B was attributed to Ms. Weems' weapon.
- The 9mm casing located near Ms. Weems' body was attributed to Ms. Weems' weapon.
- The 9mm casing located near a green pick-up truck in the parking lot was attributed to Ms. Weems' weapon.
- The 9mm casing located near the wheel of the maroon Chevrolet Impala was attributed to Ms. Weems' weapon.
- The bullet fragment located inside 944 SR-28 Business (Harky's Motorsports) under a Ducati motorcycle was fired from Ms. Weems' weapon.
- Officer [REDACTED] Sig Sauer AR-15 rifle was operable.
- The five .223 casings located near the entrance of 947 SR-28 Business were attributed to Officer [REDACTED] weapon.
- The .223 casing located on the roof of Officer [REDACTED] cruiser on May 21, 2022, was attributed to Officer [REDACTED] weapon.
- The jacketed .223 bullet fragment located near the grass island by the maroon Chevrolet Impala was found to be inconclusive.
- The jacketed bullet fragment retrieved during Ms. Weems' autopsy was found to be

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.

inconclusive.

The BCI Firearms Lab is attached below for further review.

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: 2022-1139 Source Identification and Comparison Report

Exhibit 1



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: BCI / Madison
S/A Steven Seitzman
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-14902

Analysis Date: Issue Date:
June 23, 2022 June 30, 2022

Agency Case Number: 2022-1139
BCI Agent: Aja Chung

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

Submitted on May 26, 2022 by Aja Chung:

1. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #2, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.
2. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with sling, scope, magazine, and cartridges (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - One (1) SigSauer model SIGM400, 5.56mm NATO (223 REM) semi-automatic rifle, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine, twenty-three (23) unfired 223 REM cartridges, one (1) sling, and one (1) red dot scope.
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #4, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 REM cartridge case.
4. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #5, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 REM cartridge case.
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #6, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 REM cartridge case.
6. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #7, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 REM cartridge case.
7. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #8, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 REM 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

8. White box containing firearm (serial #ABA243918) (BCI #9, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) Taurus model G2c (PT111 G2A), 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number ABA243918, with one (1) magazine.*
9. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #10, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
10. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #11, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
11. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #13, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired jacketed bullet.*
12. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #14, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
13. One manila envelope containing fired projectile (BCI #16, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired bullet jacket fragment.*
14. One manila envelope containing fired projectile (BCI #17, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) lead bullet core.*
15. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #18, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 223 REM cartridge case.*
16. One manila envelope containing fired projectile from Camille Weems' autopsy (BCI #2, Scene #2)
 - *One (1) fired jacketed bullet fragment.*

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 2: SigSauer rifle	N/A	Operable
	Items 3 – 7 and 15: Six (6) fired 223 REM cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 11: One (1) fired jacketed bullet Item 16: One (1) fired jacketed bullet fragment	Inconclusive*
Item 8: Taurus pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 1, 9, 10, and 12: Four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 13: One (1) fired bullet jacket fragment	Source Identification
Item 14: One (1) lead bullet core	N/A	Unsuitable^

*Similar class characteristics but insufficient corresponding individual characteristics to identify or exclude.

^Insufficient class and/or individual characteristics present.

Remarks

Thirteen (13) of the twenty-three (23) submitted cartridges from item 2 were used for test firing/hand cycling.

No fired cartridge cases were entered into the NIBIN database.

The remaining submitted items from item 2 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

