



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



2024-4066

Officer Involved Critical Incident – 1004 Park Lane, Apartment A,
Middletown, Ohio (Butler County) (L)

Investigative Activity: Records Received, Review of Records
Involves: Christopher Gorak (S)
Date of Activity: 01/28/2025
Activity Location: Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation – 1560 SR-56 SW, London,
OH 43140
Author: SA Steven Seitzman

Narrative:

On Monday, January 28, 2025, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation Special Agent Steven Seitzman received the Ohio BCI Laboratory report for items of evidence submitted on Friday, December 27, 2024, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 24-127340). 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 BCI Crime Scene Technician Holly Ryczek previously submitted, were as follows:

- Lab items 1-4
 - Four fired 9mm Luger cartridge casings located at the scene (BCI 1-4, scene 1)
- Lab item 8
 - One fired 9mm bullet jacket fragment (BCI 1, scene 3; recovered from Butler County Coroner's Office; retrieved from left leg exit wound)
- Lab items 9 and 10
 - Two fired jacketed bullets (BCI 1 and 2; scene 3; recovered from the Butler County Coroner's Office; retrieved from the involved subject's back and head during autopsy)
- Lab item 6
 - One lead bullet core (BCI 7.1, scene 1; recovered from the involved subject's clothing by the BCI Crime Scene Unit)

SA Seitzman reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

- Middletown Police ██████████ ██████████ Glock 45 duty pistol was determined to be operable.
- ██████████ ██████████ duty pistol was identified as the source of the four fired 9mm Luger cartridge casings located at the scene (BCI 1-4, scene 1).

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.

- [REDACTED] duty pistol was also identified as the source of the two fired jacketed bullets recovered during the autopsy (BCI 1 and 2; scene 3).
- The lead bullet core recovered from the involved subject's clothing was unsuitable for testing.
- The involved subject's Ruger LC9 pistol was determined to be operable.

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: 24-127340 FA report

Exhibit 1



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

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

BCI Laboratory Number: 24-127340

Analysis Date:
January 16, 2025

Issue Date:
January 27, 2025

Agency Case Number: 2024-4066
BCI Agent: Holly Ryczek

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

Submitted on 12/27/2024 by Holly Ryczek

1. One manila envelope containing cartridge case BCI 1, scene 1
- *one (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
2. One manila envelope containing cartridge case BCI 2, scene 1
- *one (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
3. One manila envelope containing cartridge case BCI item 3, scene 1
- *one (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
4. One manila envelope containing cartridge case BCI item 4, scene 1
- *one (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
5. White box containing firearm serial number 45381159 with magazine and cartridges in living room BCI 5, scene 1
- *one (1) Ruger model LC9s, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number 453-81159, with one (1) magazine and seven (7) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges*
6. One manila envelope containing projectile recovered from clothing BCI 7.1, scene 1
- *one (1) lead bullet core*
7. White box containing firearm and magazine with cartridges serial number [REDACTED] streamlight with serial [REDACTED] BCI item 1 Scene 2
- *one (1) Glock model 45, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) flashlight attached, one (1) magazine, and eighteen (18) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges*

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. One manila envelope containing projectile from body BCI 1, scene 3
- *one (1) fired bullet jacket fragment*
9. One manila envelope containing projectile from body BCI 2, scene 3
- *one (1) fired jacketed bullet*
10. One manila envelope containing projectile from body BCI 3, scene 3
- *one (1) fired jacketed bullet*

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 7: Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 1 - 4: four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 8: one (1) fired bullet jacket fragment	Source Identification
	Items 9 and 10: two (2) fired jacketed bullets	

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 5: Ruger pistol	N/A	Operable

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 6: one (1) lead bullet core	N/A	Unsuitable [^]

[^]Insufficient class and/or individual characteristics present.

Remarks

Six (6) of the eighteen (18) submitted cartridges from Item 7 were used for test firing.

The remaining submitted items from Items 5 and 7 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, physical, 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. Results relate only to the items tested.

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

Andrew D. McClelland
Statement of Qualifications
andrew.mcclelland@OhioAGO.gov

Education

- Bachelor's Degree, Biochemistry; 2004. Otterbein College; Westerville, Ohio.

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Firearms. 2012 – Present.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Latent Prints. 2005 – 2012.

Selected Specialized Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Firearms Training. 2012-2013.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Latent Print Training. 2005-2006.

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated: 04/19/2024