



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



2024-0590  
Officer Involved Critical Incident – 500 N. Nelson Road,  
Columbus, Ohio 43219

**Investigative Activity:** Records Received, Review of Records

**Involves:** [REDACTED]

**Date of Activity:** 03/25/2024

**Author:** SA Ryan D. Scheiderer, #89

**Narrative:**

On March 25, 2024, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation (BCI) Special Agent Ryan Scheiderer (SA Scheiderer) reviewed a Firearms report he received from the BCI Laboratory dated March 18, 2024, documenting the findings regarding the fired cartridge cases and fired projectiles submitted for examination against Columbus Division of Police (CPD) [REDACTED] s ([REDACTED] s) Smith & Wesson M&P 2.0 9mm pistol (S/N [REDACTED]).

In summary, all three (3) fired cartridge cases recovered from the incident scene and all three (3) fired bullets recovered from autopsy of Colin Jennings (Jennings) were source matched to [REDACTED] s duty pistol (See Attached Firearms Report (Attachment # 1) for complete details).

**Attachments:**

Attachment # 01: RPT-24-11819-103252024100520WXXPHSQGMP (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 S/A Ryan Scheiderer 1560 S.R. 56 SW London, OH 43140	BCI Laboratory Number:	24-11819
		Analysis Date:	Issue Date: March 13, 2024 March 18, 2024
		Agency Case Number:	2024-0590
		BCI Agent:	Aja Chung
Offense:	Shooting Involving an Officer		
Subject(s):	N/A		
Victim(s):	N/A		

**Submitted on February 22, 2024 by Aja Chung:**

1. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases (BCI #1, Scene #1)
  - *Three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
2. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] magazine and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #1)
  - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, semi-automatic pistol, serial # [REDACTED]*
  - *Forty-nine (49) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges*
  - *Three (3) magazines*

**Submitted on February 28, 2024 by Amy Gill:**

3. One manila envelope containing fired projectiles from autopsy of Colin Jennings (Scene #4, item #1)
  - *Three (3) fired bullets*

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 cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 3: Three (3) fired bullets	Source Identification

**Remarks**

Six (6) of the forty-nine (49) submitted cartridges from item 2 were used for test firing.

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.



Krystal Soles  
Forensic Scientist  
(740) 845-2127  
Krystal.Soles@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)