



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



2024-4082  
Officer Involved Critical Incident - (L) 303 S. Main St.,  
Celina, Ohio

**Investigative Activity:** Lab Results Review  
**Involves:** Dep. Spencer Heintz  
**Activity Date:** 02/04/2025  
**Activity Location:** 750 N. College St. Bowling Green, OH 43402  
**Authoring Agent:** SA Douglas Burke #162

**Narrative:**

On Friday, January 31, 2025, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Douglas Burke (SA Burke) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on January 7, 2025 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 25-20039). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Kevin Kramer. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. Items 1-5, 9mm Luger Fired Cartridge Cases
2. Item 6, 1 Glock Model 45, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED], with 1 magazine and 13, 9 mm Luger cartridges.
3. Item 7, 1 fired bullet taken from Moses Alik at autopsy.
4. Item 8, 1 fired bullet obtained from Coldwater Hospital.

SA Burke reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

In reviewing the Lab Results, the Glock Model 45 semi-automatic pistol fired by Dep. Spencer Heintz was found to be Operable. The Glock Model 45 fired by Dep. Heintz also was found to be the source firearm of items 1-5, as well as Item 7 recovered from the autopsy and Item 8 recovered from Coldwater Hospital.

A copy of the Ohio BCI Laboratory report is attached to this investigative report. Please refer to the attachment for further details.

**Attachments: 01# Lab Results from Dep. Heintz's Firearm, recovered fired casings, and fired bullets**



# DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

**Bureau of Criminal Investigation**

**Laboratory Report**  
**Firearms**

To: BCI / Bowling Green  
Douglas Burke  
750 N. College Drive  
Bowling Green, OH 43402

BCI Laboratory Number: 25-20039

Analysis Date: January 13, 2025

Issue Date: January 27, 2025

Agency Case Number: 2024-4082

BCI Agent: David Hammond

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s):

Victim(s):

**Submitted on 01/07/2025 by Douglas Burke**

1. One manila envelope containing cartridge case  
- *One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case*
2. One manila envelope containing cartridge case  
- *One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case*
3. One manila envelope containing cartridge case  
- *One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case*
4. One manila envelope containing cartridge case  
- *One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case*
5. One manila envelope containing cartridge case  
- *One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case*
6. White box containing firearm Model 45, S/N: [REDACTED]  
- *One (1) Glock model 45, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED]  
with one (1) magazine and thirteen (13) 9mm Luger cartridges*
7. Plastic bag containing fired bullet taken from Alik Moses at autopsy  
- *One (1) fired bullet*
8. Brown paper bag containing fired bullet from hospital  
- *One (1) fired 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 6 Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 1-5 (5) 9mm Luger fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Items 7 and 8 (2) 9mm Luger fired bullets	Source Identification

## **Remarks**

Two (2) of the submitted cartridges from Item 6 were used for test firing.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

## **Analytical Detail**

Analytical findings offered above were determined using visual, physical, and microscopic examinations / comparisons.



Kevin Kramer  
Forensic Scientist  
(419) 419-3584  
kevin.kramer@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/QLNQ3SY>

### 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)

Kevin Kramer  
**Statement of Qualifications**  
Kevin.Kramer@OhioAGO.gov

---

**Education**

- Master of Science in Forensic Science. May 2011. Marshall University. Huntington, WV.
- Bachelors of Science in Forensic Science. May 2008. The University of Findlay. Findlay, OH.

**Professional Experience**

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist. Firearms Unit. August 2013-Present.
- Columbus Division of Police Crime Laboratory. Forensic Scientist. Firearms Unit. June 2011- August 2013.

**Required Technical Training**

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Firearms. 2013-2014

**Memberships**

- Association of Firearm & Toolmark Examiners. Regular Member. April 2018-Present

Updated 04/02/2024      *A complete CV can be made available upon request*