



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



2022-2016

Officer-Involved Critical Incident - 5611 East Third Street, Mineral City,
OH, Tuscarawas County, 44656

Investigative Activity: Firearms Analysis Lab Report Received and Reviewed

Activity Date: 11/14/2022

Authoring Agent: Special Agent Joseph Goudy #83

Narrative:

On Monday, November 14, 2022, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Joseph Goudy (Goudy) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on October 12, 2022, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 22-39390). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Andrew Chappell. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #001)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
2. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #002)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
3. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #003)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
4. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #004)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
5. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #005)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
6. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #006)
-One (1) 223 Remington fired cartridge case.
7. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #007)
-One (1) 223 Remington fired cartridge case.
8. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix Item #013)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
9. One box containing firearm (Serial# 1C151792) with cartridge and magazine recovered from the scene (Matrix Item #020)
-One (1) Taurus 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model G2C, serial number 1C151792; one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) 9mm Luger cartridge; and one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) magazine and one (1) envelope containing ten (10) 9mm Luger cartridges.



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



2022-2016

Officer-Involved Critical Incident - 5611 East Third Street, Mineral City,
 OH, Tuscarawas County, 44656

10. One box containing firearm (SN: [REDACTED] with cartridge and magazine (Matrix Item #022)
 -One (1) Smith & Wesson 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model M&P9, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) magazine; one (1) plastic jar containing one (1) 9mm Luger cartridge; and one (1) manila envelope containing eleven (11) 9mm Luger cartridges.
11. One box containing firearm (SN: [REDACTED] with cartridge and magazine (Matrix Item #024)
 -One (1) Colt 5.56mm select-fire rifle, model M-16A1, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) 223 Remington cartridge; and one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) magazine and twenty-four (24) 223 Remington cartridges.

SA Goudy reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #9 – Taurus pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item #8 – one (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case	Source Identification
Item #10 – Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items #1 – 5 – five (5) 9mm Luger fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
Item #11 – Colt rifle	N/A	Operable
	Items #6 & 7 – two (2) 223 Remington fired cartridge cases	Source Identification

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: Ohio Attorney General's Office
Dan Boerner
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-39390

Analysis Date:
October 31, 2022

Issue Date:
November 03, 2022

Agency Case Number:
BCI Agent:

2022-2016
Joseph Goudy

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer
Subject(s):
Victim(s):

Submitted on October 12, 2022 by Dan Boerner:

1. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-1)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
2. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-2)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
3. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-3)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
4. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-4)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
5. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-5)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
6. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-6)
-One (1) 223 Remington fired cartridge case.
7. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-7)
-One (1) 223 Remington fired cartridge case.
8. Envelope containing cartridge case (CS-13)
-One (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case.
9. One box containing firearm (Serial# 1C151792) with cartridge and magazine recovered

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

from the scene

-One (1) Taurus 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model G2C, serial number 1C151792; one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) 9mm Luger cartridge; and one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) magazine and one (1) envelope containing ten (10) 9mm Luger cartridges.

10. One box containing firearm (SN: [REDACTED] with cartridge and magazine (Matrix 22)
-One (1) Smith & Wesson 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model M&P9, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) magazine; one (1) plastic jar containing one (1) 9mm Luger cartridge; and one (1) manila envelope containing eleven (11) 9mm Luger cartridges.

11. One box containing firearm (SN: [REDACTED] with cartridge and magazine (Matrix 24)
-One (1) Colt 5.56mm select-fire rifle, model M-16A1, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) 223 Remington cartridge; and one (1) manila envelope containing one (1) magazine and twenty-four (24) 223 Remington cartridges.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #9 – Taurus pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item #8 – one (1) 9mm Luger fired cartridge case	Source Identification
Item #10 – Smith & Wesson pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items #1 – 5 – five (5) 9mm Luger fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
Item #11 – Colt rifle	N/A	Operable
	Items #6 & 7 – two (2) 223 Remington fired cartridge cases	Source Identification

Remarks

Two (2) BCI supplied cartridges were used for testing Item #9. One (1) of the cartridge cases was entered and searched in the NIBIN database. If investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

Four (4) of the submitted cartridges were used for testing Item #10. Test fired specimens from a law enforcement officer’s duty weapon are not entered into the NIBIN database.

Four (4) of the submitted cartridges were used for testing Item #11. Test fired specimens from a law enforcement officer’s duty weapon are not entered into the NIBIN database.

Item #11 was determined to be operable in both semi-automatic and automatic firing modes.

There were no pertinent findings with regard to the submitted cartridges from Item #9.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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

Andrew S. Chappell

Andrew Chappell
Forensic Scientist
(234) 400-3650
andrew.chappell@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/Q9VQHL5>

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