



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: Akron Police Department
Det. Steve Snyder
217 South High Street
Akron, OH 44308

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-32250

Analysis Date:
March 16, 2022

Issue Date:
March 25, 2022

Agency Case Number: 2022-00021681

BCI Agent: Justin Soroka

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s):

Victim(s):

Submitted on March 15, 2022 by Det. William Suggett:

1. One box containing firearm (Serial #**REDACT**) along with magazine and cartridges
-One (1) Aero Precision 5.56 NATO semi-automatic rifle, model X15, serial number **REDACT**, one (1) loaded magazine containing twenty-five (25) cartridges and one (1) cartridge.
2. One box containing firearm (Serial #**REDACTED**) along with magazine and cartridges
-One (1) Glock 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model 17 Gen5, serial number **REDACTED** one (1) loaded magazine containing fifteen (15) cartridges and one (1) cartridge.
3. One box containing firearm (Serial #129-096165) with magazine
-One (1) Heckler & Koch 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model P30, serial number 129-096165 and one (1) empty magazine.
4. Brown paper bag containing cartridge casings
-Ten (10) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.
5. Brown paper bag containing cartridge casings
-Two (2) fired 5.56 NATO cartridge cases.
6. Brown paper bag containing bullets
-Two (2) fired bullets and a fragment.
7. Brown paper bag containing bullets
-Seven (7) fired bullets and seven (7) fragments.

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 bullets
 -One (1) fired bullet.
- 9. One manila envelope containing bullets
 -One (1) fired bullet.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #1-Aero Precision 5.56 NATO rifle	N/A	Operable
	Item #5-Two (2) fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item #6-Fired bullet (hallway wall)	Inconclusive*
	Item #8-Fired bullet (Right chest of Lawrence Rodgers)	Inconclusive*
Item #2-Glock 9mm Luger pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item #4-Two (2) fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item #6-Fired bullet (dining room wall)	Source Identification
	Item #9-Fired bullet (Left arm of Lawrence Rodgers)	Source Identification
	Item #7-Seven (7) bullets (Raymond Jones' autopsy and shirt)	Source Exclusion
Item #3-Heckler & Koch 9mm Luger pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item #4-Ten (10) fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item #7-Seven (7) bullets (Raymond Jones' autopsy and shirt)	Inconclusive*

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

Remarks

Six (6) submitted cartridges from Items #1 and 2 were used for testing. Six (6) BCI supplied cartridges were used for testing Item #3. One (1) of the test fired cartridge cases from Item #3 was entered and searched in the NIBIN database. If any investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

The fragments in Items #6 and 7 were not examined.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Michael E. Roberts
Forensic Scientist
(234) 400-3652
michael.roberts@OhioAGO.gov

%"\$"!."*%')%ff%ff")ff!*#%)"!(f!\$*f!)!1

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/O9VQHL5>

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