



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



2024-2255

Officer Involved Critical Incident - 818 Cherryberry Dr.,
Columbus, OH 43228 (L)

Investigative Activity: Lab Submission Review
Activity Date: 12/05/2024
Activity Location: BCI London Office
Authoring Agent: SA James Poole

Narrative:

On Thursday, August 15, 2024, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent James Poole (SA Poole) received the Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on August 12, 2024 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 24-111028). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Daniel Steiner. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. White box containing one (1) Glock Model 17 gen5, 9mm Luger Semi-Automatic Pistol, Serial Number [REDACTED], with Holosum Optic, one magazine, and fifteen (15) unfired cartridges.
2. One manila envelope containing four (4) fired 9mm cartridge cases.
3. One manila envelope containing one (1) fired projectile recovered from Benjamin Wheeler.

On December 5, 2024, SA Poole reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

Item #1: was source identified to Item #2 and Item #3.

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

References:

None

Attachments:

24-111028 FA report - Lab- Evidence Results (Evidence)

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.



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report
Firearms

To: BCI / Madison
James Poole
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 24-111028

Analysis Date:
August 14, 2024

Issue Date:
August 15, 2024

Agency Case Number: 2024-2255
BCI Agent: Aja Chung

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

Submitted on 08/05/2024 by Aja Chung

1. White box containing firearm with holosun optic, cartridges, and magazine
 - One (1) Glock model 17 Gen5, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with Holosun optic, one (1) magazine, and fifteen (15) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases
 - Four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases

Submitted on 08/12/2024 by Aja Chung

3. One manila envelope containing fired projectile recovered from Benjamin Wheeler
 - One (1) fired bullet

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #1: Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item #2: Four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item #3: One (1) fired bullet	Source Identification

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

ACA

Remarks

Four (4) of the fifteen (15) submitted cartridges from item 1 were used for test firing.

The remaining submitted items from item 1 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.



Daniel Steiner
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2619
daniel.steiner@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

Daniel E. Steiner
Statement of Qualifications
Daniel.Steiner@OhioAGO.gov

Education

- Bachelor of Science, Forensic Science; Minor, Chemistry; 2007. The University of Findlay; Findlay, Ohio.
- Bachelor of Arts, Information Technology; 2005. Bluffton University; Bluffton, Ohio.

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Firearms. 2018 – Present.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Latent Prints. 2010 – 2018.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Technical Specialist, OHLEG. 2008 – 2010.

Selected Specialized Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Firearms Training. 2018-2020.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Latent Print Training. 2010.

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated: 03/22/2024