



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



2025-0596

Officer Involved Critical Incident – 236 McKinley Ave, Piqua, OH
(Miami County) (L)

Investigative Activity: Information Provided/Obtained

Involves: Lieutenant Marcos Rodriguez (S)

Date of Activity: 04/25/2025

Author: SA David Hornyak, #112

Narrative:

On April 25, 2025, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent Dave Hornyak, received a BCI Laboratory report on the analysis of the duty pistol, cartridge casings, and projectiles involved in the critical incident that resulted in the death of David West. The report stated that the firearm was operable and was also verified to be the source of casings and projectiles collected from the scene.

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

References:

No references.

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: Lab 25-15828 FA 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.

Exhibit 1



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: BCI / Madison
David Hornyak
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 25-15828

Analysis Date:
April 14, 2025

Issue Date:
April 21, 2025

Agency Case Number: 2025-0596
BCI Agent: Amy Gill

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

Submitted on 02/24/2025 by Amy Crucey

1. One manila envelope containing Cartridge casing
 - Four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases
2. One manila envelope containing projectile
 - One (1) fired bullet jacket
3. One cardboard box containing firearm
 - One (1) Sig Sauer model P320, 9mm Luger, semi-automatic pistol, serial number: [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and fourteen (14) unfired cartridges
4. Brown paper bag containing projectile
 - Three (3) fired bullets

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 3: Sig Sauer pistol SN: [REDACTED]	N/A	Operable
	Item 1: Four (4) fired cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 2 and Item 4: One (1) fired bullet jacket and 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

Remarks

The remaining submitted items from Item 3 were not examined/compared at this time.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Kelsey Cramer, FA-AFTE
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845 - 2627
Kelsey.Cramer@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

Kelsey Cramer
Statement of Qualifications
Kelsey.Cramer@OhioAGO.gov

Education

- Bachelor of Science, Forensic and Investigative Science, Minors in Anthropology and Biology.
May 2013. West Virginia University. Morgantown, West Virginia

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation. Firearm and Tool Mark Examiner. Firearm Section. October 2022 – Present.
- Hamilton County Coroner’s Office Crime Laboratory. Firearm and Tool Mark Examiner. Firearm Section. August 2019 – October 2022.
- Arkansas State Crime Laboratory. Firearm and Tool Mark Examiner. Firearm Section. January 2014 – August 2019.
- San Francisco Police Department Crime Laboratory. Firearm and Tool Mark Intern. Firearm Section. May 2012 – August 2012.

Required Technical Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation. Firearm Training. 2022.

Memberships

- Association of Firearms and Tool Mark Examiners. Regular Member. June 2018 – Present.
- Association of Firearms and Tool Mark Examiners. Provisional Member. 2014 – June 2018.

Certifications

- Association of Firearms and Tool Mark Examiners (AFTE). Firearm Evidence Examination and Identification (FA-AFTE).
November 2024 – Present.

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated 11/04/2024