



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: 22-30198

Analysis Date:
January 10, 2022

Issue Date:
January 13, 2022

Agency Case Number: 2021-00163083

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer
Subject(s): James Warren Gross
Victim(s): Mary Alice Gross

Submitted on January 07, 2022 by Det. William Suggett:

- 5. One manila envelope containing cartridge casings
-Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.
- 6. One manila envelope containing bullet
-One (1) fired bullet.
- 7. One manila envelope containing bullet
-One (1) fired bullet.
- 8. One box containing Glock 9mm semi-automatic pistol, Model: 17, Serial #BBDC582 along with magazine and cartridges
-One (1) Glock 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model 17 Gen4, serial number BBDC582, one (1) magazine and sixteen (16) 9mm Luger cartridges.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #8: One (1) Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item #5: Two (2) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.	Source Identification
	Item #6: One (1) fired bullet.	Inconclusive*
	Item #7: One (1) fired bullet.	Source Identification

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

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

Test fired specimens from law enforcement firearms are not entered into the NIBIN database.

Four (4) submitted cartridges from Item #8 were used to test the Glock pistol.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Jonathan P. Gardner
Forensic Scientist
(234) 400-3651
jon.gardner@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/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