

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



2024-1513 Officer Involved Critical Incident - 6382 Georges Creek Drive,

Columbus, OH 43110 (L)

investigative Activity. Document neview, necolas neceived	nvestigative Activity:	Document Review,	, Records Received
---	------------------------	------------------	--------------------

Involves: Rafael Warfield (S)

Date of Activity: 06/03/2024

Author: SA Chad Holcomb, #61

Narrative:

On Monday, June 03, 2024, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Chad Holcomb (SA Holcomb) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on May 17, 2024 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 24–14538). The report originated from the Firearms Section of the Laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Krystal Soles.

SA Holcomb reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

The BCM Rifle which was used by Columbus Division of Police (CPD), was operable. The twelve (12) fired .223 REM casings recovered at the scene were *source identified* to the BCM rifle.

The Taurus pistol (SN: ACL505405), which was found next to Rafael Warfield (Warfield), was operable. The two (2) fired .40 caliber S&W casings recovered at the scene were *source identified* to the Taurus pistol.

BCI DNA Forensic Scientist Kristen Newland took swabs of the Taurus pistol (SN: ACL505405, BCI #3), and the two .40 caliber casings (BCI #4 & 5). The swabs were collected for DNA analysis if the necessity arises.

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

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: 24–14538 FA report

Attachment # 02: 24–14538 OPER report (2) Attachment # 03: 24–14538 FB report (2)

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.



Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report Firearms

To: BCI / Madison BCI Laboratory Number: 24-14538

Chad Holcomb 1560 S.R. 56 SW London, OH 43140

Analysis Date: Issue Date: May 28, 2024 May 30, 2024

Agency Case Number: 2024-1513 BCI Agent: Sarah Taylor

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): N/A
Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on May 17, 2024 by Sarah Taylor:

- 1. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing from roadway behind apartment (BCI#1/Scene#1)
 - Twelve (12) fired .223 rem cartridge cases.
- 2. White box containing firearm serial # from officer (BCI #2/ Scene #1)
 - One (1) BCM model BCM4, 5.56mm Nato semi-automatic rifle, serial number, with one (1) magazine and eighteen (18) unfired .223 rem cartridges.
- 3. White box containing firearm serial #ACL505405 from back porch (BCI #3/ Scene #1)
 - One (1) Taurus model TH 40, 40 S&W, semi-automatic pistol, serial number ACL505405, with one (1) magazine and thirteen (13) unfired 40 S&W cartridges.
- 4. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing from back porch (BCI #4/ Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 40 S&W cartridge case.
- 5. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing from back porch (BCI#5/ Scene#1)
 - One (1) fired 40 S&W cartridge case.

Please address inquiries to the office indicated, using the BCI case number.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 2:	N/A	Operable
BCM rifle	Item 1: Twelve (12) fired .223 rem cartridge cases	Source Identification
Item 3:	N/A	Operable
Taurus pistol (ACL505405)	Items 4 and 5: Two (2) fired 40 S&W cartridge cases	Source Identification

Remarks

Six (6) of the eighteen (18) submitted cartridges from item 2 were used for test firing.

The remaining submitted items from items 2 and 3 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.

Krystal Soles Forensic Scientist (740) 845-2127

Krystal.Soles@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/Q7V2N6H

24-14538

2024-1513

Lab Case:

Agency Case:

Lab Case: 24-14538 Agency Case: 2024-1513

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



Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report
Operability

To: BCI / Madison

Chad Holcomb

1560 S.R. 56 SW London, OH 43140 BCI Laboratory Number: 24-14

24-14538

Analysis Date: May 20, 2024

Issue Date: May 22, 2024

Agency Case Number: BCI Agent:

2024-1513 Sarah Taylor

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): N/A Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on May 17, 2024 by Sarah Taylor:

3. White box containing firearm serial #ACL505405 from back porch (BCI #3/ Scene #1)

- One (1) Taurus model TH40, semi-automatic 40 S&W pistol, serial number ACL505405, with a magazine.

- Thirteen (13) unfired 40 S&W cartridges.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #3:	N/A	Operable
Taurus pistol	17/1	Operation

Remarks

The remaining submitted items were not examined at this time.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Please address inquiries to the office indicated, using the BCI case number.

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation BCI&I London Date: May 22, 2024

Analytical Detail

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

Lab Case:

Agency Case:

24-14538

2024-1513

Akushee 1. Soln

Alexander Salmons Forensic Science Lab Tech (740) 845-2050

Alexander.Salmons@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/Q7V2N6H

Lab Case: 24-14538 Agency Case: 2024-1513

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



Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report

DNA

To: BCI / Madison BCI Laboratory Number: 24-14538

Chad Holcomb

1560 S.R. 56 SW Analysis Date: Issue Date: London, OH 43140 May 21, 2024 May 22, 2024

> Agency Case Number: 2024-1513 BCI Agent: Sarah Taylor

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): Victim(s):

Submitted on May 17, 2024 by Sarah Taylor:

- 3. White box containing firearm serial #ACL505405 from back porch (BCI #3/ Scene #1)
- 4. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing from back porch (BCI #4/ Scene #1)
- 5. One manila envelope containing cartridge casing from back proch (BCI#5/ Scene#1)

Item	Conclusions
3 firearm	
3.1 Swab of "unstained" portion of trigger	
3.2 Swab of trigger with staining	
3.3 Swab of grip with staining	
3.4 Swab of back slide with staining	Presumptive positive for blood
3.5 Swab of front sight with staining	Sample collected for DNA analysis
3.6 Swab of body of magazine with staining	
3.7 Swab of "unstained" portion body of	
magazine	
3.8 Swab of grip with staining from left side	
- Cartridges (13)	Not examined
Trace debris from Item 3	Not examined
4 cartridge casing	
4.1 Swab of cartridge casing	Sample collected for DNA analysis
5 cartridge casing	
5.1 Swab of cartridge casing	Sample collected for DNA analysis

Remarks

All evidence items are being returned to the submitting agency. Samples have been collected for possible future DNA analysis.

Analytical Detail

Presumptive analysis for blood was performed using chemical testing.

Please address inquiries to the office indicated, using the BCI case number.

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation BCI&I London Date: May 22, 2024

Kristen Newland Forensic Scientist (740) 845-2509

Kristen.Newland@OhioAGO.gov

Based on visual examination and 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.

Lab Case:

Agency Case:

24-14538

2024-1513

Your feedback is important to us! Please complete our Laboratory Satisfaction Survey at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q7V2N6H