

Investigative Report

2021-1772

Officer Involved Critical Incident - 300 Wood Street Apt. A8, Mansfield, OH



Investigative Activity: Laboratory Results

Authoring Agent: SA Cory Momchilov #64

Special Agent (SA) Cory Momchilov (Momchilov) received laboratory results for the previously submitted items of evidence.

DNA



Item	DNA Conclusions
7.1 Swab of stain on blade	Presumptive positive for blood
	Mixture (1 major contributor)
	Major – consistent with:
	• Jaron Von Ginn – The estimated frequency of occurrence of
	the major DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1 trillion ^① unrelated individuals.
	James Haynes – not the major contributor
	The remainder of the mixture contains DNA that is not of
	sufficient quality for comparison to a standard from any
	individua l.

Item	DNA Conclusions
7.3 Swab of handle of knife	Mixture (1 major contributor)
	Major – consistent with:
	• Jaron Von Ginn – The estimated frequency of occurrence of
	the major DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1 trillion ^① unrelated individuals.
	James Haynes – not the major contributor
	The remainder of the mixture contains DNA that is not of
	sufficient quality for comparison to a standard from any
	individua l.



Investigative Report

2021-1772

OH







9.1 Swab from suspected bodily fluid from closet off kitchen

Presumptive positive for blood DNA profile consistent with Jaron Von Ginn – The estimated frequency of occurrence of the DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1 trillion¹ unrelated individuals. James Hayes - excluded




10.1 Swab of suspected bodily fluid from carpet living room

Presumptive positive for blood DNA profile consistent with James Haynes – The estimated frequency of occurrence of the DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1 trillion¹ unrelated individuals. Jaron Von Ginn – excluded



Investigative Report

2021-1772





Latent Prints

Findings

An examination of item #7 (knife piece) did not reveal any latent prints that contain sufficient ridge detail for comparison purposes.

The remainder of item #7 (knife pieces) were not suitable for latent print examination.

Firearms

Sig Sauer pistol-SN: belonging to Officer Blair

A total of eleven (11) fired cartridge cases returned to Officer Blair's firearm.

Crime Scene #1




Crime Scene #2





Investigative Report







Crime Scene #28



Crime Scene #10




Crime Scene #12





Investigative Report







Crime Scene #13





Crime Scene #14




Crime Scene #15





Investigative Report







Crime Scene #16



Crime Scene #17




Crime Scene #18





Investigative Report







A total of five (5) recovered projectiles originated from Officer Blair's firearms. Four (4) projectiles were recovered from the scene and one (1) projectile was recovered from James Haynes.

Crime Scene #6




Crime Scene #7





Investigative Report







Crime Scene #8



Crime Scene #27



• Projectile recovered from Medial left thigh of James Haynes.



Investigative Report

2021-1772

Officer Involved Critical Incident - 300 Wood Street Apt. A8, Mansfield, OH



Sig Sauer pistol-SN: belonging to Officer Boggs

A total of nine (9) fired cartridge cases returned to Officer Boggs' firearm.

Crime Scene #9




Crime Scene #20





Investigative Report







Crime Scene #21



Crime Scene #22




THE THE PARTY OF T

Ohio Attorney General's Office Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Investigative Report







Crime Scene #23



Crime Scene #24




TOTAL TOTAL OF THE STATE OF THE

Ohio Attorney General's Office Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Investigative Report







Crime Scene #26



Crime Scene #29



Crime Scene #34





Investigative Report

2021-1772

Officer Involved Critical Incident - 300 Wood Street Apt. A8, Mansfield, OH



A total of five (5) recovered projectiles originated from Officer Boggs' firearms. One (1) projectile was recovered from the scene and four (4) projectiles were recovered from James Haynes.

Crime Scene #25



- Projectile recovered from right upper arm of James Haynes
- Projectile recovered from post lat upper abdomen of James Haynes
- Projectile recovered from right buttock of James Haynes
- Projectile recovered from right upper arm of James Haynes

Copies of the Ohio BCI Laboratory reports are attached to this Investigative Report.



Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report

DNA

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office BCI Laboratory Number: 21-37831

S/A Cory Momchilov 30 E. Broad Street

Broad Street Analysis Date: Issue Date:

Columbus, OH 43215 September 2, 2021 September 23, 2021

Agency Case Number: 2021-1772

BCI Agent: Cory Momchilov

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): Victim(s):

Submitted on August 06, 2021 by S/A Andrew Harasimchuk:

- 7. One box containing broken knife with suspected bodily fluid recovered from the scene (Matrix Item #32)
- 9. Envelope containing swab from suspected bodily fluid from closet off kitchen recovered from scene (Matrix Item #35)
- 10. Envelope containing swab of suspected bodily fluid from carpet living room recovered from scene (Matrix Item #36)
- 13. Envelope containing DNA standard from Jaron Von Ginn (Matrix Item #45)
- 19. Envelope containing DNA blood card from James Haynes (Matrix Item #56)

Item	DNA Conclusions
7.1 Swab of stain on blade	Presumptive positive for blood
	Mixture (1 major contributor)
	Major – consistent with:
	• Jaron Von Ginn – The estimated frequency of occurrence of
	the major DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1 trillion ^① unrelated
	individuals.
	James Haynes – not the major contributor
	The remainder of the mixture contains DNA that is not of
	sufficient quality for comparison to a standard from any
	individua l.

¹ Based on the national database provided by the National Institute of Standards and Technology

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

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation BCI&I Richfield

Lab Case: 21-37831 Date: September 23, 2021 Agency Case: 2021-1772

Item	DNA Conclusions
7.3 Swab of handle of knife	Mixture (1 major contributor)
	Major – consistent with:
	• Jaron Von Ginn – The estimated frequency of occurrence of
	the major DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1 trillion ^① unrelated individuals.
	James Haynes – not the major contributor
	The remainder of the mixture contains DNA that is not of
	sufficient quality for comparison to a standard from any
	individua l.
9.1 Swab from suspected bodily fluid	Presumptive positive for blood
from closet off kitchen	DNA profile consistent with Jaron Von Ginn – The estimated
	frequency of occurrence of the DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1
	trillion ^① unrelated individuals.
	James Hayes – excluded
10.1 Swab of suspected bodily fluid from	Presumptive positive for blood
carpet living room	DNA profile consistent with James Haynes – The estimated
	frequency of occurrence of the DNA profile is rarer than 1 in 1
	trillion ^① unrelated individuals.
	Jaron Von Ginn – excluded
13.1 DNA standard from Jaron Von Ginn	Profile used for comparison purposes
19.1 DNA standard from James Haynes	Profile used for comparison purposes

¹ Based on the national database provided by the National Institute of Standards and Technology

Remarks

Item 7.1 was consumed during analysis. Additional sample from the other items is available should independent analysis be requested. All remaining items will be returned to the submitting agency. The remaining DNA extracts will be retained by the laboratory.

An eligible DNA profile (Item 19.1) has been entered into the CODIS database in accordance with state and national regulations, where regular searches will be performed. If investigative information becomes available or a profile is removed from CODIS, your agency will be notified.

Analytical Detail

Presumptive analysis for blood was performed using chemical testing.

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation BCI&I Richfield

Lab Case: 21-37831 Date: September 23, 2021 Agency Case: 2021-1772

DNA profiling was performed using PCR with the GlobalFiler® STR kit on samples from Items 7, 9, 10, 13, and



Michelle Matozel Forensic Scientist (234) 400-3701

michelle.matozel@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

Your feedback is important to us! Please complete our Laboratory Satisfaction Survey at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q9VQHL5



Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report
Latent Prints

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office

S/A Cory Momchilov 30 E. Broad Street

Columbus, OH 43215

Analysis Date:

BCI Laboratory Number:

Issue Date:

21-37831

September 02, 2021

September 02, 2021

Agency Case Number:

2021-1772

BCI Agent:

Cory Momchilov

Offense:

Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): Victim(s):

Submitted on August 06, 2021 by S/A Andrew Harasimchuk:

- 7. One box containing broken knife with suspected bodily fluid recovered from the scene (Matrix Item #32)
 - 7.2. Digital images from item #7

Findings

An examination of item #7 (knife piece) did not reveal any latent prints that contain sufficient ridge detail for comparison purposes.

The remainder of item #7 (knife pieces) were not suitable for latent print examination.

Remarks

The evidence is being returned to your department for retention. Digital images were retained at BCI.

Analytical Detail

Item #7 (knife piece) was visually, chemically and/or physically examined for the presence of latent prints.

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

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation BCI&I Richfield

Lab Case: 21-37831 Date: September 2, 2021 Agency Case: 2021-1772

Rachel E. Keaton Forensic Scientist

RAZ

(234) 400-3677

Rachel.Keaton@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/Q9VQHL5



Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report
Firearms

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office BCI Laboratory Number: 21-37831

S/A Cory Momchilov
30 E. Broad Street Analysis Date:

Columbus, OH 43215 October 27, 2021 November 02, 2021

Agency Case Number: 2021-1772

Issue Date:

BCI Agent: Cory Momchilov

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): Victim(s):

Submitted on August 06, 2021 by S/A Andrew Harasimchuk:

- 1. Envelope containing cartridge casings (Matrix Item #1)
 -Twenty (20) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.
- 2. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #6) One (1) fired bullet.
- 3. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #7) One (1) fired bullet.
- 4. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #8)

 -One (1) fired bullet.
- 5. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #25)

 -One (1) fired bullet.
- 6. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #27)

 -One (1) fired bullet.
- 8. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #33)
 - -One (1) bullet fragment.
- 11. One box containing firearm (serial number recovered from the scene (Matrix Item 37)
 - -One (1) Sig Sauer 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model P320, serial number three (3) magazines and a total of forty (40) 9mm Luger cartridges.
- 12. One box containing firearm (serial number with cartridg es and magazine

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

recovered from the scene - serial number actually found to be Matrix Item

- -One (1) Sig Sauer 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model P320, serial number three (3) magazines and forty-three (43) 9mm Luger cartridges.
- 14. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #47)
 - -One (1) fired bullet.
- 15. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #48)
 One (1) fired bullet.
- 16. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #50)
 One (1) fired bullet.
- 17. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #53)
 One (1) fired bullet.
- 18. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #55)
 -One (1) fired bullet.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #11: Sig Sauer pistol (SN#	N/A	Operable
	Item #1: Eleven (11) fired cartridge cases (E1, E2, E4-E11, E18)	Source Identification
	Items #2, 3, 4, 6 & 16: Each cont. one (1) fired bullet	Source Identification
Item #12: Sig Sauer pistol (SN#	N/A	Operable
	Item #1: Nine (9) fired cartridge cases (E3, E12-E17, E19-E20)	Source Identification
	Items #5, 14, 15, 17 & 18: Each cont. one (1) fired bullet	Source Identification

Remarks

Item #8 was examined and determined to be a bullet fragment. Therefore, Item #8 was not examined at this time.

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

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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

21-37831

2021-1772

Lab Case:

Agency Case:

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation BCI&I Richfield

Lab Case: 21-37831 Date: November 2, 2021 Agency Case: 2021-1772

Jonathan P. Gardner

Forensic Scientist

(234) 400-3651

Joth Lal

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/Q9VQHL5

Lab Case: 21-37831 Date: November 2, 2021 Agency Case: 2021-1772

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

 $\underline{abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov}$