



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To:	BCI / Madison Richard Ward 1560 S.R. 56 SW London, OH 43140	BCI Laboratory Number:	22-16483
		Analysis Date:	Issue Date: July 14, 2022 July 19, 2022
		Agency Case Number:	2022-1480
		BCI Agent:	Kevin Wagner
Offense:	Shooting Involving an Officer		
Subject(s):	N/A		
Victim(s):	N/A		

Submitted on July 14, 2022 by S/A Kevin Wagner:

1. One manila envelope containing cartridge case found near ATV (BCI #3, Scene #1)
- **One (1) unfired .40 S&W cartridge**
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on ground near passenger side of ATV (BCI #4, Scene #1)
- **One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case**
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on passenger floorboard of ATV 9BCI #5, Scene #1)
- **One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case**
4. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found passenger floorboard of ATV (BCI #6, Scene #1)
- **One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case**
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on ground near front of ATV (BCI #7, Scene #1)
- **One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case**
6. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on ground near Mark Evers (BCI #8, Scene #1)
- **One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case**

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

BCI -Bow ling Green Office
750 North College Drive
Bow ling 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 Pkw y. Suite A
Richfield, OH 44286
Phone:(330)659-4600

7. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on ground near Mark Evers (BCI #9, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
8. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on ground near Mark Evers (BCI #10, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
9. White box containing firearm (serial #66A059202), magazine and cartridges (BCI #11, Scene #1)
 - One (1) Sig Sauer model P365, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number 66A059202 with one (1) magazine and six (6) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
10. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case found on hood of ATV (BCI #13, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
11. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with sight, tactical light, magazine, and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #2)
 - One (1) Glock model 17 Gen 5, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with Holosun sight, Streamlight flash light, one (1) magazine and thirteen (13) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
12. One manila envelope containing fired projectiles (BCI #3, Scene #3)
 - Four (4) fired bullets (12.1B, 12.2B, 12.3B, 12.4B)

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
#9: Sig Sauer pistol	N/A	Operable
	#6, #7, #8, #10: four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
#11: Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	#2, #3, #4, #5: four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	#12 (12.1B, 12.2B, 12.3B, 12.4B): four (4) fired bullets	Source Identification

Remarks

- Four (4) of the thirteen (13) submitted cartridges from item #11 were used for test firing.
- No fired cartridge cases were entered into the NIBIN database.
- The remaining submitted items from items #1, #9 and #11 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.



Heather A. Zollman
Forensic Scientist
740-845-2536
heather.zollman@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/O7V2N6H>

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