



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



2021-0584

Officer Involved Critical Incident – Interstate 270 Northbound on
Big Walnut Creek Bridge, Columbus (L)

Investigative Activity: Review of Records
Date of Activity: 04/12/2021
Author: SA James A. Mulford, #39

Narrative:

On March 29, 2021, Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent Jim Mulford (SA Mulford) reviewed two BCI Firearms Laboratory Reports for BCI Lab # 21-12556. Evidence was submitted regarding a fatal shooting incident between Andrew Teague (Teague) and members of the Columbus Division of Police (CPD) and the Franklin County Sheriff's Office (FCSO). Copies of these reports were saved electronically within the case file and are attached to this report.

Two projectiles (fired bullets) retrieved from the body of Andrew Teague during the autopsy were submitted to the BCI Firearms Laboratory. The laboratory report confirms that one fired bullet was confirmed to have been fired from CPD Officer Kifer's Smith & Wesson M&P 2.0 9mm caliber semi-automatic pistol, and the other recovered projectile was identified as being fired from FCSO Deputy Severance's Smith & Wesson 3913 9mm caliber semi-automatic pistol.

Furthermore, all submitted cartridge cases recovered from the scene were confirmed to have been fired from law enforcement or from the recovered pistol believed to have belonged to Andrew Teague.

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: BCI Firearms Report
Attachment # 02: BCI Firearms Report 2



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To:	BCI / Madison Jim Mulford 1560 S.R. 56 SW London, OH 43140	BCI Laboratory Number:	21-12556
		Analysis Date:	Issue Date: March 12, 2021 March 18, 2021
		Agency Case Number:	2021-0584
		BCI Agent:	Chad Holcomb
Offense:	Shooting Involving an Officer		
Subject(s):	N/A		
Victim(s):	N/A		

Submitted on March 08, 2021 by S/A Chad Holcomb:

1. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases found in front of the Chevy truck FVA2014 in #2 lane (BCI item #1)
 - *Two (2) fired 40 S&W cartridge cases.*
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases found in front of other Ram truck 0372FC in #3 lane (BCI #2)
 - *Three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge cases found in #1 lane (BCI #3)
 - *Five (5) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases.*
4. White box containing firearm with magazine and cartridges (BCI #4)
 - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model SD40VE, 40 S&W semi-automatic pistol, serial number obliterated, with one (1) magazine and eight (8) unfired 40 S&W cartridges.*
5. One manila envelope containing projectile from the front driver side door frame of the Acura (M099588)
 - *One (1) fired jacketed bullet.*
6. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED]) with magazine and cartridges (BCI #6)
 - *One (1) Smith & Wesson model 3913, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and six (6) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.*

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

7. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazine and cartridges (BCI #7)
 - One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and thirteen (13) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 4: S&W SD40VE pistol	N/A	Operable
		Unable to restore serial number
	Item 1: Two (2) fired 40 S&W cartridge cases	Source Identification
Item 6: S&W 3913 pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item 2: Three (3) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
Item 7: S&W M&P9 M2.0 pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item 3: Five (5) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 5: One (1) fired jacketed bullet	Source Identification

Remarks

Two (2) of the six (6) submitted cartridges from item 6 and two (2) of the thirteen (13) submitted cartridges from item 7 were used for test firing.

A test fired cartridge case from item 4 will be entered and searched in the NIBIN database at the Richfield laboratory. If investigative information becomes available, your agency will be notified.

No fired cartridge cases from items 6 and 7 were entered into the NIBIN database.

The remaining submitted items from items 4, 6 and 7 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.

Serial number restoration findings offered above were determined using sanding and/or chemical etching techniques.



Andrew McClelland
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2089
andrew.mcclelland@ohioattorneygeneral.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>



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





DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: BCI / Madison
Jim Mulford
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 21-12556
Analysis Date: Issue Date:
March 26, 2021 March 29, 2021

Agency Case Number: 2021-0584
BCI Agent: Chad Holcomb

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

Submitted on March 08, 2021 by S/A Chad Holcomb:

- 6. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazine and cartridges (BCI #6)
 - One (1) Smith & Wesson model 3913, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and six (6) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.
- 7. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazine and cartridges (BCI #7)
 - One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and thirteen (13) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges.

Submitted on March 25, 2021 by S/A Chad Holcomb:

- 8. Brown paper bag containing projectiles from nasopharynx and neck of Andrew Teague (BCI#1, scene 3)
 - Two (2) fired jacketed bullets (EB2 and EB3).

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

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 6: S&W 3913 pistol	Item 8 (EB3): One (1) fired jacketed bullet	Source Identification
Item 7: S&W M&P9 M2.0 pistol	Item 8 (EB2): One (1) fired jacketed bullet	Source Identification

Remarks

Test fires previously taken using items 6 and 7 were used for comparison purposes. The remaining submitted items from items 6 and 7 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.



Andrew McClelland
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2089
andrew.mcclelland@ohioattorneygeneral.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>

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

