



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



2022-2813

Officer-Involved Critical Incident- 673 Slate Hollow, Powell

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: 1/12/2023

Activity Location: BCI

Authoring Agent: SA Matt Collins, #151

Narrative:

On Wednesday, January 11, 2023, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Matt Collins (SA Collins) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on December 13, 2022 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 22-111754). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Daniel Steiner. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. Fired projectile from the body of Sean Hinton's autopsy- **BCI Scene #3, Item #1**
2. Sig Sauer M400 semi-auto rifle (Serial# [REDACTED])- **BCI Scene #1, Item #2**
3. Fired 223 Cartridge Case- BCI Scene #1, Item #3
4. Fired 223 Cartridge Case- BCI Scene #1, Item #4
5. Three (3) 223 Fired Cartridge Cases- BCI Scene #1, Item #18

SA Collins reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

The Sig Sauer M400 possessed by Delaware County Sheriff's Office, Deputy Brandon Gaunt was found to be operable. Furthermore, the fired jacketed bullet (**BCI Scene #3, Item #1**) recovered from the body of Sean Hinton was fired from Dep. Gaunt's firearm. All cartridge casings mentioned above were found to have been fired from Dep Gaunt's firearm.

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



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report
Firearms

To: BCI / Madison
Amy Gill
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-111754

Analysis Date:
December 16, 2022

Issue Date:
January 03, 2023

Agency Case Number:
BCI Agent:

2022-2813
Matt Collins

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

Submitted on December 13, 2022 by Amy Gill:

1. One manila envelope containing fired projectile from autopsy of Sean Hinton (BCI #1, Scene #3)
 - One (1) fired jacketed bullet
2. One cardboard box containing firearm (serial [REDACTED]) with magazine, and cartridge (BCI #2, Scene #1)
 - One (1) Sig Sauer model SIG M400, 5.56mm NATA semi-automatic rifle, serial [REDACTED], with one (1) magazine and **twenty (20)** unfired 223 Rem cartridges
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 Rem cartridge case
4. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #4, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 223 Rem cartridge case
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #18, Scene #1)
 - **Three (3)** fired 223 Rem cartridge cases

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: [REDACTED]

BCI -London Office
1560 St Rt 56 SW P.O. Box 365
London, OH 43140
Phone: [REDACTED]

BCI -Richfield Office
4055 Highlander Pkwy, Suite A
Richfield, OH 44286
Phone: [REDACTED]

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 2: Sig Sauer rifle	N/A	Operable
	Item 1: One (1) fired jacketed bullet	Source Identification
	Items 3, 4, 5: Five (5) fired 223 Rem cartridge cases	Source Identification

Remarks

Eight (8) of the twenty (20) submitted cartridges from item 2 were used for test firing.

No fired cartridge cases were entered into the NIBIN database.

The remaining submitted items from item 2 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.



Daniel Steiner
Forensic Scientist

[REDACTED]
daniel.steiner@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>



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
[REDACTED]
abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov