



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



2022-2608

Officer-Involved Critical Incident- 28 N. Paint St, Chillicothe

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: 1/5/2023

Activity Location: BCI

Authoring Agent: SA Matt Collins, #151

Narrative:

On Tuesday, December 20, 2022, 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 November 18, 2022, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 22-110945). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Daniel Steiner. There were thirteen (13) items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. Sig Sauer model P320, 9mm Luger (serial# [REDACTED] **BCI Scene #1; Item #1**
 - a. One magazine with twelve (12) unfired 9mm cartridges
2. Fired 9mm cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #2**
3. Fired 9mm cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #3**
4. Fired 9mm cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #4**
5. Fired 9mm cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #5**
6. Fired 9mm cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #6**
7. Fired 9mm cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #7**
8. Fired .380 auto cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #8**
9. Ruger Model LCP II, 380 semi-auto (serial# 380196961) **BCI Scene #1; Item #9**
 - a. One magazine with two (2) unfired 380 cartridges
10. Fired cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #12**
11. Fired cartridge case **BCI Scene #1; Item #13**
12. Fired jacketed bullet fragment **BCI Scene #1; Item #14**
13. Multiple fired projectiles recovered from the body of Mitchell during autopsy **BCI Scene #5; Item #1**
 - a. Four (4) fired bullet jacket fragments (13-1B, 13-3B, 13-5B, 13-6B)
 - b. Two (2) fired lead bullet core fragments (13-2B, 13-7B)
 - c. One (1) lead fragment (13-4B)



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



2022-2608

Officer-Involved Critical Incident- 28 N. Paint St, Chillicothe

SA Collins reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

Based on the report SA Collins found where the six (6) 9mm cartridge cases from BCI Scene #1 (**Item#s 2-7**) were fired from the Sig Sauer (Dep Kocheran). The report indicated the Sig Sauer could not be excluded as the source of the four (4) fired bullet jacket fragments recovered from Mitchell's body, as results were inconclusive (similar class characteristics but insufficient corresponding individual characteristics to identify or exclude).

Based on the report SA Collins also found where the three (3) .380 auto cartridge cases from **BCI Scene #1 (Item#s 8, 12, 13)** were fired from the Ruger 9mm (Mitchell). The report indicated **BCI Scene #1; Item #14** (bullet fragment) the Ruger could not be excluded as a source as the results were inconclusive (similar class characteristics but insufficient corresponding individual characteristics to identify or exclude). However, the bullet jacket fragments from the projectiles recovered from the body of Mitchell, indicted the Ruger was in fact excluded as the source.

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
SA Matt Collins
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 22-110945

Analysis Date: November 29, 2022

Issue Date: December 06, 2022

Agency Case Number: 2022-2608

BCI Agent: Matt Collins

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s): N/A

Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on November 18, 2022 by S/A Chad Holcomb:

1. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED] with magazine and cartridges (BCI #1, Scene #1)
 - One (1) Sig Sauer model P320, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial # [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and twelve (12) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #2, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
3. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #3, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
4. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #4, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #5, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
6. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #6, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
7. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #7, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
8. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #8, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 380 Auto cartridge case

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

ACS

9. White box containing firearm (serial #380196961) with magazine and cartridge (BCI #9, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) Ruger model LCP II, 380 Auto semi-automatic pistol, serial #380196961, with one (1) magazine and two (2) unfired 380 Auto cartridges*
10. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #12, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 380 Auto cartridge case*
11. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #13, Scene #1)
 - *One (1) fired 380 Auto cartridge case*
12. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (BCI #14, Scene #1)
 - ***One (1) fired jacketed bullet fragment***
13. One manila envelope containing fired projectiles recovered from the autopsy of Nicholas Mitchell (BCI #1, Scene #5)
 - *Four (4) fired bullet jacket fragments (13-1B, 13-3B, 13-5B, 13-6B)*
 - *Two (2) fired lead bullet core fragments (13-2B, 13-7B)*
 - *One (1) lead fragment (13-4B)*

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 1: Sig Sauer pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7: Six (6) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 12: One (1) fired jacketed bullet fragment	Source Exclusion
	Item 13 (13-1B, 13-3B, 13-5B, 13-6B): Four (4) fired bullet jacket fragments	Inconclusive*
Item 9: Ruger pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items 8, 10, 11: Three (3) fired 380 Auto cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item 12: One (1) fired jacketed bullet fragment	Inconclusive*
	Item 13 (13-1B, 13-3B, 13-5B, 13-6B): Four (4) fired bullet jacket fragments	Source Exclusion
Item 13 (13-2B, 13-4B, 13-7B): Two (2) fired lead bullet core fragments, one (1) lead fragment	N/A	Unsuitable^

*Similar class characteristics but insufficient corresponding individual characteristics to identify or exclude.

^Insufficient class and/or individual characteristics present.

Remarks

Three (3) of the twelve (12) submitted cartridges from item 1 were used for test firing.

No fired cartridge cases were entered into the NIBIN database.

The remaining submitted items from items 1 and 9 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
740-845-2619
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
(740) 845-2517
abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov