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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>DNA Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 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 individual. |
| 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 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 individual. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9.1 Swab from suspected bodily fluid from closet off kitchen</th>
<th>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 trillion unrelated individuals. James Hayes – excluded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Swab of suspected bodily fluid from carpet living room</td>
<td>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 trillion unrelated individuals. Jaron Von Ginn – excluded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: [redacted] belonging to Officer Blair

A total of eleven (11) fired cartridge cases returned to Officer Blair’s firearm.
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This document is the property of the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation and is confidential in nature. Neither the document nor its contents are to be disseminated outside your agency except as provided by law - a statute, an administrative rule, or any rule of procedure.
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**
Crime Scene #8

Crime Scene #27

- Projectile recovered from Medial left thigh of James Haynes.
Sig Sauer pistol-SN: [redacted] belonging to Officer Boggs

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

Crime Scene #9
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![Crime Scene #34 Image]
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.
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>DNA Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1 Swab of stain on blade</td>
<td>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 individual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Based on the national database provided by the National Institute of Standards and Technology
### 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 individual.

#### 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 trillion\(^1\) unrelated individuals.
- James Haynes – 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 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.
DNA profiling was performed using PCR with the GlobalFiler® STR kit on samples from Items 7, 9, 10, 13, and 19.

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 request.

Your feedback is important to us! Please complete our Laboratory Satisfaction Survey at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q9YQHL5
To: Ohio Attorney General's Office
S/A Cory Momchilov
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215

BCI Laboratory Number: 21-37831

Analysis Date: September 02, 2021
Issue Date: 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.
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
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.
7. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #33)
   - One (1) bullet fragment.
8. Envelope containing firearm (serial number [REDACTED] with cartridges and magazine recovered from the scene (Matrix Item 37)
   - One (1) Sig Sauer 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model P320, serial number [REDACTED] three (3) magazines and a total of forty (40) 9mm Luger cartridges.
9. One box containing firearm (serial number [REDACTED] with cartridges and magazine recovered from the scene (Matrix Item 37)
   - One (1) Sig Sauer 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model P320, serial number [REDACTED] three (3) magazines and a total of forty (40) 9mm Luger cartridges.
recovered from the scene - **serial number actually found to be [redacted]** (Matrix Item 38)
- One (1) Sig Sauer 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model P320, serial number [redacted] 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #11: Sig Sauer pistol (SN# [redacted])</td>
<td>Item #1: Eleven (11) fired cartridge cases (E1, E2, E4-E11, E18)</td>
<td>Operable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items #2, 3, 4, 6 &amp; 16: Each cont. one (1) fired bullet</td>
<td>Source Identification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Item #12: Sig Sauer pistol (SN# [redacted]) | Item #1: Nine (9) fired cartridge cases (E3, E12-E17, E19-E20) | Operable |
|                  | 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.
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](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/Q9VQHL5)
## 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Source Identification</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Support for Same Source</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Support for Different Source</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Source Exclusion</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We invite you to direct your questions to:

Abby Schwaderer, Quality Assurance Manager  
(740) 845-2517  
abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov