



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



2023-2812
Officer Involved Critical Incident – 16178 SR 160, Vinton 45686
(L)

Investigative Activity: Document Review
Involves: Roger Meade (S)
Date of Activity: 10/22/2023
Author: SA Craig Call

Narrative:

As a part of this investigation, BCI Crime Scene Unit Special Agent Sarah Taylor (SA Taylor) submitted the shooting officer's (Gallia County Sheriff's Office Deputy ██████) firearm, 9mm cartridge casing recovered from the original scene, and the two projectiles recovered from Roger Meade's (Meade) body during autopsy to the BCI Laboratory for analysis. The BCI Laboratory report is attached to this report reference.

The following will be a summary of the findings:

Deputy ██████'s firearm, described as a Glock model 45, 9mm handgun bearing serial number ██████ was found to be in operable condition. The fired 9mm cartridge casing recovered from the original scene was found to have been fired from Deputy ██████'s firearm. The two fired projectiles recovered from Meade's body during autopsy were found to have been fired from Deputy ██████'s firearm.

The above items will remain in evidence at BCI until the disposition of the case.

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: FA lab report

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.



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

**Laboratory Report
Firearms**

To: BCI / Madison
S/A Craig Call
1560 S.R. 56 SW
London, OH 43140

BCI Laboratory Number: 23-110238

Analysis Date:
November 01, 2023

Issue Date:
November 07, 2023

Agency Case Number: 2023-2812
BCI Agent: Mathew Austin

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

Submitted on October 27, 2023 by S/A Sarah Taylor:

1. White box containing firearm (serial # [REDACTED]) with magazine and cartridges
 - One (1) Glock model 45, 9mm Luger, semi-automatic pistol, serial number: [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine, and fourteen (14) 9mm Luger cartridges
2. One manila envelope containing firearm cartridge case (BCI #7, Scene #1)
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
3. One manila envelope containing projectile from body of Roger Meade (BCI #1, Scene #3)
 - Two (2) fired bullets

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
#1: Glock pistol	N/A	Operable
	#2: One (1) fired cartridge case	Source Identification
	#3: Two (2) fired bullets	

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

Remarks

Four (4) of the fourteen (14) submitted cartridges from item #1 were used for test firing.

The remaining submitted items from item #1 were not examined/compared at this time.

No fired cartridge cases were 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.



Kelsey Cramer
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2627
Kelsey.Cramer@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