



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



2023-3223  
 Officer Involved Critical Incident - 807 Alan Page Dr SE,  
 Canton, OH 44707

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review  
 Activity Date: 1/31/2024  
 Activity Location: BCI Richfield  
 Authoring Agent: SA Jon Lieber #50

**Narrative:**

On Monday, January 29, 2024, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Jon Lieber (Lieber) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on January 22, 2024 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 24-30543). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Monica Coblentz. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

- Fired cartridge case – Speer 9mm (Lab item #1, Matrix item #1, CS #1)
- Fired cartridge case – Speer 9mm (Lab item #2, Matrix item #2, CS #2)
- Fired cartridge case – Speer 9mm (Lab item #3, Matrix item #3, CS #3)
- Fired cartridge case – Speer 9mm (Lab item #4, Matrix item #4, CS #4)
- Fired projectile found in subject’s clothing – (Lab item #5, Matrix item #7, CS #7)
- Clock 17, 9mm pistol belonging to CPD Ofc. Garrett Marino (Lab item #7, Matrix item #9, CS #9)

SA Lieber reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

**Findings**

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #7: Glock Pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items #1-4: four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item #5: one (1) fired bullet	Source Identification

On Wednesday, January 31, 2024, SA Lieber received a second Ohio BCI Laboratory report for items of evidence submitted on January 26, 2024. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

- Projectile recovered during autopsy of Zachary Fornash (Lab item #9, Matrix item #16)

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.



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



2023-3223  
Officer Involved Critical Incident - 807 Alan Page Dr SE,  
Canton, OH 44707

SA Lieber reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

**Findings**

<b>Item Description</b>	<b>Comparison</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
Item #7: Glock pistol	Item #9: One (1) fired bullet	Source Identification

A copy of the Ohio BCI Laboratory reports are attached to this investigative report.  
Please refer to the attachments for further details.

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: Ohio Attorney General's Office  
S/A Jon Lieber  
30 E. Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

BCI Laboratory Number: 24-30543

Analysis Date:  
January 23, 2024

Issue Date:  
January 25, 2024

Agency Case Number: 2023-3223  
BCI Agent: Jon Lieber

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer  
Subject(s):  
Victim(s):

**Submitted on January 22, 2024 by S/A Jon Lieber:**

1. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix #001, CS #01)  
*-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
2. Envelope containing Cartridge case (Matrix #002, CS #02)  
*-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
3. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix #003, CS #03)  
*-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
4. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix #004, CS #04)  
*-One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case.*
5. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix Item #007, CS #07)  
*-One (1) fired bullet.*
7. White box containing firearm (Serial # [REDACTED] (Matrix #009, CS #09)  
*-One (1) Glock 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model 17 Gen 5, serial number [REDACTED] three (3) magazines, and fifty (50) 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

**Findings**

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #7: Glock Pistol	N/A	Operable
	Items #1-4: four (4) fired 9mm Luger cartridge cases	Source Identification
	Item #5: one (1) fired bullet	Source Identification

**Remarks**

Two (2) BCI-supplied cartridges and two (2) submitted cartridges were used for testing Item #7.

There were no pertinent findings in regards to the optic or flashlight attached to Item #7 or the additional submitted magazines (magazine B and C).

The flashlight attached to Item #7 was obstructing the serial number on the frame of the firearm. Because of this, the serial number recorded for the firearm is from the slide and barrel.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

**Analytical Detail**

Analytical findings offered above were determined using visual and microscopic examinations / comparisons.

*Monica Coblenz*

Monica Coblenz  
Forensic Scientist  
(234) 400-3715  
Monica.Coblenz@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/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.

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](mailto:abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)



# DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

**Bureau of Criminal Investigation**

**Laboratory Report  
Firearms**

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office  
S/A Jon Lieber  
30 E. Broad Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

BCI Laboratory Number: 24-30543

Analysis Date:  
January 29, 2024

Issue Date:  
January 30, 2024

Agency Case Number: 2023-3223  
BCI Agent: Jon Lieber

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer  
Subject(s):  
Victim(s):

**Submitted on January 22, 2024 by S/A Jon Lieber:**

- 7. White box containing firearm (Serial # [REDACTED] (Matrix #009, CS #09)  
-One (1) Glock 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, model 17 gen 5, serial number [REDACTED] three (3) magazines, fifty (50) 9mm Luger cartridges, and previously generated BCI test fires.

**Submitted on January 26, 2024 by S/A Jon Lieber:**

- 9. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix item #16)  
-One (1) fired bullet.

**Findings**

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #7: Glock pistol	Item #9: One (1) fired bullet	Source Identification

**Remarks**

The previously generated BCI test fires were used for comparison with Item #9.

The additional items submitted with Item #7 were not re-examined.

Please address inquiries to the office indicated, using the BCI case number.

BCI -Bow ling Green Office  
750 North College Drive  
Bow ling 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 Pkw y. Suite A  
Richfield, OH 44286  
Phone:(330)659-4600

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

**Analytical Detail**

Analytical findings offered above were determined using visual and microscopic examinations / comparisons.

*Monica Coblentz*

Monica Coblentz  
Forensic Scientist  
(234) 400-3715  
Monica.Coblentz@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/O9VOHL5>

### 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](mailto:abby.schwaderer@ohioattorneygeneral.gov)