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

2026-2566
Officer Involved Critical Incident - State Route 67 and Township Road 8, Republic, OH 44867, Seneca County

Investigative Activity:	Search Warrant Obtained
Involves:	Jeffrey Sergent
Activity Date:	07/10/2026
Activity Location:	BCI – Bowling Green
Authoring Agent:	**SA David Hammond**

Narrative:

Search Warrant Obtained

Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Ryan Emahiser (SA Emahiser) drafted a search warrant for a black Apple iPhone with a black screen with a black case. The item was described as Matrix item #17 (Crime Scene Search Warrant Inventory #17) from report #2026-2566. The phone was further described as resting on the dashboard of Jeffrey Sergent's black, GMC, truck, Ohio plate KWX-2981, collected by CST E. Miller on June 7, 2026. This item was collected as evidence relative to the officer-involved critical incident which occurred on July 7, 2026.

On Friday, July 10, 2026, SA Emahiser electronically sent the search warrant and search warrant affidavit to Wood County Court of Common Pleas Judge Matthew L. Reger (Judge Reger). Judge Reger reviewed the search warrant and search warrant affidavit. On, July 10, 2026 at approximately 909 hours, Judge Reger signed / authorized the search warrant.

Search Warrant Executed

On Tuesday, August 18, 2026, SA Robert Surgenor Jr. executed / served the aforementioned search warrant by downloading the cell phone and digital data.

During the search, the following items of potential evidence were seized:

1. Digital and cellular data/files

On August 31, 2026, an inventory of the items seized was prepared with a copy of the search warrant and placed in the secure evidence storage room at the Bowling Green Office of BCI, to be attached to item #17 upon its return from the London Cyber Crimes Unit.

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.

Search Warrant Returned

On Monday, August 31, 2026, SA Hammond met with the Wood County Clerk of Courts. The search warrant, search warrant affidavit, inventory, and search warrant return were filed with the Wood County Clerk of Courts.

A copy of the search warrant documents and search inventory are attached to this investigative report.

References:

None

Attachments:

1. Seneca County OIS Cell Phone – Signed Search Warrant
2. Search Warrant with Return 8.31.2026

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.

AFFIDAVIT FOR SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF OHIO } ss
WOOD COUNTY }

Before me, **Matthew Reger**, Judge of the **Wood County Common Pleas Court** in the City of **Bowling Green**, Ohio, **Special Agent Ryan Emahiser** of the **Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation**, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I have probable cause to believe that contained in the electronic devices listed below:

A black Apple iPhone with a black screen with a black case. Listed as Matrix item #17 (Crime Scene Search Warrant Inventory #17) from report #2026-2566. The phone was further described as resting on the dashboard of Jeffrey Sergent's black, GMC, truck, Ohio plate KWX-2981, collected by CST E. Miller on June 7, 2026

seized during a Seneca County Common Pleas search warrant execution of a vehicle involved in an Officer Involved Shooting Incident, currently being held in evidence at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation in Bowling Green, Wood County, Ohio,

there is now being concealed certain property, namely:

1. All telephone numbers, direct connect numbers, identities assigned to the device and any other device information.
2. Call and direct connect history information and contact list.
3. Photographs, videos, audio files, documents, user dictionary and user created files.
4. Text messages, chat logs and email.
5. Applications, application data and database files.
6. Internet history, bookmarked web pages and favorite internet sites.
7. Wi-Fi information stored on the device.
8. Passwords stored on the device.
9. Geographical location recorded by the device.
10. Any other data, including deleted data, contained on the device.

which are in violation of Ohio Revised Code Section(s):

2903.08 Aggravated Vehicular Assault; Vehicular Assault

Affiant Qualifications

Your Affiant is Special Agent Ryan Emahiser of the Ohio Attorney General's Office Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) and I have been a Special Agent with BCI since 2012. As a Special Agent, and as a former Federal Bureau of Investigation Task Force Officer from 2016 through 2023, I have investigated numerous major violent felony crimes within the state of Ohio that have led to successful Federal and State prosecutions, including cases involving public official

corruption, theft and fraud, homicides, human trafficking, child exploitation, and officer-involved critical incidents. Prior to my employment with BCI I was employed as a Wood County Sheriff's Office Deputy for fifteen years working in assignments in road patrol, special response team, school resource officer, and temporary assignments within the detective bureau. During my law enforcement career, I have investigated hundreds of cases, written and executed hundreds of search warrants, and have obtained probable cause for arrests in both State and Federal felony level investigations. Since 1997, I have received continued training and have experience in interviewing and interrogation techniques, arrest procedures, search and seizure law, search warrant applications, and various other crimes and advanced investigative techniques.

I have made arrests and followed through these arrests to indictment and successful prosecution for the mentioned crimes during my employment as a certified peace officer. During my law-enforcement career I have obtained, through established probable cause, search warrants to obtain DNA evidence, biological evidence, cell phone content evidence, digital media, social media account content, and computer evidence to identify, investigate, prosecute, and convict those involved in felony level criminal activity.

Facts to Establish the Grounds for the Issuance of a Search Warrant

1. On Tuesday, July 7, 2026, Seneca County Sheriff Fred Stevens requested the assistance of the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) in the investigation of an officer-involved shooting incident that occurred in Seneca County. BCI Agents responded to the scene and learned the following information.

2. On Tuesday, July 7th, 2026, at approximately 10:10 hours, Officers from the Bloomville Police Department and Seneca County Sheriff's Office conducted a traffic stop with Jeffrey Sergent (Sergent) at the corner of State Route 67 and Township Road 8, Republic, Seneca County, Ohio. Sergent was the suspect in a domestic violence incident involving his wife, over the weekend of July 4th, 2026, and the Seneca County Sheriff's Office indicated that felony charges had been filed for his arrest relative to his actions in the incident.

3. Sergent has a criminal history that includes attempted felonious assault (2007), failure to comply with police officers (2007), felony escape (2013), and is listed in law enforcement databases as "approach with caution." For these reasons, Deputies from the Seneca County Sheriff's Office blocked the forward path of Sergent's vehicle as the Bloomville Police initiated the traffic stop to avoid Sergent fleeing.

4. Officers present attempted to speak with the Sergent as he was seated in the driver's seat with the vehicle still running. Law Enforcement Officials notified Sergent that he was under arrest and ordered Sergent to exit the vehicle, however Sergent was non-compliant and visibly agitated. Deputies conversed with Sergent for a significant period of time at a distance attempting to gain compliance from Sergent to exit the vehicle.

5. During this time, Sergent was using the cell phone named in this affidavit to Facebook Messenger Video call his friend, Jacob Kendrick (Kendrick). Kendrick recorded the call on a

secondary phone as he interacted with Sergent on his own cell phone. BCI Agents also observed on obtained body worn camera footage Sergent holding the cell phone and speaking with a male subject on a call.

6. BCI Agents have since reviewed the body worn camera video footage provided and Sergent can be seen in a heightened state of anxiety and anger. Sergent was heard yelling at police officers who were attempt to deescalate the situation, and Sergent repeatedly tells officers that he thinks the officers will kill him if he exits the truck.

7. After a significant period of negotiating with Sergent, Sergent rolled up the windows of the vehicle. Deputies used a device to break out the driver's window to gain access to Sergent, and in that moment Sergent put the vehicle in reverse, accelerated rapidly turning his wheels to the right causing the Deputies to jump back to avoid being struck. Sergent's vehicle continued in a rear passenger direction turn and struck a guardrail. Sergent then accelerated rapidly forward, making contact with a Deputy with the front of his truck. Officers fired approximately eight rounds into the vehicle and the vehicle then struck a Seneca County Sheriff's Office cruiser causing damage where the vehicle came to rest. Sergent sustained injuries as a result of the gunfire and died as a result of his injuries.

8. At the request of BCI, the Seneca County Sheriff's Office Detective Bureau obtained a Seneca County Common Pleas search warrant, authorizing the search of Sergent's vehicle. During an examination of the subject's vehicle by the BCI Crime Scene Unit, the black cell phone with black cell phone case named in this affidavit and used during the incident was located in the instrument panel above the steering wheel. Also, BCI located a dash mounted camera, a F/2.0 1800P FOV 130, equipped with Wi-Fi. Both items were seized as evidence

9. On July 9th, 2026, agents interviewed Sergent's friend, Kendrick, who had been on the video call with Sergent during the officer involved shooting incident. Kendrick stated that during the vehicle stop that Sergent had texted him "911" and phoned him. It was during the video call that Kendrick had begun recording the video call because Sergent told Kendrick to record and Sergent was showing his surroundings and law enforcement's actions on the video call. Kendrick told agents that he did not begin recording the video call until several minutes after the call started.

10. Kendrick showed agents numerous text messages between he and Sergent regarding the domestic violence incident from the weekend prior, and Sergent told Kendrick over voice calls and texts that Sergent was going to see his wife the same morning prior to the incident. Kendrick said that Sergent had been texting and or calling his wife just prior to being stopped by the police. Kendrick also told agents that Sergent linked his cell phone to the Wi-Fi compatible dash camera seized by agents, and that any video recorded by the dash camera is stored on Sergent's cell phone.

11. I believe that it is necessary to search the data on this cellular phone to determine times, and specific facts leading up to the incident with law enforcement. According to facts already gathered by investigating BCI agents, Sergent was actively communicating on his cell phone prior to and during the officer involved shooting incident. In officer involved shooting

incidents that we investigate on a routine basis it is my experience that it is common for those subjects involved to utilize cellular communications (text and voice) to relay to friends and family their intentions prior to being involved in an officer involved shooting incident. It is also highly probable that based on witnesses interviewed Sergent's phone will contain video recordings, text messages, screen capture images, and call logs that are relevant to the overall BCI investigation of the incident including potential video of the incident.

12. I believe that it is also necessary to search the above-described cell phone for any personal communications including but not limited to opened and unopened e-mail messages instant messages (IM), text messages, letters, other electronic records, documents, correspondence stored and/or exchanged in electronic form, notes, memoranda, address lists, telephone contacts, screen name lists, or items reflecting or relating in any way to communications or contacts between any individuals.

13. Based on these facts, I have probable cause to believe that the above-described electronic data will be found within the above-described cellular telephone.

14. Agents are aware that seizing stored communications may implicate privacy rights, which Congress believed important enough to protect under the Electronic Communication Privacy Act (ECPA), specifically 18 U.S.C. 2703. Such material is further protected by Ohio Revised Code 2933.51, et. seq. In executing this warrant, it is possible that such communications may be seized, along with other material encompassed in the warrant. In this instance the cellular device named in this affidavit is highly probable to belong to Jeffrey Sergent, based on the location of the device during and at the conclusion of the incident as well as video corroboration of Jeffrey Sergent using the cell phone to communicate. Also, due to Jeffrey Sergent being deceased as a result of the incident there is no expectation of privacy for the cellular device that is probable to have been used and owned by Jeffrey Sergent.

Searching Digital Evidence

Based upon my training, experience and discussions with those involved in digital forensics, I know that searching all areas of an electronic device is necessary in order to conduct a complete search for electronic evidence relevant to the investigation for the following reasons:

1. All electronic devices have a "file system," which is how the device organizes directories and files. The "file system" is a representation of the storage device's organization as opposed to the actual data that is stored inside of the files. In other words, the "file system" is like a table of contents or an index in a book; it is a mechanism that keeps track of where the actual file or data is located on the hard drive. Each "file system" works in different ways and can vary between devices. "File systems" have their own conventions for the naming of files, such as how long a name can be or what characters are permissible in a file name.

2. Keyword searches may assist the examiner in locating electronic evidence, due to the vast amount of storage contained on electronic devices; however, the software and applications used to create or store the files may be such that it is not conducive to finding relevant evidence by solely using a keyword search. Software and applications may save data in a proprietary format, in an encrypted format, or in a compressed format that is not human readable and therefore not conducive to keyword searching. Therefore, the forensic examiner must review and analyze the operating system, software, and application configurations.

3. In addition, the user can take other steps that inhibit law enforcement from discovering the information that is the subject of the search relevant to the investigation. This includes, but is not limited to, renaming files or file extensions, using encryption or compression, password protecting files, using software or applications specifically designed to allow a user to hide portions of the storage area, or to embed a file within another file or files. In other words, a keyword search or merely looking at a file name or file type may lead an examiner to conclude, for example, that a data file contains text, when the file actually contains a picture, or vice-versa. A user does not need extensive computer knowledge to perform these steps and software and applications are readily available for free on the internet that will perform these steps for the user.

4. When a file is deleted, it may still be possible to recover the file because the file system usually just changes the entry related to that file as to where a file is located but does not actually go to the physical location on the storage media and remove the information at that physical location. Therefore, it may be possible to recover deleted data for a substantial period of time after the deletion occurred.

Therefore, personnel executing the search warrant must examine all areas of an electronic device, including but not limited to, scanning storage areas to discover and possibly recover deleted data, scanning storage areas for deliberately hidden files, performing electronic keyword searching through all electronic storage areas, and opening and previewing various file folders or directories and the individual files they contain, because evidence relevant to the investigation can reasonably be expected to be found anywhere on the device.

Request for Issuance of a Search Warrant

I submit based on the facts set forth in this affidavit, that there is probable cause to believe that the electronic devices listed above will contain evidence involving violations of Ohio Revised Code Section **2903.08 Aggravated Vehicular Assault; Vehicular Assault**. Based upon the foregoing, I respectfully request that this Court issue a search warrant for the electronic devices listed above, authorizing the search/examination by a qualified computer forensics examiner.

Request For Modification of Three (3) Day Execution Deadline

This Affiant states that the requested search of the electronic media to be performed by a qualified computer forensic examiner is expected to require more than three (3) days due to logistical and technical concerns. Hence, the "execution" of the requested warrant may require several weeks

from beginning to end. If the term "execution" were deemed to occur at the completion of the examination rather than the initiation of the examination, then it would be pragmatically impossible for law enforcement officers to comply with the three (3) day deadline and still properly conduct the search. Therefore, pursuant to revised Code 2933.24(A), this Affiant requests this Court require said seizure and/or search be initiated, by delivering the electronic evidence to the examiner, within three (3) days, unless and until otherwise authorized by this Court.

Permission for nighttime search (from 8:00 PM to midnight and from midnight to 7:00 AM) (X) is not requested, ( ) is requested for the above reasons and facts and these: **[LIST FACTS FOR A NIGHT TIME SEARCH IF APPLICABLE]**

Permission for Waiver of the Statutory Precondition for Nonconsensual Entry (X) is not requested, ( ) is requested for the above reason and facts and those facts detailed below:

Electronically Signed
2026-07-09 11:18 pm EDT
AFFIANT

Sworn to before me, and subscribed in my presence on July 10, 2026

Electronically Signed
Matthew L Reger
2026-07-10 9:09 am EDT
JUDGE

SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF OHIO } ss
WOOD COUNTY }

Based on the sworn affidavit made before me, **Matthew Reger**, Judge of the **Wood County Common Pleas Court** in the City of **Bowling Green**, Ohio by **Special Agent Ryan Emahiser** of the **Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation**, who has probable cause to believe that contained in the electronic devices listed below:

A black Apple iPhone with a black screen with a black case. Listed as Matrix item #17 (Crime Scene Search Warrant Inventory #17) from report #2026-2566. The phone was further described as resting on the dashboard of Jeffrey Sergent's black, GMC, truck, Ohio plate KWX-2981, collected by CST E. Miller on June 7, 2026

seized during a Seneca County Common Pleas search warrant execution of a vehicle involved in an Officer Involved Shooting Incident, currently being held in evidence at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation in Bowling Green, Wood County, Ohio,

there is now being concealed certain property, namely:

1. All telephone numbers, direct connect numbers, identities assigned to the device and any other device information.
2. Call and direct connect history information and contact list.
3. Photographs, videos, audio files, documents, user dictionary and user created files.
4. Text messages, chat logs and email.
5. Applications, application data and database files.
6. Internet history, bookmarked web pages and favorite internet sites.
7. Wi-Fi information stored on the device.
8. Passwords stored on the device.
9. Geographical location recorded by the device.
10. Any other data, including deleted data, contained on the device.

which are in violation of Ohio Revised Code Section(s):

2903.08 Aggravated Vehicular Assault; Vehicular Assault

I am satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that the property so described is being concealed in the electronic devices listed above and that the foregoing grounds for application for issuance of the search warrant exist.

You are hereby commanded to have a qualified computer forensic examiner search/examine the electronic devices listed above, making the search in the (X) day season, (7:00 AM to 8:00 PM) or ( ) night season (from 8:00 PM to midnight and from midnight to 7:00 AM), permission for a nighttime search is granted based on the reasons and facts contained in the affidavit. The Statutory

Precondition for Nonconsensual Entry ( ) is, (X) is not, waived based on the reasons and facts contained in the affidavit.

If the property is found there, seize it, leaving a copy of this warrant and receipt for the property taken required by law. You shall make prompt return of this warrant to Judge **Matthew Reger**, **Wood County Court of Common Pleas**, accompanied by a written inventory of any property taken as required by law.

It is further ORDERED and authorized for good cause that the three (3) day rule for execution of the said warrant is extended to a reasonable period of time to allow officers to execute and thoroughly search the seized property. Said extension is based on the logistical and technical difficulties confronting law enforcement.

Given under my hand and seal of said Court on July 10, 2026

Electronically Signed
Matthew L Reger
2026-07-10 9:09 am EDT

JUDGE

RETURN; RECEIPT; INVENTORY OF SEARCH WARRANT

State of Ohio
Wood County ss.

I, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation **Special Agent David Hammond**, the person taking property hereunder, received the attached search warrant on the **10th** day of July 2026, and (check appropriate box):

☐ I am returning the Warrant without having executed the same.

☒ Ohio BCI executed it as follows: On the 18th day of August, 2026, Ohio BCI executed the search as described in the warrant. A copy of the warrant and journal entry was placed with the cell phone in the secure evidence storage room. Location:

_X___cell phone. ☐ at Wood County Common Pleas

Furthermore (check appropriate box): ☐ no evidence was seized.

The following is an **INVENTORY** of property taken pursuant to the warrant prepared by Special Agent Ryan Emahiser and the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation:

Item No. **Quantity and description of property taken**

1. Digital & Cellular Phone Data & Files

I swear this Inventory is a true and detailed account of all property taken by me on the Warrant; and a copy of this Inventory was deposited with the person or at the premises from which the property was taken as a Receipt of the items taken.

D. Hammond Ohio BCI
Signing Agent

This 31st day of August, 2026

Sworn to before me, and subscribed in my presence by

Notary Public/Clerk of Courts/Deputy Clerk

FILED
WOOD COUNTY CLERK
COMMON PLEAS COURT
2026 AUG 31 AM 9:57
DOUGLAS F. CUDERLEY

FILED
WOOD COUNTY CLERK
COMMON PLEAS COURT
2026 AUG 31 AM 9:57
DOUGLAS F. CUBBERLEY

SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF OHIO } ss
WOOD COUNTY }

Based on the sworn affidavit made before me, **Matthew Reger**, Judge of the **Wood County Common Pleas Court** in the City of **Bowling Green**, Ohio by **Special Agent Ryan Emahiser** of the **Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation**, who has probable cause to believe that contained in the electronic devices listed below:

A black Apple iPhone with a black screen with a black case. Listed as Matrix item #17 (Crime Scene Search Warrant Inventory #17) from report #2026-2566. The phone was further described as resting on the dashboard of Jeffrey Sergent's black, GMC, truck, Ohio plate KWX-2981, collected by CST E. Miller on June 7, 2026

seized during a Seneca County Common Pleas search warrant execution of a vehicle involved in an Officer Involved Shooting Incident, currently being held in evidence at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation in Bowling Green, Wood County, Ohio,

there is now being concealed certain property, namely:

1. All telephone numbers, direct connect numbers, identities assigned to the device and any other device information.
2. Call and direct connect history information and contact list.
3. Photographs, videos, audio files, documents, user dictionary and user created files.
4. Text messages, chat logs and email.
5. Applications, application data and database files.
6. Internet history, bookmarked web pages and favorite internet sites.
7. Wi-Fi information stored on the device.
8. Passwords stored on the device.
9. Geographical location recorded by the device.
10. Any other data, including deleted data, contained on the device.

which are in violation of Ohio Revised Code Section(s):

2903.08 Aggravated Vehicular Assault; Vehicular Assault

I am satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that the property so described is being concealed in the electronic devices listed above and that the foregoing grounds for application for issuance of the search warrant exist.

You are hereby commanded to have a qualified computer forensic examiner search/examine the electronic devices listed above, making the search in the (X) day season, (7:00 AM to 8:00 PM) or ( ) night season (from 8:00 PM to midnight and from midnight to 7:00 AM), permission for a nighttime search is granted based on the reasons and facts contained in the affidavit. The Statutory

WOOD CO. CLERK OF COURTS
AUG 31 2026
JOURNALIZED

Precondition for Nonconsensual Entry ( ) is, (X) is not, waived based on the reasons and facts contained in the affidavit.

If the property is found there, seize it, leaving a copy of this warrant and receipt for the property taken required by law. You shall make prompt return of this warrant to Judge **Matthew Reger**, **Wood County Court of Common Pleas**, accompanied by a written inventory of any property taken as required by law.

It is further ORDERED and authorized for good cause that the three (3) day rule for execution of the said warrant is extended to a reasonable period of time to allow officers to execute and thoroughly search the seized property. Said extension is based on the logistical and technical difficulties confronting law enforcement.

Given under my hand and seal of said Court on July 10, 2026

Electronically Signed
Matthew L Reger
2026-07-10 9:09 am EDT
JUDGE

WOOD CO. CLERK OF COURTS
AUG 31 2026
JOURNALIZED

FILED
WOOD COUNTY CLERK
COMMON PLEAS COURT
2026 AUG 31 AM 9:57
DOUGLAS F. CUDLERLEY

AFFIDAVIT FOR SEARCH WARRANT

THE STATE OF OHIO } ss
WOOD COUNTY }

Before me, **Matthew Reger**, Judge of the **Wood County Common Pleas Court** in the City of **Bowling Green**, Ohio, **Special Agent Ryan Emahiser** of the **Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation**, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I have probable cause to believe that contained in the electronic devices listed below:

A black Apple iPhone with a black screen with a black case. Listed as Matrix item #17 (Crime Scene Search Warrant Inventory #17) from report #2026-2566. The phone was further described as resting on the dashboard of Jeffrey Sergent's black, GMC, truck, Ohio plate KWX-2981, collected by CST E. Miller on June 7, 2026

seized during a Seneca County Common Pleas search warrant execution of a vehicle involved in an Officer Involved Shooting Incident, currently being held in evidence at the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation in Bowling Green, Wood County, Ohio,

there is now being concealed certain property, namely:

1. All telephone numbers, direct connect numbers, identities assigned to the device and any other device information.
2. Call and direct connect history information and contact list.
3. Photographs, videos, audio files, documents, user dictionary and user created files.
4. Text messages, chat logs and email.
5. Applications, application data and database files.
6. Internet history, bookmarked web pages and favorite internet sites.
7. Wi-Fi information stored on the device.
8. Passwords stored on the device.
9. Geographical location recorded by the device.
10. Any other data, including deleted data, contained on the device.

which are in violation of Ohio Revised Code Section(s):

2903.08 Aggravated Vehicular Assault; Vehicular Assault

Affiant Qualifications

Your Affiant is Special Agent Ryan Emahiser of the Ohio Attorney General's Office Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) and I have been a Special Agent with BCI since 2012. As a Special Agent, and as a former Federal Bureau of Investigation Task Force Officer from 2016 through 2023, I have investigated numerous major violent felony crimes within the state of Ohio that have led to successful Federal and State prosecutions, including cases involving public official

corruption, theft and fraud, homicides, human trafficking, child exploitation, and officer-involved critical incidents. Prior to my employment with BCI I was employed as a Wood County Sheriff's Office Deputy for fifteen years working in assignments in road patrol, special response team, school resource officer, and temporary assignments within the detective bureau. During my law enforcement career, I have investigated hundreds of cases, written and executed hundreds of search warrants, and have obtained probable cause for arrests in both State and Federal felony level investigations. Since 1997, I have received continued training and have experience in interviewing and interrogation techniques, arrest procedures, search and seizure law, search warrant applications, and various other crimes and advanced investigative techniques.

I have made arrests and followed through these arrests to indictment and successful prosecution for the mentioned crimes during my employment as a certified peace officer. During my law-enforcement career I have obtained, through established probable cause, search warrants to obtain DNA evidence, biological evidence, cell phone content evidence, digital media, social media account content, and computer evidence to identify, investigate, prosecute, and convict those involved in felony level criminal activity.

Facts to Establish the Grounds for the Issuance of a Search Warrant

1. On Tuesday, July 7, 2026, Seneca County Sheriff Fred Stevens requested the assistance of the Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) in the investigation of an officer-involved shooting incident that occurred in Seneca County. BCI Agents responded to the scene and learned the following information.

2. On Tuesday, July 7th, 2026, at approximately 10:10 hours, Officers from the Bloomville Police Department and Seneca County Sheriff's Office conducted a traffic stop with Jeffrey Sergent (Sergent) at the corner of State Route 67 and Township Road 8, Republic, Seneca County, Ohio. Sergent was the suspect in a domestic violence incident involving his wife, over the weekend of July 4th, 2026, and the Seneca County Sheriff's Office indicated that felony charges had been filed for his arrest relative to his actions in the incident.

3. Sergent has a criminal history that includes attempted felonious assault (2007), failure to comply with police officers (2007), felony escape (2013), and is listed in law enforcement databases as "approach with caution." For these reasons, Deputies from the Seneca County Sheriff's Office blocked the forward path of Sergent's vehicle as the Bloomville Police initiated the traffic stop to avoid Sergent fleeing.

4. Officers present attempted to speak with the Sergent as he was seated in the driver's seat with the vehicle still running. Law Enforcement Officials notified Sergent that he was under arrest and ordered Sergent to exit the vehicle, however Sergent was non-compliant and visibly agitated. Deputies conversed with Sergent for a significant period of time at a distance attempting to gain compliance from Sergent to exit the vehicle.

5. During this time, Sergent was using the cell phone named in this affidavit to Facebook Messenger Video call his friend, Jacob Kendrick (Kendrick). Kendrick recorded the call on a

secondary phone as he interacted with Sergent on his own cell phone. BCI Agents also observed on obtained body worn camera footage Sergent holding the cell phone and speaking with a male subject on a call.

6. BCI Agents have since reviewed the body worn camera video footage provided and Sergent can be seen in a heightened state of anxiety and anger. Sergent was heard yelling at police officers who were attempt to deescalate the situation, and Sergent repeatedly tells officers that he thinks the officers will kill him if he exits the truck.

7. After a significant period of negotiating with Sergent, Sergent rolled up the windows of the vehicle. Deputies used a device to break out the driver's window to gain access to Sergent, and in that moment Sergent put the vehicle in reverse, accelerated rapidly turning his wheels to the right causing the Deputies to jump back to avoid being struck. Sergent's vehicle continued in a rear passenger direction turn and struck a guardrail. Sergent then accelerated rapidly forward, making contact with a Deputy with the front of his truck. Officers fired approximately eight rounds into the vehicle and the vehicle then struck a Seneca County Sheriff's Office cruiser causing damage where the vehicle came to rest. Sergent sustained injuries as a result of the gunfire and died as a result of his injuries.

8. At the request of BCI, the Seneca County Sheriff's Office Detective Bureau obtained a Seneca County Common Pleas search warrant, authorizing the search of Sergent's vehicle. During an examination of the subject's vehicle by the BCI Crime Scene Unit, the black cell phone with black cell phone case named in this affidavit and used during the incident was located in the instrument panel above the steering wheel. Also, BCI located a dash mounted camera, a F/2.0 1800P FOV 130, equipped with Wi-Fi. Both items were seized as evidence

9. On July 9th, 2026, agents interviewed Sergent's friend, Kendrick, who had been on the video call with Sergent during the officer involved shooting incident. Kendrick stated that during the vehicle stop that Sergent had texted him "911" and phoned him. It was during the video call that Kendrick had begun recording the video call because Sergent told Kendrick to record and Sergent was showing his surroundings and law enforcement's actions on the video call. Kendrick told agents that he did not begin recording the video call until several minutes after the call started.

10. Kendrick showed agents numerous text messages between he and Sergent regarding the domestic violence incident from the weekend prior, and Sergent told Kendrick over voice calls and texts that Sergent was going to see his wife the same morning prior to the incident. Kendrick said that Sergent had been texting and or calling his wife just prior to being stopped by the police. Kendrick also told agents that Sergent linked his cell phone to the Wi-Fi compatible dash camera seized by agents, and that any video recorded by the dash camera is stored on Sergent's cell phone.

11. I believe that it is necessary to search the data on this cellular phone to determine times, and specific facts leading up to the incident with law enforcement. According to facts already gathered by investigating BCI agents, Sergent was actively communicating on his cell phone prior to and during the officer involved shooting incident. In officer involved shooting

incidents that we investigate on a routine basis it is my experience that it is common for those subjects involved to utilize cellular communications (text and voice) to relay to friends and family their intentions prior to being involved in an officer involved shooting incident. It is also highly probable that based on witnesses interviewed Sergent's phone will contain video recordings, text messages, screen capture images, and call logs that are relevant to the overall BCI investigation of the incident including potential video of the incident.

12. I believe that it is also necessary to search the above-described cell phone for any personal communications including but not limited to opened and unopened e-mail messages instant messages (IM), text messages, letters, other electronic records, documents, correspondence stored and/or exchanged in electronic form, notes, memoranda, address lists, telephone contacts, screen name lists, or items reflecting or relating in any way to communications or contacts between any individuals.

13. Based on these facts, I have probable cause to believe that the above-described electronic data will be found within the above-described cellular telephone.

14. Agents are aware that seizing stored communications may implicate privacy rights, which Congress believed important enough to protect under the Electronic Communication Privacy Act (ECPA), specifically 18 U.S.C. 2703. Such material is further protected by Ohio Revised Code 2933.51, et. seq. In executing this warrant, it is possible that such communications may be seized, along with other material encompassed in the warrant. In this instance the cellular device named in this affidavit is highly probable to belong to Jeffrey Sergent, based on the location of the device during and at the conclusion of the incident as well as video corroboration of Jeffrey Sergent using the cell phone to communicate. Also, due to Jeffrey Sergent being deceased as a result of the incident there is no expectation of privacy for the cellular device that is probable to have been used and owned by Jeffrey Sergent.

Searching Digital Evidence

Based upon my training, experience and discussions with those involved in digital forensics, I know that searching all areas of an electronic device is necessary in order to conduct a complete search for electronic evidence relevant to the investigation for the following reasons:

1. All electronic devices have a "file system," which is how the device organizes directories and files. The "file system" is a representation of the storage device's organization as opposed to the actual data that is stored inside of the files. In other words, the "file system" is like a table of contents or an index in a book; it is a mechanism that keeps track of where the actual file or data is located on the hard drive. Each "file system" works in different ways and can vary between devices. "File systems" have their own conventions for the naming of files, such as how long a name can be or what characters are permissible in a file name.

2. Keyword searches may assist the examiner in locating electronic evidence, due to the vast amount of storage contained on electronic devices; however, the software and applications used to create or store the files may be such that it is not conducive to finding relevant evidence by solely using a keyword search. Software and applications may save data in a proprietary format, in an encrypted format, or in a compressed format that is not human readable and therefore not conducive to keyword searching. Therefore, the forensic examiner must review and analyze the operating system, software, and application configurations.

3. In addition, the user can take other steps that inhibit law enforcement from discovering the information that is the subject of the search relevant to the investigation. This includes, but is not limited to, renaming files or file extensions, using encryption or compression, password protecting files, using software or applications specifically designed to allow a user to hide portions of the storage area, or to embed a file within another file or files. In other words, a keyword search or merely looking at a file name or file type may lead an examiner to conclude, for example, that a data file contains text, when the file actually contains a picture, or vice-versa. A user does not need extensive computer knowledge to perform these steps and software and applications are readily available for free on the internet that will perform these steps for the user.

4. When a file is deleted, it may still be possible to recover the file because the file system usually just changes the entry related to that file as to where a file is located but does not actually go to the physical location on the storage media and remove the information at that physical location. Therefore, it may be possible to recover deleted data for a substantial period of time after the deletion occurred.

Therefore, personnel executing the search warrant must examine all areas of an electronic device, including but not limited to, scanning storage areas to discover and possibly recover deleted data, scanning storage areas for deliberately hidden files, performing electronic keyword searching through all electronic storage areas, and opening and previewing various file folders or directories and the individual files they contain, because evidence relevant to the investigation can reasonably be expected to be found anywhere on the device.

Request for Issuance of a Search Warrant

I submit based on the facts set forth in this affidavit, that there is probable cause to believe that the electronic devices listed above will contain evidence involving violations of Ohio Revised Code Section **2903.08 Aggravated Vehicular Assault; Vehicular Assault**. Based upon the foregoing, I respectfully request that this Court issue a search warrant for the electronic devices listed above, authorizing the search/examination by a qualified computer forensics examiner.

Request For Modification of Three (3) Day Execution Deadline

This Affiant states that the requested search of the electronic media to be performed by a qualified computer forensic examiner is expected to require more than three (3) days due to logistical and technical concerns. Hence, the "execution" of the requested warrant may require several weeks

from beginning to end. If the term "execution" were deemed to occur at the completion of the examination rather than the initiation of the examination, then it would be pragmatically impossible for law enforcement officers to comply with the three (3) day deadline and still properly conduct the search. Therefore, pursuant to revised Code 2933.24(A), this Affiant requests this Court require said seizure and/or search be initiated, by delivering the electronic evidence to the examiner, within three (3) days, unless and until otherwise authorized by this Court.

Permission for nighttime search (from 8:00 PM to midnight and from midnight to 7:00 AM) (X) is not requested, ( ) is requested for the above reasons and facts and these: **[LIST FACTS FOR A NIGHT TIME SEARCH IF APPLICABLE]**

Permission for Waiver of the Statutory Precondition for Nonconsensual Entry (X) is not requested, ( ) is requested for the above reason and facts and those facts detailed below:

Electronically Signed
2026-07-09 11:18 pm EDT
AFFIANT

Sworn to before me, and subscribed in my presence on July 10, 2026

Electronically Signed
Matthew L Reger
2026-07-10 9:09 am EDT
JUDGE