



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



2022-0826

Officer Involved Critical Incident - W. 46th Street, between Collins Blvd.
and Valley View Blvd.

Investigative Activity: Records Received; Document Review

Activity Date: 5/31/2022

Activity Location: BCI Richfield

Authoring Agent: SA Jon Lieber #50

Narrative:

On Tuesday, May 31, 2022, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Jon Lieber (Lieber) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on April 13, 2022 and April 22, 2022, for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 22-33189). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Dylan Matt. The items relevant to this report, which had previously been submitted, were as follows:

1. One cardboard box containing firearm (Serial # B573172U) (Matrix #1) - One (1) Remington 20 Gauge pump action shotgun, model 870 Express Magnum, serial number B573172U.
2. One cardboard box containing firearm (Serial # [REDACTED] (Matrix #4) - One (1) Ruger 308 Winchester bolt action rifle, model Ruger Precision Rifle, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) magazine and eight (8) 308 Winchester cartridges.
3. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix #6) - One (1) 308 Winchester fired cartridge case.
4. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix #12) – One (1) fired bullet. This projectile was recovered from David Ward Jr. during his autopsy at the Cuyahoga County Medical Examiner's Office.

SA Lieber reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

Item #1 (Remington 20-gauge pump action shotgun) was found to be operable.

Item #3 (.308 Winchester fired cartridge case) was found to have been fired from Item #2 (Ruger bolt action rifle). Item #4 (Fired bullet) was determined to be inconclusive when compared to test fires from Item #2.

A copy of the Ohio BCI Laboratory report is attached to this Investigative Report. Please refer to the attachment 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: 22-33189

Analysis Date:
April 28, 2022

Issue Date:
May 20, 2022

Agency Case Number:

2022-0826

BCI Agent:

Justin Soroka

Offense: Shooting Involving an Officer

Subject(s):

Victim(s):

Submitted on April 13, 2022 by S/A Justin Soroka:

1. One cardboard box containing firearm (Serial # B573172U) (Matrix #1)
-One (1) Remington 20 Gauge pump action shotgun, model 870 Express Magnum, serial number B573172U.
2. One cardboard box containing firearm (Serial # [REDACTED]) (Matrix #4)
-One (1) Ruger 308 Winchester bolt action rifle, model Ruger Precision Rifle, serial number [REDACTED] one (1) magazine and eight (8) 308 Winchester cartridges.
3. Envelope containing cartridge case (Matrix #6)
-One (1) 308 Winchester fired cartridge case.

Submitted on April 22, 2022 by S/A Justin Soroka:

4. Envelope containing bullet (Matrix #12)
-One (1) fired bullet.

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #1: Remington shotgun	N/A	Operable

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

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item #2: Ruger bolt action rifle	N/A	Operable
	Item #3: 308 Winchester fired cartridge case	Source Identification
	Item #4: fired bullet	Inconclusive*

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

Remarks

Two (2) BCI supplied shotshells were used for testing Item #1.

Two (2) BCI supplied and three (3) submitted cartridges were used for testing Item #2.

Test fired specimens from shotguns and law enforcement firearms are not entered into the NIBIN database. Therefore, test fires from Items #1 and 2 were not entered.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Dylan Matt
Forensic Scientist
234-400-3648
dylan.matt@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.

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