



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



2026-2171

Officer Involved Critical Incident - 9093 Zinnia Court, Apt
1209, West Chester, Ohio 45069 (L)

Investigative Activity: Lab Report Received & Reviewed
Involves: Lorenzo Miller, [REDACTED]
Activity Date: 07/21/2026
Authoring Agent: SA Joshua T. Welty, # 173

Narrative:

On Tuesday, July 21, 2026, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent (SA) Joshua Welty (SA Welty) received Ohio BCI Laboratory report(s) for items of evidence submitted on June 10, 2026 for scientific analysis (laboratory case number 26-119763). The report originated from the Firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Andrew McClelland. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

1. Sig Sauer pistol (Lab item 4)
2. One (1) fired 9mm Lugar cartridge case (Lab item 2)
3. One (1) fired jacketed bullet (Lab item 3)

SA Welty reviewed the laboratory report and noted the following:

It was found the Sig Sauer pistol was operable and source identified to lab items two and three. It was also found the second bullet removed from Lorenzo Miller was not source identified to the Sig Sauer pistol.

A copy of the Ohio BCI Laboratory report is attached to this investigative report. Please refer to the attachment for further details.

References:

No references.

Attachments:

Attachment # 1: BCI Lab Report (Firearms) 26-119763

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.



ANDY WILSON

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report Firearms

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office BCI Laboratory Number: 26-119763
Joshua Welty
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, OH 43215 Analysis Date: Issue Date:
July 09, 2026 July 17, 2026

Agency Case Number: 2026-2171
BCI Agent: Holly Ryczek

Offense: Officer Involved Critical
Incident

Subject(s): N/A

Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on 06/10/2026 by Holly Ryczek

2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge casing located master bedroom bathroom floor (Scene 1, item #4)
 - *one (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
3. Brown paper bag containing fired bullets recovered from autopsy of Lorenzo Miller (Scene 2, item 1)
 - *one (1) fired jacketed bullet*
 - *one (1) fired lead bullet*
4. White box containing firearm (Sn# [REDACTED]) with magazine and ammunition (Scene 3, item 1)
 - *one (1) Sig Sauer model P320, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial number [REDACTED] with one (1) magazine and seventeen (17) unfired 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 4: Sig Sauer pistol	N/A	Operable
	Item 2: one (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case	Source Identification
	Item 3: one (1) fired jacketed bullet	Source Identification
	Item 3: one (1) fired lead bullet	Source Exclusion

Remarks

The remaining submitted items from Item 4 were not examined at this time.

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency.

Analytical Detail

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



Andrew McClelland
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2089
andrew.mcclelland@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. Results relate only to the items tested.

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

Andrew D. McClelland
Statement of Qualifications
andrew.mcclelland@OhioAGO.gov

Education

- Bachelor's Degree, Biochemistry; 2004. Otterbein College; Westerville, Ohio.

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Firearms. 2012 – Present.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Latent Prints. 2005 – 2012.

Selected Specialized Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Firearms Training. 2012-2013.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Latent Print Training. 2005-2006.

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated: 04/19/2024