



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



2025-3739

Officer Involved Critical Incident – 4272 Cider Mill Drive,
Cincinnati, OH 45245 (L)

Investigative Activity: Records Received, Review of Records

Involves: Thomas Mitchell Noble (S), [REDACTED] (S), [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] (S)

Date of Activity: 01/05/2026

Author: SA Lauren Frazier, #129

Narrative:

On January 5, 2026, Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation (BCI) Special Agent Lauren Frazier received two (2) Ohio BCI Laboratory reports for items of evidence that were submitted on November 21, 2025, for scientific analysis. The BCI laboratory case number is 25-135133.

The first report originated from the DNA section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Peter Tassi. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

- 3. White box contained Airsoft BB gun (S#21M014661) (Scene #1, item 5)

DNA samples were collected but were not forwarded for DNA analysis at this time.

The second report originated from the firearms section of the laboratory and was authored by Forensic Scientist Daniel Steiner. The BCI Firearms Section was requested to perform an analysis of the officers' firearms, as well as the firearm-related evidence collected from the scene (casings and bullets). By comparing evidentiary cartridge casings/projectiles to known standards from each weapon, identifications can be made as to which casings/projectiles were fired from each firearm. The items relevant to this report which had previously been submitted were as follows:

- 1. One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case
- 2. One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case
- 4. One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial # [REDACTED], with attached flashlight and optic sight, three (3) magazines, and fifty (50) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges
- 5. One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case
- 6. One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case
- 7. One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case

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.

- 8. One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case
- 9. One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P-15, 5.56 NATO semi-automatic rifle, serial # [REDACTED], with two (2) magazines and fifty-four (54) unfired 5.56mm NATO cartridges
- 10. One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case
- 11. Two (2) fired bullet jacket fragments & two (2) lead fragments

Findings:

- Smith & Wesson pistol (S/N [REDACTED]) – operable
 - One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case – source identification
- Smith & Wesson rifle (S/N [REDACTED]) – operable
 - Six (6) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge cases – source identification
- Two (2) fired bullet jacket fragments:
 - Smith & Wesson pistol (S/N [REDACTED]) – source exclusion
 - Smith & Wesson rifle (S/N [REDACTED]) – inconclusive
- Two (2) lead fragments – unsuitable

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

References:

No references.

Attachments:

Attachment # 01: 2025-12-03 BCI Lab Report – DNA 25-135133-1

Attachment # 02: 2025-12-18 BCI Lab Report – Firearms Analysis 25-135133-2



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation

Laboratory Report DNA

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office BCI Laboratory Number: 25-135133
Holly Ryczek
30 E. Broad Street Analysis Date: Issue Date:
Columbus, OH 43215 November 25, 2025 December 03, 2025

Agency Case Number: 2025-3739
BCI Agent: Holly Ryczek

Offense: Officer Involved Critical Incident
Subject(s):
Victim(s):

Submitted on November 21, 2025 by Holly Ryczek

3. White box containing Airsoft BB gun (S#21M014661) (Scene #1, item 5)

Item	Conclusions
3 Airsoft BB gun (S#21M014661) (Scene #1, item 5)	
3.1 Swab of trigger	Sample collected for DNA analysis
3.2 Swab of grip	Sample collected for DNA analysis
3.3 Swab of back slide area	Sample collected for DNA analysis
3.4 Swab of textured buttons/levers	Sample collected for DNA analysis
3.5 Swab of front sight area	Sample collected for DNA analysis
3.6 Swab of CO ₂ holder	Sample collected for DNA analysis

Remarks

All evidence will be returned to the submitting agency. Samples are not being forwarded for DNA analysis at this time.

Peter J. Tassi Jr.
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2626
peter.tassi@OhioAGO.gov



Based on visual examination and 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>

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

Peter J. Tassi Jr.
Statement of Qualifications
peter.tassi@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

Education

- Bachelor of Science in Forensic Science. January 2003.
The University of New Haven, West Haven, Connecticut
- Bachelor of Science in Chemistry. January 2003.
The University of New Haven, West Haven, Connecticut

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist. 2008 - Present
- Wallingford Police Department. Police Officer. 2004 - 2008
- Massachusetts State Crime Laboratory. Intern. 2002 - 2003

Selected Specialized Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Biology. 2008
- Connecticut Police Academy. Police Officer Training. 2004

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated: 7-25-24



DAVE YOST

OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL

Bureau of Criminal Investigation**Laboratory Report**
Firearms

To: Ohio Attorney General's Office BCI Laboratory Number: 25-135133
Holly Ryczek
30 E. Broad Street Analysis Date: Issue Date:
Columbus, OH 43215 December 15, 2025 December 18, 2025

Agency Case Number: 2025-3739
BCI Agent: Holly Ryczek

Offense: Officer Involved Critical Incident

Subject(s): N/A

Victim(s): N/A

Submitted on 11/21/2025 by Holly Ryczek

1. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, Item #1)
- *One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case*
2. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #2)
- *One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case*
4. White box containing firearm (SN# [REDACTED]) with magazine, cartridges, streamlight, optic (Scene #1, item #6)
- *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P9 M2.0, 9mm Luger semi-automatic pistol, serial # [REDACTED] with attached flashlight and optic sight, three (3) magazines, and fifty (50) unfired 9mm Luger cartridges*
5. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #7)
- *One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case*
6. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #8)
- *One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case*
7. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #9)
- *One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case*
8. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #10)
- *One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case*

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

[X] 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

9. One cardboard box containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #11); actually found to contain firearm (SN: [REDACTED])
- *One (1) Smith & Wesson model M&P-15, 5.56mm NATO semi-automatic rifle, serial # [REDACTED] with two (2) magazines and fifty-four (54) unfired 5.56mm NATO cartridges*

10. One manila envelope containing fired cartridge case (Scene #1, item #12)
- *One (1) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge case*

11. One manila envelope containing fired bullet fragments from autopsy of Tommy Noble (Scene #3, item #2)
- *Two (2) fired bullet jacket fragments*
- *Two (2) lead fragments*

Findings

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 4: Smith & Wesson pistol [REDACTED]	N/A	Operable
	Item 2: One (1) fired 9mm Luger cartridge case	Source Identification

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 9: Smith & Wesson rifle [REDACTED]	N/A	Operable
	Items 1, 5 - 8, 10: Six (6) fired 5.56mm NATO cartridge cases	Source Identification

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 11: Two (2) fired bullet jacket fragments	Item 4: Smith & Wesson pistol [REDACTED]	Source Exclusion
	Item 9: Smith & Wesson rifle [REDACTED]	Inconclusive*

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

Item Description	Comparison	Conclusion
Item 11: Two (2) lead fragments	N/A	Unsuitable [^]

[^]Insufficient class and/or individual characteristics present.

Remarks

The remaining submitted items from Items 4 and 9 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.



Daniel Steiner
Forensic Scientist
(740) 845-2619
daniel.steiner@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

Daniel E. Steiner
Statement of Qualifications
Daniel.Steiner@OhioAGO.gov

Education

- Bachelor of Science, Forensic Science; Minor, Chemistry; 2007. The University of Findlay; Findlay, Ohio.
- Bachelor of Arts, Information Technology; 2005. Bluffton University; Bluffton, Ohio.

Professional Experience

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Firearms. 2018 – Present.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Forensic Scientist, Latent Prints. 2010 – 2018.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Technical Specialist, OHLEG. 2008 – 2010.

Selected Specialized Training

- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Firearms Training. 2018-2020.
- Ohio Bureau of Criminal Investigation. Latent Print Training. 2010.

A complete CV can be made available upon request

Updated: 03/22/2024