

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF COLLETON

State of South Carolina,

v.

Richard Alexander Murdaugh,
Defendant.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
FOURTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Indictment Nos. 2022-GS-15-00592,
593, 594, and -595

STATE'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION
TO DEFENSE MOTION TO COMPEL
BALLISTICS EXAMINATION WITH
UNRELATED CASES

The State hereby responds as follows to the defense's motion to compel on various points regarding the .300 Blackout bullet casings collected at the murder scene. It seeks: (1) a list of every crime in the Second and Fourteenth Circuits in which a .300 Blackout bullets or casings were recovered, (2) every "hit" from IBIS or NIBIN from a shooting in Allendale County on April 25, 2026, and another shooting on April 27, 2024, (3) defense examination of the casings from the Allendale shooting, (4) identification of every .300 Blackout firearm recovered in any crime in the Second and Fourteenth Circuit since Maggie and Paul were murdered, and (5) as supposed Giglio, every .300 Blackout firearm, casing, or projectile received by SLED since the first trial.

The sole basis for this request is that the unrelated Allendale cases from three and five years later involved the same commonly available caliber of ammunition and occurred in the same geographic region. However, the evidence from the unrelated cases has already been entered into the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) and it yielded zero leads or potential matches to the evidence in the Defendant's case or any other case for that matter. Because the defense cannot establish a logical or factual nexus between the two crimes, the motion represents a speculative fishing expedition for

public consumption that lacks legal relevance, creates an unwarranted burden and intrusion into state forensic resources, and should be denied.

1. Facts

Maggie Murdaugh was killed on June 7, 2021, by a weapon firing .300 Blackout rounds, and casings from that ammunition surrounded her body. {Tr. 786}. Casings from spent .300 Blackout rounds were found elsewhere on the Moselle property -- outside the gun room of the main house and at the nearby family shooting range. {Tr. 923}. When the casings from elsewhere on the property were compared with the casings found around Maggie's body, the SLED forensic examiner found they had been cycled through and ejected from the same weapon. {Tr. 1906, 1942}. Defendant could not account for a missing .300 Blackout AR-style rifle owned by the family, and similarly could not account for a missing 12 gauge shotgun consistent with the weapon used to kill Paul. One of Paul's friends testified that in the months prior to the murders he and Paul had been sighting in the missing .300 Blackout rifle outside the gun room where the matching casings were found. {Tr. 1476}.

On April 25, 2026, almost four years later, a person named Frank Brown was murdered in Allendale County. Apparently, .300 Blackout rounds were used. As this Court is aware, the defense raised an issue at the August 14 hearing because of a website report about this crime which noted the same caliber ammunition was used. The undersigned, which was unaware of the website report much less its speculation, asked SLED representatives in the courtroom, who informed the undersigned (who then informed the Court) that there was no connection to the Murdaugh case. Indeed, SLED later released the following statement about the Allendale crime:

SLED was requested by Allendale Police Chief Jim Evans on April 25, 2026, to investigate the murder of Frank Alexander Brown, III.

Fired 300 Blackout caliber cartridge cases from this Allendale Homicide with the incident date of April 25, 2026 (SLED Laboratory Case Number L26-06899) were triaged and entered into the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network (NIBIN) on August 13, 2026. As a result of these actions, no investigative leads were developed to any previously entered evidence.

In the State's letter response on September 17, 2026, it also noted that there was another shooting involving Blackout rounds in Allendale on April 27, 2024, but that also has generated no NIBIN hits with the Murdaugh case.

NIBIN is the National Integrated Ballistic Information Network. Run by the ATF, it uses "Integrated Ballistic Identification System (IBIS) technology [to capture] high-resolution images of ammunition casings to identify unique markings. These markings are then entered into NIBIN and compared to submissions of markings at other crime scenes. If investigators find a match, that information can be used to uncover the history of a crime gun and potentially connect it to other crimes and suspects." See <https://www.atf.gov/resource-center/infographics/national-integrated-ballistic-information-network-nibin>.

Relying on this media report about this Allendale crime, the defense apparently now contends that any time a .300 Blackout round is used within the Second and Fourteenth Circuits, comprising eight counties, over 5600 square miles, and over half a million people, then somehow the discovery rules require these extraordinary requests that are unsupported by either the facts or the law.

2. The defense requests are speculative and do not meet the standard for materiality under Rule 5 and Brady.

The defense claims do not meet the necessary test for materiality under Rule 5, SCRCrimP, or Brady. Rule 5(a)(1)(C) provides:

(C) Documents and Tangible Objects. Upon request of the defendant the prosecution shall permit the defendant to inspect and copy books, papers, documents, photographs, tangible objects, buildings or places, or copies or portions thereof, which are within the possession, custody or control of the prosecution, and which are **material to the preparation of his defense** or are intended for use by the prosecution as evidence in chief at the trial, or were obtained from or belong to the defendant.

(Emphasis added). Brady v. Maryland similarly contains a materiality standard:

A *Brady* claim is based upon the requirement of due process. Such a claim is complete if the accused can demonstrate (1) the evidence was favorable to the accused, (2) it was in the possession of or known to the prosecution, (3) it was suppressed by the prosecution, and (4) it was **material** to guilt or punishment.

Gibson v. State, 334 S.C. 515, 524, 514 S.E.2d 320, 324 (1999) (citing Brady and various cases). "The materiality test is the same under Brady and under the rule." State v. Proctor, 358 S.C. 424, 429, 595 S.E.2d 480, 482 (2004). Evidence is material under Brady if there is a reasonable probability that had the evidence been disclosed, the result of the proceeding would have been different. State v. Proctor, 358 S.C. 424, 429, 595 S.E.2d 480, 482 (2004).

Materiality requires more than a theoretical or speculative possibility that evidence might be helpful. The defense must demonstrate a reasonable probability that the sought-after evidence will resolve a fact in issue. See United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97, 109–110 (1976) ("The mere possibility that an item of undisclosed information might have helped the defense ... does not establish 'materiality' in the constitutional sense."); State v. Freeman, 319 S.C. 110, 121, 459 S.E.2d 867, 874 (Ct. App. 1995) ("[T]here is no

indication in the record before us that [the supposed witnesses] possessed any exculpatory or material information which would have aided [the defendants], and to so hold would be mere speculation. We agree with the trial judge that . . . [the defendants] have failed to meet the Brady standard of materiality as relates to this issue.”).¹

Speculation that a weapon might link to an unsolved third-party crime merely from caliber and geographic location does not satisfy this threshold. And indeed, since the advanced automated database (NIBIN) has already mathematically ruled out a correlation, the defense cannot show that a manual review and its other discovery requests are material to preparing a defense. An unsupported mere possibility of helpfulness – and indeed a *refuted* possibility of helpfulness -- is legally insufficient.

3. The defense ballistics requests in the current motion additionally have no reasonable basis to meet the standard for permissible evidence of third-party guilt under South Carolina law.

Consideration of South Carolina law on evidence of third-party guilt is also relevant in assessing the insufficiency of the defense’s ballistics motion as to materiality. Under the third-party guilt doctrine, evidence a criminal defendant may elicit to show another person committed the crime is “limited to such facts as are inconsistent with his own guilt, and to such facts as raise a reasonable inference or presumption as to his own innocence[.]” State v. Gregory, 198 S.C. 98, 104, 16 S.E.2d 532, 534 (1941). Our state

¹ See also United States v. Prochilo, 629 F.3d 264, 268–69 (1st Cir. 2011) (noting that to merit *in camera* review of disputed *Brady* materials, the defendant must “articulate with some specificity what evidence he hopes to find in the requested materials, why he thinks the materials contain this evidence, and finally, why this evidence would be both favorable to him and material,” and, in this regard, his “showing cannot consist of mere speculation”); United States v. Bland, 517 F.3d 930, 935 (7th Cir. 2008) (noting that “mere speculation that a government file might contain *Brady* material is not sufficient” to justify *in camera* review).

supreme court has held evidence that does nothing but “cast a bare suspicion upon another, or ... raise a conjectural inference as to the commission of the crime by another, is not admissible.” *Id.*; see also Holmes v. South Carolina, 547 U.S. 319, 328–30 (2006).

Here, relying on regional proximity and a commercially available ammunition type like .300 Blackout is too remote and speculative to establish the necessary link beyond a bare suspicion or conjectural inference. Even if the casings was found to match Allendale or any other South Carolina crime scene – which NIBIN says it does not – that does not exclude Defendant's use of the missing Murdaugh family Blackout rifle some five years earlier. Aside from the speculative and theoretical nature of the basis of the defense request, it would not meet the Holmes/Gregory standard anyway.

4. The speculative defense ballistics discovery demands are insufficient to justify an unwarranted intrusion into other cases and normal forensic procedures, and represent an unreasonable burden on the lab.

Granting the Defendant's motion on speculative possibilities would impose an undue and unauthorized burden on the forensic infrastructure of this state, and would represent an unwarranted intrusion into other cases. SLED utilizes NIBIN as a technological gatekeeper to devote limited available resources to possible “hits”, and to filter out non-matches. Forcing forensic examiners to conduct manual microscopic examinations on negative NIBIN entries without independent, corroborating evidence or something more than “possibilities” would set a dangerous precedent, significantly disrupting already strained state laboratory resources, and creating large costs to the public with an insufficient basis for doing so.

Moreover, requiring manual examinations from a negative NIBIN based on nothing but speculation and possibilities upends the normal forensic workflow that has manual

examinations occur after *positive* NIBIN hits. It would complicate the chain in those unrelated cases, potentially affecting prosecutions, defendants, and victims that have absolutely nothing to do with Defendant's case. Adding defense experts into chains of unrelated cases, without anything more than the speculation from geography and caliber set forth here, would add yet another layer of risk and complication.

The defense's showing is simply insufficient to justify such unprecedented, costly, and burdensome relief when all the defense have is speculation, and the very system designed to address such things has *refuted* the defense speculation.

- 5. There is no contradiction or Giglio in SLED's testimony at the first trial and the State's position in its recent letter regarding commonality of Blackout ammunition – both positions are true and were always put in their proper context.**

Next, the defense is again incorrect in claiming that somehow the State's evidence was false or that there is Giglio material as to the commonality of .300 Blackout ammunition. The defense notes that the undersigned's recent September 17, 2026, letter stated that .300 Blackout had become the second most popular cartridge for AR chambering behind .223/5.56. It thus asserts that testimony at the first trial and State argument that .300 Blackout was not as common as other calibers is somehow incorrect.

If only things were always static in time, maybe the defense might have a point. But yet again, they don't. In June of 2021, when the murders happened, the country was still dealing with COVID shortages, and in particular very acute ammunition shortages. Moreover, as ammo supplies started to increase, manufacturers were focused on making more mainstream rounds such as 9mm and 5.56 than the then-more niche cartridges like .300 Blackout. And, of course, unsurprisingly the defense motion leaves out the complete actual testimony from the first trial, which put the point exactly in that proper context.

During the defense's cross-examination of SLED Senior Special Agent Jeff Croft, the following occurred:

Q: And you're aware that 300 Blackout has – it's not a rare gun in the area of Hampton and Colleton County, is it?

A: **It's not as common as the general 223 or AR15, 308, different caliber rifles. It's not as common.**

Q: But there are plenty out there, correct?

A: I can't testify as to how many is out there, sir.

Q: I understand, but it's not the first time you'd seen a 300 Blackout on June 8th of 2021, was it?

A: I had seen one before, yes, sir.

{Tr. 1007} (emphasis added). During the State's redirect examination of SS/A Croft, the following occurred:

Q: All right. You were asked a little about this right here, **and this was June of 2021**, correct?

A: That is correct, yes, sir.

Q: **Had Covid had any effect generally on the availability of ammunition?**

A: Yes, sir.

Q: **And tell the jury what, it[f] any, effect that was.**

A: **Ammunition was difficult to get during that time because of the shutdown during Covid.**

Q: Did you find a lot of ammunition inside the defendant's residence?

A: There was quite a bit of ammunition.

Q: Did you find a lot of different types of ammunition inside the defendant's residence?

A: Yes, sir, we did.

Q: Did you find a lot of S&B 300 Blackout in the defendant's residence?

A: That was mostly what we found.

Q: You were asked about the commonality of various rounds, Blackout through others, and you mentioned 308 and 223 and 556. Can you tell the jury a little bit about those rounds and why they tend to be a bit more common as you testified, please?

A: I'm sorry, can you – do you mind remind repeating?

Q: Yeah, sure.

Mr. Griffin: Your Honor, I'm going to object. Beyond the scope. I didn't ask anything about 223s or whatever he said.

Mr. Waters: He asked about the commonality of Blackouts, and he answered about those.

The Court: The witness asked you to repeat the question. I would like to hear it as well.

Mr. Waters: Yes, sir.

Q: You were asked earlier about the commonality of Blackout, and you mentioned it was not as common as 308, 223, and 556. I was asking you to explain a little bit about those calibers and why they were more common.

The Court: I overrule the objection.

A: 223 is a very common round. It's utilized in law enforcement. 556 is utilized within law enforcement and also within the military. It's – prior to Covid, it was easily found, fairly cheap ammunition to go out and shoot as far as rifle ammunition goes. 308 is a hunting rifle, which can be used for larger games such as Whitetail and such like that. 308 is also common round that's used within law enforcement and the military side. It's a very common round. **300, on the other hand, is – it's just at that particular time, 300 rounds were just – or weapons were just not that common.**

Q: How many criminal investigations have you worked where a 300 Blackout was the murder round?

A: I have none.

Q: None?

A: None.

{Tr. 1050-52} (emphasis added).

Thus, SS/A Croft and the State's questioning were very clear of appropriate context — that .223, 5.56, and .308 were "more common" rifle ammunition, and that COVID had negatively impacted ammunition supplies, so that — "at that particular time" — .300 BLK was "just not that common". And the State's question to SS/A Croft was whether *he* personally has a Blackout murder case – and the State is unaware of any information to contrary.

As the years have passed, though, .300 Blackout has absolutely increased in popularity, particularly has ammo availability and manufacturing has stabilized and broadened. This is further reflected in the increase of SLED's NIBIN submissions of .300 BLK since 2021 to the present:

2021 – 42
2022 – 81
2023 – 114
2024 – 148
2025 – 209
2026 – 130

{Exhibit A}.

The defense wrongly asserts that the point about .300 BLK must be mutually exclusive and thus binary — either it is "common" or it is not. The reality is both assertions are true given the time period being discussed, and the State and its witness never put things in anything other than the appropriate context.

6. The specific requests in the defense motion should each be denied.

As to the relief requested in paragraph VII(7), demanding a list of every crime in the Second and Fourteenth Circuits in which a .300 Blackout bullets or casings were recovered, SLED does not possess such a list, nor could a reliable list be created. SLED publishes the annual Crime Book, which represents the data SLED collects in this regard, and the State has already advised the defense of such.

As to the relief requested in paragraph VII(8), the IBIS system is used to enter cartridge cases from test fired firearms or evidence recovered from a crime scene into NIBIN. The IBIS Specimen Input Form is in the Firearms Case File page 113. The State will provide any data SLED has responsive to this request. {Exhibit B}.

As to the relief requested in paragraph VII(9), for the reasons set out in the previous sections, the State objects to manual examinations by defense examiners in unrelated cases based on pure speculation from regional geography and a commonly available caliber, particularly where, as here, NIBIN has negative results for matches with those cases.

As to the relief requested in paragraph VII(10), demanding identification of every .300 Blackout firearm recovered in any crime in the Second and Fourteenth Circuit since Maggie and Paul were murdered, SLED does not possess such a list.

As to the relief requested in paragraph VII(11), the State is not aware of any Giglio material, but regardless SLED does not possess such a list.

CONCLUSION

The materiality standard of Brady and Rule 5 is not met simply because a certain type of commercially available ammunition is used in a particular geographic region of the state in another crime years later. Injecting the defense into casings recovered in


completely separate and unsolved crimes, based on nothing but speculation, is simply not required by the materiality standard or the third party guilt standard, particularly where the State has the burden of proof and the obligation to preserve evidence and chains of custody.² Moreover, nothing about the trial testimony and the State's current representations are inaccurate that both were expressed in the appropriate context. Thus, there is no Giglio material.

OCT 8 2026 AM 9:59
COLLETON CO GS. GARY HALE

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

By:



S. Creighton Waters
Sr. Assistant Deputy Attorney General

Columbia, South Carolina
October 8, 2026

² Jurisdictions have expressly imposed the duty of preservation on the State once an item of evidence is collected and held in State custody. State v. Krosch, 642 N.W.2d 713, 718 (Minn. 2002) (citing State v. Steffes, 500 N.W.2d 608, 612-13 (N.D. 1993); State v. Ware, 118 N.M. 319, 881 P.2d 679, 682 (1994)). "It is well-settled that the prosecutor is under a duty to preserve evidence even before [a] defendant's right to discovery attaches." People v. Hale, 167 Misc. 2d 872, 875, 638 N.Y.S.2d 886, 889 (Sup. Ct. 1996). "The duty to preserve evidence starts as soon as the evidence is obtained and continues after a conviction." Chouleng Soun, The Rising Tide in Wrongful Convictions: The Shortcomings of Brady and the Need for Additional Safeguards, 56 New Eng. L. Rev. 221, 240 (2022).

Exhibit

A

OCT 8 2026 AM 9:59
COLLETON CO GS, GARY HALE

[9] LEADS [9] ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2021 to 12/31/2021

Filter	Selection
Site	6 selected: 'SC-COLSBR1','SC-COLSBR2','SC-COLSLED','SC-MYRTBR1','SC-SUMSCBRX1','SC-YORKCOSOBXR1'
Exhibits Categories	All selected
Event Type	All selected
Caliber	2 selected: 300 AAC Blackout, 300 BLK

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2021 to 12/31/2021

	CC	Total
SC-COLSBR1	14	14
SC-COLSBR2	28	28
Total	42	42

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2022 to 12/31/2022

Filter	Selection
Site	6 selected: 'SC-COL.SBR1','SC-COL.SBR2','SC-COL.SLED','SC-MVRTBR1','SC-SUMSCBRX1','SC-YORKCOSOBXR1'
Exhibits Categories	All selected
Event Type	All selected
Caliber	2 selected: 300 AAC Blackout, 300 BLK

LEADS ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2022 to 12/31/2022

	CC	Total
SC-COLSB1	18	18
SC-COLSB2	59	59
SC-MYRTB1	4	4
Total	81	81

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2023 to 12/31/2023

Filter	Selection
Site	6 selected: 'SC-COLSBRT','SC-COLSBR2','SC-COLSLED','SC-MYRTBR1','SC-SUMSCBRX1','SC-YORKCOSOB RX1'
Exhibits Categories	All selected
Event Type	All selected
Caliber	2 selected: 300 AAC Blackout,300 BLK

LEADS ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2023 to 12/31/2023

	CC	Total
SC-COLSB R1	44	44
SC-COLSB R2	56	56
SC-MYRTB R1	14	14
Total	114	114

For official use only
Sensitive but unclassified

LEADS ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2024 to 12/31/2024

	CC	Total
SC-COLSB1	38	38
SC-COLSB2	92	92
SC-MYRTB1	14	14
SC-SUMSCBRX1	4	4
Total	148	148

All selected
2 selected: 300 AAC Blackout,300 BLK

[9] LEADS [9] ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2025 to 12/31/2025

	CC	Total
SC-COLSB1	45	45
SC-COLSB2	115	115
SC-MYRTB1	22	22
SC-SUMSCBRX1	8	8
SC-YORKCOSOB1	19	19
Total	209	209

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2026 to 9/29/2026

Filter	Selection
Site	6 selected: 'SC-COLSBR1','SC-COLSBR2','SC-COLSLD','SC-MVRTBR1','SC-SUMSCBRX1','SC-YORKCOSOBXR1'
Exhibits Categories	All selected
Event Type	All selected
Caliber	2 selected: 300 AAC Blackout, 300 BLK

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2026 to 9/29/2026

	CC	Total
SC-COLSB R1	30	30
SC-COLSB R2	81	81
SC-MYRTB R1	9	9
SC-SUMSCB R1	3	3
SC-YORKCOSOBRX1	7	7
Total	130	130

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2021 to 9/14/2026

Filter	Selection
Site	6 selected: 'SC-COLSBRT','SC-COLSBRT2','SC-COLSLER','SC-MYRTBR1','SC-SUMSCBRX1','SC-YORKCOSOBXR1'
Exhibits Categories	All selected
Event Type	All selected
Caliber	All selected

LEADS ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1
Acquired From 1/1/2021 to 9/14/2026

9/29/2026
2

	CC	Total
SC-COLSB R1	19034	19034
SC-COLSB R2	34644	34644
SC-MYRTB R1	7060	7060
SC-SUMSCB R1	785	785
SC-YORKCOSOB R1	1104	1104
Total	62627	62627

LEADS [9] ONLINE

Exhibits by Caliber
Site: GA-ATLADC1

Acquired From 1/1/2021 to 9/14/2026

9/14/2026
1

Filter	Selection
Site	6 selected: 'SC-COLSBRT1','SC-COLSBRT2','SC-COLSLED','SC-MYRTBR1','SC-SUMSCBRX1','SC-YORKCOSOBXR1'
Exhibits Categories	All selected
Event Type	All selected
Caliber	2 selected: 300 AAC Blackout,300 BLK

OCT 8 2026 AM10:00
COLLETON CO GS, GARY HALE

	CC	Total
SC-COLSBR1	188	188
SC-COLSBR2	429	429
SC-MYRTBR1	63	63
SC-SUMSCBRX1	14	14
SC-YORKCOSOBRX1	26	26
Total	720	720

OCT 8 2026 AM 10:00
COLLETON CO 6S, GARY HALE

Exhibit B

OCT 8 2026 AM 10:00
COLLETON CO GS, GARY HALE

*SECONDARY REVIEWS TOT SUMED PER REQUESTS SINCE 8/13/26 1/17/26

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
8/12/26	ANDCSO 2026-03840 TF	TF 1263378C	223 Rem	PPH	8/13/26	NO			§		
	2026-02445 TF	TF 1263378C	223 Rem			NO					
	2026-01842 TF	TF 1263380C	223 Rem		8/13/26	NO			§		
8/13/26	2026-02445 TF	TF 1263382C	5.71 28		8/14/26	YES?	SC ANDPD 2622047	125730C	PPH	8/14/26	CW
8/13/26	"	TF 1263385C	380 Auto		8/14/26	NO			PPH		
8/13/26	"	TF 1263386C	9x19			NO					
8/13/26	2026-04949 *	TF 1263388C	9x19			NO					
8/13/26	2026-02869 TF	TF 1263386C	9x19			NO					
8/12/26	SC OCSO 20260005093	1C	45 Auto	PPH	8/13/26	NO			§		
"	20260005322	8C	40SW	"		NO					
8/12/26	UCSO SOCA 2502164 TF	TF 1C	9x19	PPH	8/13/26	NO			§		
8/13/26	SC CHOCES 2026-01241	01.1C	550A 45	PPH	8/13/26	YES	SC JC50 23519504 SC JC50 23519504 " " "	9709C 9704C 9704C	PPH	8/14/26	CW
		01.2C	223 Rem			NO					
		01.3C	223 Rem			YES	SC JC50 23519504 " "	9709C 9704C 9704C		8/14/26	CW
8/13/26	SC SLED 2026-02527	9C	300 BLK	PPH		NO					

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
03/29/25	SC S&PD C25030200 TF	TF270	40SW	AB	4-28-25	NO			Y		
	SC S&PD C25030499	SC	223Rem			NO					
	SC S&PD C25030604	9C	9mmL	↓		NO					
3/29/25	S&PD 31240059 TF	TF	12HC	40SW	ABX	NO					
3/29/25	SC FCSO 2025-03-0322	1C	7.62 39mm	MM		Yes	FSC 2025-06059	3C	✓	3/31/25	MM
	"	3C	45Auto			NO					
	2025-02-0312	2C	9mmL			NO					
03/29/25	SC FPD FCSO 2025-03-0626	1C	9mmL	AB		NO					
	S&PD 2025-0074 TF	TF2C	45ACP	I	↓	NO					
03/29/25	SC FCSO 202405666 TF	TF1C	9mmL	AB	4-1-25	NO			✓		
3/31/25	SC ABVPD 322? 2025030032	ITEM DC	9mmL	MM		Yes	2025030032 TF ABVPD 23-2233	TF1C 1203A2C	✓	3/31/25	MM
03/31/25	ABVPD 202500322 TF	TF1C	9mmL	AB		Yes	ABVPD 2025-0322 ABVPD 23-2233	Shu DC 121052A.CC	✓	4/1/25	MM
	ABVPD 202802546 TF	TF1C	223Rem	↓		NO					
3/31/25	SUMCSO 2501116	Sub Panel 05 001.6C	40SW	MM	↓	NO					
"	2501134	002C	40SW	MM		Yes	SCREENED 100130 SUMCSO 2501133 TF	TF002C	✓	4/1/25	MM

Issuing Authority: Quality Manager

(Cont on next)

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
2/24/25	WCSD 242182 TF	TF 40C	12GA	AB	2-26-25	NO			X		
02/24/25	LANCSD 25-09233 TF	TF12C	9mm	AB		YES	CLPD 240015314 240700021800 240700021400 LANCSD 24-80200 24-31907	YC 2AC, 2AC 21C		2/26/25	AB
		TF13.1C				YES					
		TF13.2C				YES	LANCSD 24-30270 24-31907	2AC, 3AC 21			
		TF14C	7.62 x 39mm			NO					
	LANCSD 25-05057 TF	TF7C	9mm			NO					
	SC BPPD 24070068 TF	TF1C				NO					
		TF2C				YES	FPC024002475	7C		2/26/25	AB
	SC BPPD 25010035 TF	TF1C				NO					
2/25/25	CHCSD 25-0260 TF	TF1C		AB		NO					
	SLED 31240059 TF	TF 120C	40SW			NO					
	"	TF 123C	223 Rem			NO					
	"	TF 122C	12GA			NO					
2/25/25	SC COLPD 250003270 TF	TF1C	5.56 NATO	AB		NO					
	250004186 TF	TF1C	45 AUTO			NO					

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
6/16/25	EPD 20257596 TE	TF 224C	223 Rem	MMK	6-13-25	NO			V		
6/16/25	RESIED 31240059 TE	F 120	40SW	APL		NO					
		121	40SW			NO					
		122	12 GA			NO					
		123	223 Rem			NO					
6-12-25	6L COLPD 250009108	1C	9mm Luger	JL		yes	COLPD 250009102 TF	TFIC	J	6/16/25	APL
	250012448	1C	9mm Luger			NO					
	250012534	1C	9mm Luger			yes	W00230F2B C010176201 250012534 C0000319000 C0000319000	3 4 1 16	V	6/16/25	APL
	↓	2C	9mm Luger			yes	250012534 2500057100	SC 1	Q	6/16/25	APL
	250012604	1C	9mm Luger			NO					
	250012696	1C	9mm Luger			NO					
	250012761	1C	223 REM			yes	250012761 TE		Q	6/16/25	APL
	250011254 TE	TFIC	9mm Luger			NO					
	↓	TFIA	9mm Luger			NO					
	250012994 TE	TFIC	357 MAG			NO					

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
6-11-25	250011972 TF	TFIC	380 AUTO	JL	06/12/25	No			AS		
+	250009065 TF	TFIC	9mm Luger	L		No					
06/22/25	SC ACSD 25-034279 TF	TF	3006	AS		No					
	VAPD 5442500483 TF	TFIC	9mm L			No					
	SC SLED 202402018	3C	9mm L			No					
	SC GWPB 25002056 TF	TF3.26	9mm L		6/18/25	NO			MPX		
		TF3.26				NO					
6/12/25	SC ACSD 25-0284	1C	9x19mm	MPX		NO					
6/12/25	SC SLED 31240059	140C	7.62x 39mm	MPX		YES	SC EPD 20257596 SC EPD 202412122 SC EPD 20257596	1C 4C 2C		6-13-25	V
	"	131C	40SW	"		NO					
6/12/25	SC GWPB 25-0475	1C	9x19mm	MPX		NO					
6/12/25	SC EPD 20257596	1C	7.62x 39mm	MPX		YES	SC SLED 31240059 SC EPD 202412122	140C 4C, 5C		6-13-25	V
	"	2C	7.62x 39mm	"		YES	SC SLED 31240059 SC EPD 202412122	5C		6-13-25	V
	"	13C	40SW	"		NO					
+	EPD 20257596	25C	7.62x39 mm	"	+	YES	SC JCSO 25507662 SC EPD 2025-5443	1894C 1C		6-13-25	V

Issuing Authority: Quality Manager

(cont on next)

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
5/6/24	SC ALPD 24-0931	472C	7.62x 39mm	AK	5/7/24	NO			CW		
		474C	300BLK			NO					
		444C	9mm L			NO					
		449C	40SW			Yes	SC SLED L24-07423	S4C		5/7/22	BAK
		469C	40SW			NO					
05/06/24	SC HP 23024277 HP32TF	TF 002C	380Auto	AB		NO					
	SC HP 23042907 HP28TF	TF 002C	9mm L			NO					
	SC HP 22184532 HP32TF	TF 003C	380Auto			NO					
	SC HP 22112617 HP28TF	TF 002C	40SW			NO					
	SC HP 22122410 HP43TF	TF 002C	9mm L			NO					
	SC HP 22147316 HP32TF	TF 002C	9mm L			NO					
5/7/24	SC SLED L24-07412	17C	5.56 45mm	BAK	5/7/24	NO			MAC		
		21C	40SW			NO					
		32C	40SW			NO					

IBIS ENTRY LOG

ENTRY					CORRELATION					SECONDARY REVIEW	
Date Entered	Case #	Item #	Caliber	Initials	Date Correlated	HCC Yes/No	Reference Case #	Exhibit #	Initials	Date Reviewed	Initials
6/8/21	SC ANDPD 21-18738 TF	TFI 520C	380 Auto	PAK	6/10	No	modified caliber, resubbed		OP		
	SC BRCSD 215098021	TF 109780C	9mm L	PAK		No	modified → TF returned		↓		
	SC LCSD 19-025087TF	TF 2.2C	9mm L	PAK		No	modified → TF returned		↓		
	SC LCSD 21-002563TF	TF 1.2C	9mm L	PAK	✓	No	modified → TF returned		↓		
6/8/21	LA 1-09074	3C	300 Blackcat	CW	6/9/21	No			CW		
		9C	12 Gauge			No			↓		
		10C	12 Gauge			No			↓		
6/9/21	SC WCSO 15006950	5C		PAK	6/9/21	No	modified case && resubbed 6/11/21		OP		
	SC COLPD 210013867 TF	TFIC	380 Auto	JC	6/10/21	No			OP		
	210014036 TF	TFIC	9mm Luger			No			↓		
	210014137 TF	TFIC	9mm Luger			No			↓		
	210012381 TF	TFIC	380 Auto			No			↓		
	210002613 TF	TFIC	9mm Luger			No			↓		
	210013341 TF	TFIC	9mm Luger			No			↓		
	14240 210012420 TF	TFIC	9mm Luger		✓	No			↓		

Issuing Authority: Quality Manager

SLED Forensics Form # FIR 021, August 2018
Page 1 of 1

OCT 8 2026 AM10:00
COLLETON CO GS, GARY HALE