Review of Dr. Jon Nordby’s “Shotgun Death of Col. James E. Sabow”

Summary:
I know Dr. Jon Nordby through his excellent publications. He is a fine scientist and certainly his works are valuable additions to any forensic science library. However, I am mystified by Dr. Nordby’s report on this case. His work is not well thought out and the report is not the quality that I would consider appropriate for a scientist of his caliber.

1. Dr. Nordby engages in attacks on Dr. David Sabow that are inappropriate for the apparent mandate of a scientific study of the cause of death of Colonel James Sabow.
2. There is no excuse for not obtaining critical evidence in this case. The evidence exists and its location known. I find it astonishing, considering the nature of this case, that Dr. Nordby could not find the means to obtain this evidence.
3. Critical to this case is the Ithaca 12 gauge shotgun Model 200E, which was “unobtainable.” Nordby claims that he could not find a substitute for the Ithaca 200E. He also notes that these shotguns, when found are extraordinarily expensive ($3000 and up). Not true on either issue. The Ithaca 12 gauge Model 200E is available on the internet and costs around $1000.
4. It is inappropriate to use a different brand (Gentry) shotgun in his tests. Considering the conditions of these tests (i.e., none of the critical evidence available), Dr. Nordby should have dropped this case when it became apparent that the critical evidence was not forthcoming.
5. The use of his plywood-constructed “skull boxes” to simulate the internal conditions of a human skull subjected to an intraoral shotgun blast has no apparent foundation in the scientific literature and would pass neither a Daubert nor a Frye challenge.
6. Dr. Nordby does not show that the damaging of the barrel of the Gentry shotgun in one of his tests is a valid feature for all shotguns when the muzzle is pressed hard against human soft tissue. It is inappropriate, due to lack of sufficient data, to consider this shotgun failure as having anything to do with the case.
7. The so-called “sound tests” of the Gentry shotgun conducted by Dr. Nordby are presented in an unscientific manner and, therefore, not valid.
8. There is a vast amount of inappropriate material (e.g., discussion concerning black powder shotguns) included in Dr. Nordby’s report. I do not understand why Dr. Nordby felt it necessary include this material, which only obfuscates the issues of this case and the work that he presents.
Introduction.

Dr. David Sabow first contacted me on January 10, 2005 regarding the death of his brother, Colonel James Sabow. He requested that I conduct an investigation concerning the gunshot residue evidence in this case.

On January 11, 2005 I received by FedEx the shotgun and pajama bottoms worn by Colonel Sabow at the time of his death. This was followed (February 8, 2005) by the bathrobe and the rest of the clothing that was worn by Colonel Sabow at his death. The results of my analyses mainly concern gunshot residue (GSR) are in a forthcoming report.

During the first conversation with Dr. Sabow, he noted that an analysis of Colonel Sabow’s death was recently issued by Dr. Jon Nordby of Final Analysis Forensics. He stated that was not happy with the conclusions that Dr. Nordby came to in that report and my retention by Dr. Sabow was the result of Dr. Nordby’s report.

The Department of Defense apparently issued Dr. Nordby’s report on December 30, 2004. I was asked by Dr. David Sabow to review Dr. Nordby’s report as part of my investigation into this matter.

The report by Dr. Jon Nordby concerning the death of Colonel James Sabow.

1) My understanding is that the investigation conducted by Jon Nordby was mandated by Congress of the United States. The intent of this mandate was to initiate a multidisciplinary analysis of the evidence. I see no indication from the cover letter or the report itself that this occurred. Indeed, the letter dated December 30, 2004 to Congressman Duncan Hunter by Charles S. Abell lists a number of individuals who allegedly participated in this study, but nowhere in the material that I received were reports from these individuals. There is no indication in Dr. Nordby’s report that these individuals generated reports. Until reports are received from these participants, their alleged participation should be considered hearsay and unreliable.

2) Dr. Nordby’s report does not direct the reader to appropriate references and is essentially a “tome” of a report. While I was reading, I kept on saying to myself, “please get to the point!” For instance, on page 4, the entire section on “Bloodstain Pattern Analysis” could have been reduced to a single sentence with a reference directing the reader to this information. The self aggrandizement (page 4, third paragraph) belongs in Nordby’s CV, not in this report.

3) The section, “Brief History of this Case” (pages 5 through 7) should have been placed in an appendix.

4) There are numerous inappropriate references to Dr. David Sabow’s activities and conclusions. Colonel Sabow either committed suicide or was murdered. A short description of the two proposed scenarios is all that is necessary. My impression of Nordby’s continual referencing Dr. Sabow’s position, that Nordby himself has injected bias into his study.

5) On page 11, third paragraph under “Reports vs. Hard Evidence,” Dr. Nordby complained that Dr. Sabow has refused to release critically important evidence, the most important of which is the Ithaca 12 gauge shotgun. This complaint was reiterated more times (pages 20, 21 and 25). This is a study, mandated by the Congress of the United States, and Dr. Nordby cannot get the evidence? I find this absurd.

6) Page 14, paragraph 4. “… bird shot shell which is not considered to be extremely powerful load given the small size of bird shot. Consequently, and not surprisingly, there was no exit wound.” Considering that this study and report was requested by Congress, I think it would benefit the reader for Dr. Nordby to cite references. Certainly, there must be victims who have committed suicide with a 12 gauge shotgun using the Winchester Game load cartridge or comparable brand. Dr. Nordby has broad expertise in these matters; I think
that it is reasonable to ask that he provide numbers as to how many of suicide victims of record (inquires of MEs over the country) using this ammunition had exit wounds as well as for those victims who used more powerful loads.

7) Page 21, paragraph 2. “Finding a similar Ithaca Model 200E shotgun proved extremely difficult.” Nordby then states, “When available, examples were mostly antique versions of the weapon with Damascus steel barrels designed for black powder shooting…” A check (February 8, 2005) on the website, GunBroker.com, showed that there are four Ithaca 12 gauge Model 200E shotguns up for bid. Two of those shotguns have 26-inch barrels. I checked a local gun shop, Duncan’s (San Marcos, California) whose proprietor stated that the Ithaca 200E, (circa 1970 – 1980) is rare, but they occasionally come into the shop. He sited a price of $600 and up. According to the listings (Fig. 1, attached) on GunBroker.com, it appears that the price is around $1000. The timeframe of the bids is about a week; likely there would always be Ithaca 200E shotguns available for sale. Another Ithaca 200E, 26-inch barrel was found on gunsamerica.com for $995.00. This shotgun appeared to matched the design of the Sabow shotgun. The point is that the Ithaca 12 gauge Model 200E shotguns (26” barrel) are available for around the price that Nordby paid for his Gentry shotgun. I am surprised that Dr. Nordby was unable to find the shotgun.

8) Page 23, paragraph 2. “It should be noted here that the issue of the barrel’s choke, …, remains largely irrelevant for a contact wound…” If so, why does he continue?

9) “Of much more interest is the presence of any GSR on the clothing of living suspects – more specifically, the patterns of GSR, if identifiable, on the clothing. This (sic) data must at the very least indicate that the clothing was near the vicinity of a fire arm’s (sic) discharge.” My study of the Sabow evidence indicates that a firearm was not discharged either near the bathrobe or the pajama bottoms that were worn by the victim at the time of his death.

10) Page 28, Table (bottom of page). “Listed from least loud to most sound [(measured in decibels].” Apparently, Dr. Nordby interprets the terms “least,” “louder” and “most” as decibel measurements. Also page 38, “After the weapon’s discharge with the Federal #4, we noted that the sound also minimal (sic) when compared with a discharge of the weapon in the open air:…” It seems that, Dr. Nordby was unable to purchase a decibel meter and just “winged it” for his so-called decibel measurements.

11) The “skull boxes.” Nordby goes through a series of experiments in which he constructed plywood “skull boxes” to simulate a human skull. There is no foundation work to support such an association. In the late 1980s, I studied backspatter from close-range shots to heads (Burnett, 1991, “Detection of bone and bone-plus-bullet particles in backspatter from close-rang shots to heads” Journal of Forensic Sciences 36(6):1745-1752). That work relied on experiments performed on livestock (pigs). Nordby could have performed more reliable tests on freshly butchered livestock. In San Diego County, a livestock butcher, whose services I used for my study, made his living by going to small farms and butchering onsite. With compensation to both the butcher and the livestock owner, I was permitted to do my experiments. Likely most rural areas in this country have access to traveling livestock butchers and arrangements could have been made by Dr. Nordby.

12) Page 38, paragraph 5. “[no human subjects volunteered for these tests]” I find it inappropriate for Dr. Nordby to resort to this misplaced levity in a report of this nature.

13) Page 38, bottom. “Despite the exit wound to the wooded skull box, this test also shows that with the decedent leaning slightly forward, onto, or toward the shotgun, holding the muzzle barrel would have exploded if the tight contact were made before the weapon’s discharge. Since the shotgun recovered at the scene did not have a damaged barrel, one may conclude that this specific scenario did not happen in the death of Col. Sabow.” One might also just as well conclude that the experimental shotgun barrel was defective. In addition, Dr. Nordby’s conclusion assumes that the construct of the “skull box” accurately simulates a real human skull (he
has not proved this). Finally, there have been no statistical analyses on how many shotguns explode under this circumstance (this is not a tongue-in-cheek statement). It could well be that other brands of shotguns do not explode or have a low likelihood of exploding when subjected to these experimental conditions (i.e., the exploding shotgun was a rare event).

Test #3 – the exploding shotgun (additional comment). If during the hard forcing of the shotgun into the “skull box,” the “skull box” material (ballistic gel and foam) inserted into the barrel of the shotgun. This would be quite different from a muzzle contact with the soft pallet where tissue resistance would likely occur - that tissue would not enter the barrel as the gelatin and the other materials in the box likely did. The pressure buildup causing the barrel rupture would be more probable if the barrel were physically plugged.

14) Page 44 – Summary Conclusions: Since the only large-scale exit of the gases injected in the mouth in the suicide scenario would be the mouth, the shotgun muzzle would partially block that gas exit. The gas then would have to go around the shotgun muzzle past the sides of the mouth. The mouth in the suicide scenario is positioned where the backspatter would at least hit the thighs of the victim. The shotgun does produce GSR from the breech and trigger housing (my report will be forthcoming). It is likely that GSR would have been deposited on the Colonel’s hand, if he had depressed the trigger. These results essentially negate Dr. Nordby’s conclusion that Colonel Sabow committed suicide.

Comment:

Considering that none of the critical evidence was available to Dr. Nordby, he should have dropped this case when it became apparent that this evidence was not forthcoming.

“In forensic science, ‘critical’ means ‘careful’ and ought not to entail a personal attack or the devaluation of a person or an agency doing difficult work under less than desirable circumstances.” (Jon Nordby, “Shotgun Death of Col. James E. Sabow” Page 47).
Figure 1. A internet page from the website Gunbroker.com concerning Ithaca 12 gauge Model 200E shotguns. Red letters are added by author. Asterisks: Marks likely appropriate shotguns for the Nordby study.
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