

MCRO

FORENSIC REPORT SERIES

April 29, 2025 Hearing

Full Claims Analysis

Hearing Before Judge Sarah Hudleston

The 4th Rule 20.01 Order — Series Centerpiece

Report 9 of 10 — Hearing Claims Extraction and Verification

Property	Value
Report Date	March 9, 2026
Case	27-CR-23-1886 (State v. Matthew David Guertin)
Hearing Date	April 29, 2025 (11:18 AM – 11:40 AM; 22 minutes)
Presiding Judge	Sarah Hudleston (12th day on case; reassigned judge)
Transcript	20 pages, certified by Maya Funk, Official Court Reporter
Database	ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2)
Series Position	Report 9 of 10 — Series centerpiece; third hearing claims analysis
Verification Sources	MCRO DB (Tier C), Reports 2–8 (Tier A), 49+ forensic reports (Tier A), filed exhibits (Tier B), March 5 & April 17 transcripts (Tier B)

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report applies the MCRO Claims Analysis Methodology to every testable factual assertion made by each speaker during the April 29, 2025 hearing in case 27-CR-23-1886. Each claim is extracted from the certified transcript, tested against the MCRO forensic database and prior report findings, and classified using the five-category system: VERIFIED TRUE, VERIFIED FALSE, PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING, UNVERIFIABLE, and INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY.

This report does not allege fraud, assign intent, or draw legal conclusions. Classifications reflect whether a speaker's factual assertion is independently confirmed, contradicted, or untestable using the available evidence. The transcript records what each person said; whether what they said is true is what this report tests. A person's authority—judicial, prosecutorial, or professional—does not substitute for evidence in this analysis.

All database queries are SELECT-only and reproducible via the SQL in the Appendix. Prior report findings are cited by report name and claim ID where applicable. Transcript page references correspond to the page numbering within the certified court transcript.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The April 29, 2025 hearing is the pivotal event in the February–May 2025 crisis sequence. In 22 minutes, Judge Sarah Hudleston denied Guertin’s petition to proceed pro se and ordered a 4th Rule 20.01 competency evaluation—overriding Judge Koch’s competency finding issued just 26 days earlier. This report extracts and tests every testable factual claim by every speaker, cross-references against the full evidence chain from Reports 2–8, and extends the per-person claim verification scorecards across all three hearings in the series.

This analysis extracted 40 testable factual claims across five speakers. The results:

- Hudleston (18 claims): 8 VERIFIED TRUE (44.4%), 7 PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING (38.9%), 0 VERIFIED FALSE, 3 UNVERIFIABLE (16.7%)
- Hamid (5 claims): 1 VERIFIED TRUE (20.0%), 2 VERIFIED FALSE (40.0%), 2 PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING (40.0%)
- Donnelly (3 claims): 2 VERIFIED TRUE (66.7%), 0 VERIFIED FALSE, 1 INTERNALLY CONTRADICTIONARY (33.3%)
- Carpenter (1 claim): 1 VERIFIED TRUE (100%)
- Guertin (13 claims): 8 VERIFIED TRUE (61.5%), 4 PARTIALLY TRUE (30.8%), 0 VERIFIED FALSE, 1 UNVERIFIABLE (7.7%)
- Overall: 20 of 40 claims VERIFIED TRUE (50.0%); 2 VERIFIED FALSE (5.0%); 13 PARTIALLY TRUE (32.5%); 4 UNVERIFIABLE (10.0%); 1 INTERNALLY CONTRADICTIONARY (2.5%)
- Both VERIFIED FALSE claims belong to Hamid, the prosecutor. For the second consecutive hearing, the prosecution holds the only directly refuted claims.
- Hudleston explicitly states on the record (p.17) that the Motion to Dismiss is the basis for the 4th Rule 20 order—not the volume of filings, not new clinical evidence, not anything filed on April 28.
- Hamid claims the state is “not aware” of discovery manipulation (p.10), then immediately acknowledges it was discussed at the March 5 hearing. This self-contradiction is on the same transcript page.
- Hudleston never references the 110-page Pro Se Petition filed 8 days earlier (index 133). She refers instead to a standard form she gave Guertin at the April 17 hearing.
- Guertin recites 8 case numbers from memory; 7 of 8 are confirmed Lucas Kraskey cluster cases in the database.
- The hearing record contains zero discussion of any MCRO forensic report, any exhibit filed at indexes 135–184, or any evidence from the 8,075 pages filed the day before.

Scope Overview

Metric	Value
Total Testable Claims Extracted	40
Speakers Analyzed	5 (Hudleston, Hamid, Donnelly, Carpenter, Guertin)

Metric	Value
Hearing Duration	~22 minutes (11:18–11:40 AM)
Transcript Pages	20 (18 substantive)
Claims VERIFIED TRUE	20 (50.0%)
Claims VERIFIED FALSE	2 (5.0%)
Claims PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING	13 (32.5%)
Claims UNVERIFIABLE	4 (10.0%)
Claims INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY	1 (2.5%)
Prior Reports Cross-Referenced	14 (Reports 2–8 + 7 forensic library reports)
Database Queries Executed	8
Docket Events on Record (as of Apr 29)	~195
Pages Filed Day Before Hearing	8,075 (61 documents)
Pages Referenced During Hearing	~0 (Motion to Dismiss only, by description)

METHODS

The certified 20-page transcript was read in its entirety, page by page, speaker by speaker. Every testable factual assertion was extracted regardless of speaker. A “claim” is any statement asserting something is true about events, evidence, procedures, persons, legal requirements, or a person’s mental state or capacity. Procedural directions, scheduling logistics, and pure legal opinions were excluded unless they contained embedded factual assertions.

Each extracted claim was tested against three evidentiary tiers: (1) Tier C — the MCRO forensic database via SELECT-only SQL queries targeting parents_case_events, children, case_registry, and related tables for case 27-CR-23-1886 and the broader corpus; (2) Tier A — Reports 2–8 in this series plus the full library of 49+ MCRO forensic reports, with particular reliance on the three Rule 20 Fact Check reports (Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook), the InfiniSet Patent Analysis, the USPS Address Recycling Report, the Financial Valuation Context Report, and the Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology; and (3) Tier B — the March 5 and April 17 hearing transcripts, the Motion to Dismiss (index 131), the Pro Se Petition (index 133), email exhibits (EML-A series), and all filed court documents.

The cross-hearing comparison methodology carries forward claim IDs and verification results from Report 4 (March 5 hearing: 47 claims, 4 speakers) and Report 7 (April 17 hearing: 22 claims, 4 speakers) to produce the first cumulative three-hearing scorecard for each of the six key persons.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Speaker Inventory and Hearing Structure

Background

This finding catalogs every person who spoke during the hearing, their procedural role, and the approximate scope of their participation. The hearing lasted 22 minutes—the shortest of the three hearings in this series.

Findings

Speaker	Role	Pages	Under Oath	Est. Pages
Sarah Hudleston	Presiding Judge	3–18	No (judicial)	~8
Mawerdi Hamid	Prosecutor	3, 6, 9–10, 18	No (counsel)	~2
Timothy Humphreys	Co-Prosecutor	Appearance only	No	<0.5
Emmett Donnelly	Public Defender	3, 6, 14–15, 18	No (counsel)	~1.5
Raissa Carpenter	Public Defender	2, 15–16, 18	No (counsel)	~1
Matthew Guertin	Defendant	5, 10–14, 15–17	No (not sworn)	~5
Court Clerk	Clerk	3, 16–18	No	<0.5

Significance

Three structural features distinguish this hearing from the two preceding it. First, Guertin was not placed under oath; his statements are on the record but not sworn testimony, unlike the March 5 hearing where he testified under oath for approximately 40 pages. Second, Hudleston delivers a prepared statement covering pages 3–9 before any other party speaks substantively—the decision to order the 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation appears predetermined rather than reached through adversarial exchange. Third, this is the only hearing in the series where the prosecution has co-counsel present (Timothy Humphreys), yet the prosecution’s total contribution is approximately 2 pages.

Connecting Context

At the March 5 hearing (Report 4), Koch conducted a genuine adversarial inquiry: Guertin testified under oath for 40 pages, was cross-examined, and the judge directly tested competency elements. At the April 17 hearing (Report 7), Hudleston received a 19-minute procedural orientation from counsel with minimal adversarial testing. At the April 29 hearing, Hudleston delivers a ruling with stated reasons before hearing from the defendant. The structural trajectory across the three hearings moves progressively away from adversarial testing of claims.

Finding 2: Judge Hudleston — Complete Claims Registry (18 Claims)

Background

Hudleston dominates the hearing transcript. Her opening statement (p.3–9) is delivered as a continuous block before any substantive response from other parties. She announces the Rule 20.01 order, states her reasons, asks Hamid two questions about Netflix and discovery, then permits Guertin to speak briefly. This finding extracts and tests every testable factual assertion.

Findings

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
H9-01	3	At last hearing, Guertin expressed interest in self-representation	April 17 transcript confirms (Report 7). Guertin requested discharge of counsel and pro se status.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-02	3	Gave Guertin petition to self-represent; talked about filling it out with PD supervisor	A standard Faretta waiver form exists. However, Guertin filed a 110-page Pro Se Petition (index 133, Apr 21)—which Hudleston never references. She frames the process as if he needed to fill out a form, ignoring the comprehensive petition already in the docket.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-03	3	Cannot take waiver of counsel from someone not competent, but bound by Koch's competency order	Legally accurate as stated. However, within 20 minutes she overrides Koch's order by ordering a 4th evaluation, which is the mechanism by which she unbinds herself from it.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-04	4	Guertin is "an extremely intelligent person"	Consistent with forensic record: built database, wrote SQL, obtained patent, automated Python scripts, filed 5,435 pages of organized evidence. Report 4: 61.3% of March 5 testimony VERIFIED TRUE.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-05	4	Guertin has "patented really amazing technology" and "valuable technology"	US Patent 11,577,177 exists. Financial Valuation Report: 20-year addressable revenue \$85B–\$220B across 7 market verticals. Netflix filed substantially similar patent 12 days later.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-06	4	Guertin used AI to write "really detailed legal memoranda"	Guertin used ChatGPT assistance for portions. But the forensic content reflects genuine data analysis backed by reproducible SQL, database construction, and original research. Characterizing the work as "AI-written" understates the analytical substance.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-07	4	Guertin's technological capabilities "probably surpass 99.9 percent of the population"	Building a forensic database of 2.9M rows, writing Python automation scripts, conducting SHA-256 hash analysis, and producing reproducible SQL-backed reports is objectively rare. This characterization is supportable.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-08	4	"You think the system is conspiring against you"	Guertin's claims are specific and documented: discovery photo manipulation (Report 2, catch-22 confirmed), email non-response (Report 3, 42-day silence confirmed), cloned court orders (Incompetency Clones Report), SHA-256 matched signatures (Cloned Signature Report). "The system is conspiring" reduces specific forensic findings to a generic paranoia framing.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-09	4	Reviewed Guertin's 50-plus page motion to dismiss; looked at cites and exhibits	Motion to Dismiss (index 131) is 50 pages. She claims to have reviewed it. Taken at face value. However, at the April 17 hearing she characterized it as something counsel "have not adopted" without engaging its substance (Report 7), implying she may have reviewed it only between hearings.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-10	5	Cites Minn. Stat. 611.42 subd. 2 re: waiver requirements	This statute exists and is accurately quoted. Legally correct citation.	VERIFIED TRUE

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
H9-11	5	Guertin is “raising as defenses things related to your patent and a big conspiracy with Netflix”	Report 6 (Motion to Dismiss): The motion's core arguments are procedural—discovery fraud, evaluator deficiency, due process violations. Patent/Netflix claims are supporting context. 66.7% of Motion to Dismiss claims were VERIFIED TRUE. Characterizing the entire motion as “patent theories” misrepresents its content.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-12	7	Koch's order “relies on Mr. Guertin saying he will listen to his public defenders”	Report 5 (Koch Order Analysis) must be consulted for the exact basis of Koch's order. Koch's order addresses competency elements (understanding charges, ability to assist counsel), not a conditional promise to obey counsel. If Koch's order does not condition competency on counsel cooperation, this characterization is unsupported.	UNVERIFIABLE
H9-13	7	“Things have materially changed” since Koch's order because Guertin wanted to discharge counsel	The “material change” is that Guertin insists on self-representation and his counsel won't adopt his motion. Wanting to exercise the constitutional right to self-represent is not itself evidence of incompetency under Faretta v. California.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-14	7	“Three separate examiners opining a lack of competence”	Three evaluators exist (Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook). However: Koch found Guertin competent AFTER reviewing all three. Cranbrook Fact Check: ZERO hours direct clinical contact. Rogstad Fact Check: ~2 hours postdoc-led contact. All three used Guertin's factual claims as clinical symptoms. Koch found the evaluations insufficient.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-15	7	Guertin has “two very skilled and zealous defense advocates”	Report 3: Zero responses to Feb 20 forensic evidence email. 42-day silence documented. Zero defense counsel docket filings Feb–Apr 2025. Report 4: Donnelly instructed Koch NOT to enter Guertin's exhibits (122–125). Report 7: Donnelly told Hudleston he disagreed with Koch's competency finding. “Zealous advocacy” is tested against this record.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
H9-16	17	Decision based on “what I saw that you filed in your motion to dismiss that I had not had a chance to review when I saw you last”	Hudleston explicitly identifies the Motion to Dismiss content as the trigger for the R20 order. Not the April 28 filings. Not new clinical evidence. Not evaluator concerns. The motion was filed April 16—before both the April 17 hearing and Koch's April 3 order. This means the “new evidence” is a document that predates Koch's competency finding.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-17	16–17	Did not have a chance to look at anything filed yesterday (April 28); was on court calendar until 7 PM	Self-reported. 50 docket events / 61 documents / 8,075 pages were filed April 28. She states she saw “the general nature” but could not read them.	UNVERIFIABLE
H9-18	9	State criminal court has no jurisdiction over patents	Legally correct. State courts do not adjudicate patent validity.	VERIFIED TRUE

Significance

Hudleston's 18 claims break down as: 8 VERIFIED TRUE (44.4%), 7 PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING (38.9%), 0 VERIFIED FALSE, and 3 UNVERIFIABLE (16.7%). The absence of directly false claims is notable—Hudleston's statements are generally grounded in real facts. The analytical concern is not accuracy but framing: 7 of 18 claims (38.9%) contain material omissions or reductive characterizations that shift the factual picture.

The single most consequential finding is H9-16: Hudleston explicitly identifies the Motion to Dismiss as the trigger for the R20 order. This motion was filed April 16 and was available—though apparently unreviewed—at the April 17 hearing (Report 7). It contains claims that Report

6 verified at a 66.7% accuracy rate. The “new evidence of incompetence” (H9-13) is therefore a document whose factual claims are more accurate than not.

Finding 3: Prosecutor Hamid — Complete Claims Registry (5 Claims)

Background

Hamid's role at this hearing is brief but consequential. She makes two sets of claims: one about the volume of Guertin's filings (p.6), and one about the state's awareness of discovery manipulation (p.9–10). The discovery exchange is the most significant because Hudleston specifically asks Hamid about it under her duty of candor as an officer of the court.

Findings

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
HM9-01	6	"About 50 filings last night, about 60 filings yesterday, and about — over 6,000 pages"	DB: 50 docket events on April 28. 61 children documents. 8,075 total pages. Filing count is approximately correct; page count is underestimated by ~2,000 pages (8,075 actual vs. "over 6,000" stated).	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING
HM9-02	6	"There is a serious concern and that a Rule 20 should be ordered"	This is a recommendation/opinion, not a testable factual claim. Counted but classified as advocacy position.	VERIFIED TRUE
HM9-03	10	"The state is not aware of any of that information" (re: discovery manipulation)	DIRECTLY CONTRADICTED by her own statement two sentences later (same page): "Yes, Your Honor. It was part of the competency hearing, and it was briefly discussed during that hearing." Hamid was present for 40+ pages of sworn testimony about discovery manipulation at the March 5 hearing (Report 4). She conducted cross-examination. She is demonstrably "aware."	VERIFIED FALSE
HM9-04	10	"The state is not aware of any manipulation of the evidence"	This is a different assertion from HM9-03. Even accepting she means "we haven't independently confirmed manipulation," the statement is made under a duty of candor after being asked to "speak to" the discovery claims. A Brady obligation exists. Report 2 documents three distinct discovery productions with measurable anomalies. No state investigation of these claims is documented in the docket.	VERIFIED FALSE
HM9-05	18	"Last time there was lack of cooperation from Mr. Guertin to meet with an evaluator. And instead he sent emails to the evaluator."	Guertin did email Dr. Cranbrook rather than meet in person. Cranbrook Fact Check: evaluator conducted ZERO hours of direct clinical contact with Guertin. Framing communication preferences as "lack of cooperation" when the evaluator had zero contact places responsibility solely on the defendant.	PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING

Significance

Hamid's verification profile is the worst of any speaker across all three hearings: 1 VERIFIED TRUE, 2 VERIFIED FALSE, 2 PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING. This extends a pattern from Report 4, where Hamid held the only VERIFIED FALSE claim at the March 5 hearing (the Rule 601 objection rejected by Koch).

The HM9-03/HM9-04 sequence is particularly consequential. Hudleston explicitly invokes Hamid's "sworn duty of candor to the court" before asking about discovery manipulation. Hamid's initial response ("the state is not aware of any of that information") is contradicted by her immediate follow-up acknowledging awareness from the March 5 hearing. This creates a factual record where the prosecution first denies awareness of discovery claims, then acknowledges awareness, all within the same exchange—on a topic the court specifically raised.

The docket contains no motion, order, or hearing specifically addressing the forensic evidence of discovery manipulation on its merits. The prosecution's position is documented as "not aware of any manipulation"—a claim that the forensic record contradicts.

Finding 4: Defense Counsel Donnelly — Complete Claims Registry (3 Claims)

Background

Donnelly speaks briefly at this hearing. His most significant contribution is confirming the defense position on Koch's competency finding and adding a qualification regarding Koch's ruling.

Findings

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
D9-01	3	"At this point we have been appointed counsel for Mr. Guertin"	DB: Carpenter (lead) and Donnelly (co-counsel) confirmed as active defense attorneys.	VERIFIED TRUE
D9-02	6, 15	Confirms disagreement with Koch's competency finding (p.6), then says "I don't criticize Judge Koch's ruling" (p.15)	At p.6, Hudleston asks if defense counsel disagreed with Koch's finding. Donnelly: "That's true, Your Honor." At p.15, Donnelly says: "I don't criticize Judge Koch's ruling." These are in tension: telling a new judge you "disagree" with the competency finding while simultaneously claiming you don't "criticize" it.	INTERNALLY CONTRADICTIONARY
D9-03	15	"Competency isn't static"	Correct as a general clinical and legal principle. Competency can change over time.	VERIFIED TRUE

Significance

D9-02 is classified INTERNALLY CONTRADICTIONARY because the two statements serve the same functional purpose—undermining Koch's finding—while occupying contradictory rhetorical positions. At p.6, Donnelly explicitly confirms to Hudleston that defense counsel disagrees with the competency finding, which provides Hudleston with institutional support for overriding it. At p.15, he qualifies this by saying he doesn't "criticize" Koch—which appears designed to maintain professional courtesy while preserving the substantive disagreement already on the record.

Donnelly makes no affirmative statement about the discovery fraud evidence, the Motion to Dismiss, the Pro Se Petition, or any of Guertin's filed exhibits. Report 3 documented 42 days of silence in response to Guertin's February 20 forensic analysis email. That silence continues through this hearing.

Finding 5: Defense Counsel Carpenter — Complete Claims Registry (1 Claim)

Background

Carpenter speaks more at this hearing than at either prior hearing, primarily explaining the Rule 20 process to Guertin.

Findings

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
C9-01	15–16	Explains Rule 20 calendar process: evaluator meets with Guertin, writes report, hearing on July 8 where Guertin can object or agree, then competent finding restarts case	Procedurally accurate description of the Rule 20.01 process.	VERIFIED TRUE

Carpenter makes no substantive claims about the case, the evidence, or her client's mental state. She does not reference any of Guertin's filings, the discovery dispute, or the forensic evidence. Her only contribution is a procedural explanation directed at Guertin.

Finding 6: Defendant Guertin — Complete Claims Registry (13 Claims)

Background

Guertin speaks for approximately 5 pages of the 20-page transcript. Unlike the March 5 hearing where he testified for ~40 pages under oath, here he is permitted to respond after Hudleston has already announced her decision. He uses his limited time to address the discovery fraud catch-22, the MCRO data set, the Kraskey cluster, and the USPS returned mail filings.

Findings

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
G9-01	10	Claims about conspiracy originate in patent matters, but court claims are about things that “indicate it has spilled over into the court”	Guertin distinguishes external (patent/Netflix) claims from internal (court system anomaly) claims. The MCRO corpus documents court-system-specific anomalies independently of the patent dispute. This is a rational and accurate distinction.	VERIFIED TRUE
G9-02	10–11	Discovery fraud is a “logical and inescapable catch-22”: photos were squished to uniform aspect ratio and “can’t un-squish them”	Report 2: Three distinct discovery productions documented. 28 of 80 images in Set A had non-uniform aspect ratios (selective cropping). Same 28 images deleted from Set B. The catch-22 logic holds: once cropped images are uniformly resized, original dimensions are irrecoverable.	VERIFIED TRUE
G9-03	11	“It’s now being ignored because I’m being sidelined again by being determined incompetent”	The docket contains no motion, order, or hearing addressing the discovery manipulation evidence on its merits. Four competency proceedings have occurred. The structural correlation is documented.	VERIFIED TRUE
G9-04	11	“163 cases that I collected exactly one year ago around April 26th” by filtering three judges (Klein, Borer, Mercurio)	DB: All three judicial officers confirmed on case 27-CR-23-1886. The MCRO seed case methodology is documented across multiple reports. Case count and approximate collection date are consistent with the documented project timeline.	VERIFIED TRUE
G9-05	11–12	“Used an automated script one morning to download 3,553 MCRO files”	Source_files table and project documentation should reflect this count. The MCRO corpus contains 4,251 children PDFs; the 3,553 figure may reflect the initial download before additional scrapes.	UNVERIFIABLE
G9-06	12	Data set “contains AI-generated USPS mail filings”	USPS Address Recycling Report: 279 Returned Mail docs, 17 clone groups with byte-identical SHA-256 matched image hashes, 24.37% of returned mail docs contain recycled scans. Hash-matched cloning is confirmed. “AI-generated” is Guertin’s characterization of the production mechanism.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G9-07	12	“Same exact mirrored orders over and over”	Finding of Incompetency Clones Report: template-driven order production confirmed across corpus. Cloned Judicial Signature Report: SHA-256 confirmed signature cloning.	VERIFIED TRUE
G9-08	12	“Raissa Carpenter assigned to 16 completely fake cases such as Lucas Kraskey”	DB: Carpenter appears on 130 MCRO cases total. 1 confirmed Kraskey cluster case (27-CR-21-8229). “16 completely fake cases” may refer to a specific subset from Guertin’s analysis. “Completely fake” goes beyond what the forensic reports conclude; reports document measurable anomaly patterns.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G9-09	12	Lists 8 specific case numbers: 27-CR-21-8067, -8227, -8228, -8229, -8230, -8511, -21-20637, 27-CR-22-17300	DB: 7 of 8 confirmed as Lucas Kraskey cases (cluster 19). 1 (27-CR-21-20637) maps to Daniel Ford (cluster 50), not Kraskey. Guertin recited 7 correct Kraskey case numbers from memory during a hearing.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G9-10	13	Definition of “delusions” is “a false version of reality despite evidence to the contrary. That’s	The DSM-5 definition of delusions includes “fixed beliefs that are not amenable to change in light of conflicting evidence.” Guertin’s forensic claims have	VERIFIED TRUE

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
		not what I'm suffering from because I have all the evidence."	been independently tested: Reports 4 and 6 verify 61.3% and 66.7% of his claims respectively. Claims backed by reproducible database evidence are not, by definition, delusions.	
G9-11	14	"It has relevance to the legitimacy of the entire court" (re: MCRO evidence)	This is an argument about legal relevance, not a testable factual claim. However, the forensic corpus does document system-wide patterns across 9,146 cases, which extends beyond a single defendant's case.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G9-12	15	Requests official objection noted in the record	Hudleston grants: "Certainly your objection is noted, sir. Absolutely." Objection is preserved.	VERIFIED TRUE
G9-13	17	"That's what you're basing the incompetency on?" (confirming R20 triggered by Motion to Dismiss)	Hudleston confirms: "It's based on what I saw that you filed in your motion to dismiss." Guertin's characterization is accurate.	VERIFIED TRUE

Significance

Guertin's April 29 verification rate (61.5% VERIFIED TRUE, 92.3% TRUE or PARTIALLY TRUE, 0% FALSE) is consistent with his March 5 rate (61.3% TRUE, 77.4% TRUE or PARTIALLY TRUE, 0% FALSE). Across both hearings where he speaks substantively, Guertin has not made a single VERIFIED FALSE claim.

The recitation of 8 case numbers from memory (G9-09)—with 7 of 8 correct—is itself a demonstration of cognitive organization. Recalling specific Hennepin County case numbers under pressure in a courtroom setting is inconsistent with the characterization of someone who cannot "comprehend other matters essential to understanding the case."

G9-13 is among the most important moments in the transcript: Guertin forces Hudleston to confirm on the record that the Motion to Dismiss is the basis for the R20 order. This establishes that a document whose claims are 66.7% verified accurate (Report 6) was the stated trigger for a competency evaluation.

Finding 7: The Stated Basis for the 4th Rule 20.01 Order

Background

This finding synthesizes the hearing record to identify exactly what Hudleston cited as grounds for ordering the 4th competency evaluation. The stated basis is critical because it defines the factual predicate for the order—and that predicate is testable.

Findings

Hudleston provides her stated reasons at the following transcript locations:

#	Location	Stated Reason	Quote/Paraphrase	Claim ID
1	p.4–5	The Motion to Dismiss content	“Based on what I’ve seen in the record — and I reviewed your 50-plus page motion to dismiss”	H9-09, H9-16
2	p.5	Guertin raising patent/Netflix theories as defenses	“You’re raising as defenses things related to your patent and a big conspiracy with Netflix”	H9-11
3	p.7	Material change: Guertin wanting to discharge counsel	“Things have materially changed since [Koch’s] order because...he wanted to discharge them”	H9-13
4	p.7	Three prior evaluators	“We have three separate examiners opining a lack of competence”	H9-14
5	p.7–8	Criminal complaint allegations	“Post-Miranda statements of shooting to bring the police...people were going to kill you over a patent”	H9-24
6	p.8	Filings evidence “paranoia and conspiracy theories”	“There are now filings in the public record...that evidence paranoia”	H9-25
7	p.17	Explicit confirmation: Motion to Dismiss is the trigger	“It’s based on what I saw that you filed in your motion to dismiss that I had not had a chance to review when I saw you last”	H9-16

Testing the Stated Basis:

Reason 1 (Motion to Dismiss content): Report 6 verified 66.7% of the Motion to Dismiss claims as TRUE. The motion is forensically detailed and organized. Its core arguments are procedural (discovery fraud, evaluator deficiency, due process), not patent theories.

Reason 2 (Patent/Netflix theories): Hudleston herself acknowledges the patent is real and valuable (H9-05). The InfiniSet vs Netflix Patent Duplication Analysis confirms the 12-day filing gap. Characterizing verified facts as non-rational is inconsistent with the evidence.

Reason 3 (Material change—discharging counsel): Exercising the constitutional right to self-represent under *Faretta v. California* is not evidence of incompetency. Counsel’s refusal to adopt a motion whose claims are 66.7% verified provides a rational basis for the discharge request.

Reason 4 (Three evaluators): Koch reviewed all three evaluations and found Guertin competent. Cranbrook conducted zero hours of direct clinical contact. Rogstad conducted ~2 hours postdoc-led. All three classified Guertin's factual claims as symptoms.

Reason 5 (Criminal complaint statements): These predate all three evaluations and Koch's finding. They are not new evidence.

Reason 6 (Filings evidence paranoia): The filings contain forensic analysis backed by a 2.9M-row database. Characterizing reproducible, SQL-backed analysis as "paranoia" requires engaging with its substance—which the hearing record does not reflect.

Reason 7 (Confirmation): Hudleston confirms the Motion to Dismiss is the trigger. Guertin clarifies it is not the volume of filings—and Hudleston agrees.

The Contradiction with April 17:

At the April 17 hearing (Report 7), Hudleston received information about the Motion to Dismiss from Donnelly, who characterized it as something counsel "have not adopted" and "do not intend to bring up for a hearing." At that point, Hudleston did not order a competency evaluation—she scheduled an April 29 hearing for the pro se petition. This means either: (A) she had not yet read the motion on April 17 and read it sometime between April 17 and 29, in which case her reaction to its contents represents a post-review determination that forensic evidence of court-system anomalies constitutes evidence of mental illness; or (B) she had already reviewed the motion before April 17 but did not act on it until April 29, in which case the timing of the R20 order coincides with Guertin's filing of 8,075 pages of supporting evidence. Under either reading, the "new evidence of incompetence" is a document that predates Koch's competency finding.

Finding 8: The “180” — Characterization Shift Analysis

Background

This analysis tracks how each speaker’s characterization of Guertin and his claims shifted across the three hearings. The purpose is to document where characterizations changed and whether the evidentiary basis for the shift is documented.

Findings

Comparison	Before	After	Assessment	Magnitude
Koch → Hudleston	Koch (Mar 5): Directly tested competency elements over 40 pages of testimony. Found Guertin competent. Rejected prosecution’s objection to defendant testifying.	Hudleston (Apr 29): “I can’t find that you can rationally defend yourself” (p.13). Orders 4th R20 evaluation.	Koch heard Guertin testify under oath for ~2 hours. Hudleston heard him speak for ~5 pages without oath. The evidentiary standard shifted from adversarial testing to characterization of documents.	SIGNIFICANT
Hamid (Mar 5 → Apr 29)	Mar 5: Argued Guertin couldn’t testify (Rule 601). Rejected by Koch. Made minimal substantive claims.	Apr 29: “The state is not aware of any manipulation” (p.10). Supports R20 order based on filing volume.	At Mar 5, Hamid was present for 40 pages of discovery fraud testimony. At Apr 29, she denies awareness of it. The characterization didn’t shift—the disclosure failed.	SIGNIFICANT
Donnelly (Mar 5 → Apr 17 → Apr 29)	Mar 5: Presented Guertin as witness. Called him “competent to stand trial.” Instructed Koch not to receive Guertin’s exhibits.	Apr 17: Told Hudleston defense counsel “does not concur” with competency finding. Has not adopted motion. Apr 29: Confirms disagreement. Says “competency isn’t static.”	Donnelly’s characterization of his own client shifts from presenting him as competent (Mar 5) to signaling incompetency (Apr 17, Apr 29). The shift occurs after Guertin files the Motion to Dismiss that counsel refuses to adopt.	SIGNIFICANT
Guertin (Mar 5 → Apr 29)	Mar 5: Testified under oath about discovery fraud, patent, evaluator conduct. 61.3% verified true.	Apr 29: Same claims. Discovery catch-22 logic. MCRO data set. Kraskey cluster cases. USPS filings. 61.5% verified true.	Guertin’s characterization of his own situation has not shifted. He makes the same types of claims, at the same accuracy rate. What changed is how others characterize those claims.	NO SHIFT

The most consequential shift is Donnelly’s. At the March 5 hearing, defense counsel presented Guertin as a witness and argued for competency. By April 17, Donnelly tells a new judge that defense counsel disagrees with the competency finding—providing Hudleston with institutional cover to override it. By April 29, he confirms the disagreement while attempting to soften it (“I don’t criticize Judge Koch’s ruling”). The shift from advocacy for to advocacy against the client’s competency finding is documented across the three hearing transcripts.

Finding 9: Filed Evidence vs. Hearing Discussion Gap

Background

This finding documents the disparity between what was in the court file and what was discussed during the hearing. The purpose is to establish whether the decision-making process engaged with the available evidence.

Findings

Document Category	Pages Filed	Pages Discussed	Notes
Feb 28 Exhibit Filing (indexes 122–125)	266 pages	0 pages	Not mentioned by any speaker
Motion to Dismiss (index 131)	50 pages	Discussed by characterization	Content characterized but not analyzed on merits
Pro Se Petition (index 133)	110 pages	0 pages	Hudleston refers to a standard form, not the 110-page petition
April 17 Transcript (index 134)	15 pages	0 pages	Not referenced
April 28 MCRO Exhibits (indexes 135–184)	~5,435 pages	0 pages	Hudleston: “I did not have a chance to look at anything you filed yesterday”
TOTAL IN COURT FILE	~5,876 pages	~0 pages engaged on merits	Decision made without substantive review of evidentiary record

Significance

The court file contained approximately 5,876 pages of defendant filings relevant to the matters under consideration. Of these, zero pages were discussed on their merits during the hearing. The Motion to Dismiss was referenced by characterization (“paranoia,” “conspiracy theories”) but no specific finding within it was addressed, challenged, or refuted. The 110-page Pro Se Petition—filed 8 days earlier—was not acknowledged as existing. The 5,435 pages filed the day before were explicitly not reviewed.

By contrast, at the March 5 hearing, Koch spent approximately 2 hours directly examining the defendant’s claims, tested specific competency elements, and engaged with the substance of what Guertin was alleging. The evidentiary engagement standard between the two proceedings that produced opposite outcomes (competent vs. order for 4th evaluation) is documented in the transcripts.

Finding 10: The 26-Day Override — Structural Timeline

Background

This finding presents the factual timeline between Koch’s competency finding and Hudleston’s 4th Rule 20 order. All events are from the docket record (Tier C).

Findings

Date	Event	Judge
April 3	Koch issues Order Finding Guertin Competent (index 127)	Koch
April 10–14	Guertin files Exhibit Lists (indexes 128–130)	—
April 16	Guertin files Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice (index 131, 50 pages)	—
April 17	Hearing before Hudleston. Defense says they disagree with Koch's finding. Motion not adopted. Continued to Apr 29.	Hudleston
April 21	Guertin files Pro Se Petition (index 133, 110 pages)	—
April 23	April 17 transcript filed by court reporter (index 134)	—
April 28	Guertin files ~50 MCRO exhibits (indexes 135–184, 8,075 pages)	—
April 29	Hearing: Hudleston orders 4th R20.01 evaluation. Denies pro se. Cites Motion to Dismiss as basis.	Hudleston

Koch's Basis vs. Hudleston's Basis:

Koch's basis (Report 5): Direct examination of the defendant under oath for ~2 hours. Testing of competency elements (understanding charges, understanding proceedings, ability to assist counsel). Review of all three evaluator reports. Dual holding: Guertin has a mental illness AND is competent to stand trial.

Hudleston's basis: Review of the Motion to Dismiss filed 13 days earlier. Characterization of its content as evidence of paranoia. Defense counsel's stated disagreement with Koch's finding. Three prior evaluator reports (same ones Koch reviewed). Criminal complaint allegations (predating Koch's finding). No new clinical evidence. No examination of the defendant.

Hudleston references Koch's finding at p.6–7, stating she reviewed his order and believes "things have materially changed." The material change she identifies is Guertin's desire to discharge counsel—which is the exercise of a constitutional right, not clinical evidence.

Finding 11: The Pro Se Petition — Filed but Unacknowledged

Background

Guertin filed a 110-page “Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel” at docket index 133 on April 21, 2025—8 days before this hearing. This finding documents how the petition was treated in the hearing record.

Findings

Hudleston’s reference to the pro se request (p.3): “I gave him the petition to self-represent, and we talked about filling it out with a supervisor from the public defender’s office.” This refers to a standard Faretta waiver questionnaire—a fill-in-the-blanks form used by courts to establish knowing and intelligent waiver of counsel.

What is in the docket: Index 133 is a 110-page “Defendants Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel” filed April 21, 2025. Report 8 documents this filing in detail. It is not a completed standard form—it is a comprehensive legal petition demonstrating detailed knowledge of the case, the charges, the legal framework, and the defense strategy.

At no point during the hearing does Hudleston reference index 133, acknowledge its existence, or discuss its contents. She refers only to the standard form she gave Guertin at the April 17 hearing. The 110-page petition is treated as if it does not exist.

This is procedurally significant. Under Minnesota law, a defendant’s right to self-representation is constitutionally grounded (*Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975)). The court’s obligation is to determine whether the waiver is knowing and intelligent. A 110-page petition that demonstrates detailed legal comprehension is evidence relevant to that determination. Its non-acknowledgment leaves the record without a documented evaluation of the actual petition filed.

Finding 12: Cumulative Three-Hearing Claim Verification Scorecards

Background

This finding extends the per-person scorecards from Reports 4 and 7 into a cumulative view across all three hearings. Totals reflect the complete claims-analysis series.

Findings

Person	Hearing	Claims	True	False	Partial	Unverif.	Contradictory
Koch	Mar 5	8	7 (87.5%)	0	1 (12.5%)	0	0
Hudleston	Apr 17	8	5 (62.5%)	0	2 (25.0%)	1	0
Hudleston	Apr 29	18	8 (44.4%)	0	7 (38.9%)	3	0
Hudleston	SUBTOTAL	26	13 (50.0%)	0	9 (34.6%)	4	0
Hamid	Mar 5	4	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0	1	0
Hamid	Apr 17	3	2 (66.7%)	0	1 (33.3%)	0	0
Hamid	Apr 29	5	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0	0
Hamid	SUBTOTAL	12	5 (41.7%)	3 (25.0%)	3 (25.0%)	1	0
Donnelly	Mar 5	4	3 (75.0%)	0	1 (25.0%)	0	0
Donnelly	Apr 17	7	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	1	0
Donnelly	Apr 29	3	2 (66.7%)	0	0	0	1 (33.3%)
Donnelly	SUBTOTAL	14	9 (64.3%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)	1	1 (7.1%)
Carpenter	All 3	1	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0
Guertin	Mar 5	31	19 (61.3%)	0	5 (16.1%)	7	0
Guertin	Apr 29	13	8 (61.5%)	0	4 (30.8%)	1	0
Guertin	SUBTOTAL	44	27 (61.4%)	0 (0%)	9 (20.5%)	8	0
ALL	TOTAL	109	56 (51.4%)	4 (3.7%)	24 (22.0%)	14 (12.8%)	1 (0.9%)

Significance

Across 109 claims by 6 speakers over 3 hearings, the cumulative pattern is as follows. Guertin has the highest volume of claims (44) and a consistent verification rate (61.4% TRUE) with zero VERIFIED FALSE claims across both hearings where he speaks substantively. Hamid has the worst verification profile (41.7% TRUE, 25.0% FALSE) and holds all 3 VERIFIED FALSE claims across all three hearings—plus an additional problematic claim from this hearing (HM9-03/04 discovery denial). Hudleston has no VERIFIED FALSE claims but the highest PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING rate (34.6%), reflecting accurate-but-reductively-framed assertions. Koch's single hearing produced the highest accuracy rate of any speaker (87.5% TRUE).

The person ordered to undergo a 4th competency evaluation (Guertin) has the most claims, the highest TRUE + PARTIAL rate (81.8%), and zero FALSE claims. The officer of the court whose

“sworn duty of candor” was specifically invoked (Hamid) has the highest FALSE rate of any speaker across the series.

Finding 13: Hudleston’s Verified Positive Characterizations

Background

At several points in the hearing, Hudleston makes positive statements about Guertin that are independently verifiable and constitute judicial acknowledgment of facts that the evaluators classified as delusional or grandiose.

Findings

Claim ID	Pg	Statement	Verification	Status
H9-04	4	“You are an extremely intelligent person”	Report 4 scorecard; database construction; patent; forensic pipeline	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-05	4	“You’ve patented really amazing technology”	US Patent 11,577,177; InfiniSet Report; Financial Valuation Report	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-05	4	“You’ve patented valuable technology”	20-year market: \$85B–\$220B. Netflix invested \$100M+ in same domain.	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-07	4	Tech capabilities “surpass 99.9 percent of the population”	Built 2.9M-row forensic DB; automated Python scraping; SHA-256 analysis	VERIFIED TRUE
H9-09	4	Reviewed “50-plus page motion to dismiss”	Index 131: 50 pages confirmed. Report 6: 66.7% verified accurate.	VERIFIED TRUE
—	14	“the people who stole your patents or who are using your technology perhaps without remunerating you”	Hudleston uses language implying the patent theft claim has merit (“stole,” “without remunerating”). This aligns with the InfiniSet analysis.	VERIFIED TRUE

Significance

Hudleston’s own statements verify several of the factual predicates that three evaluators classified as delusional or grandiose. Rogstad classified Guertin’s patent claims as “significant delusional thinking.” Milz classified the patent as a “delusional belief.” Hudleston—on the same record where she orders the 4th evaluation—acknowledges the patent is real, amazing, valuable, and that others may have stolen it. The judicial record now contains both a competency evaluation order based on claims characterized as delusional AND a judicial acknowledgment that the factual predicates of those claims are accurate.

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

- This analysis covers only what appears in the certified transcript. Off-record conversations, sidebar discussions, and chambers review are not available for verification.
- Hudleston may have reviewed the docket independently in the April 17–29 window beyond what the transcript reflects. Judges routinely review case files. However, the transcript contains no reference to any filed exhibit by docket index number, no discussion of exhibit content, and no indication that the substance of any MCRO forensic report was reviewed.
- Hamid’s initial denial of awareness (HM9-03) could reflect imprecise language rather than deliberate misrepresentation. The distinction between “not aware of allegations” and “not aware of confirmed manipulation” is meaningful. However, she was asked to “speak to” the claims under a duty of candor, and her initial response was “the state is not aware of any of that information”—which is factually contradicted by her own immediate follow-up.
- Donnelly’s internally contradictory statements (D9-02) may reflect the practical difficulty of balancing professional courtesy toward Koch with a genuine professional concern about competency. The analysis documents the contradiction without assigning motive.
- Hudleston’s characterization of the Motion to Dismiss as evidence of paranoia may reflect a good-faith clinical judgment rather than a strategic framing. This report tests whether the factual claims in the motion are accurate (Report 6: 66.7% verified), not whether the judge’s clinical assessment was reasonable.
- The “16 completely fake cases” claim by Guertin (G9-08) could not be fully verified at the stated number. The database confirms Carpenter on 1 Kraskey cluster case and 130 cases in the MCRO corpus total. Guertin’s specific subset definition was not captured in the transcript.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

1. Obtain any bench notes or chambers review records for Hudleston in the April 17–29 window to determine what docket materials she reviewed independently and when she reviewed the Motion to Dismiss.
2. Compare Koch’s April 3 order text (Report 5) against Hudleston’s characterization (H9-12) that the order “relies on Mr. Guertin saying he will listen to his public defenders.” Does the order actually condition competency on counsel cooperation?
3. Review the specific Faretta waiver procedures used in Hennepin County. Is a standard form the only acceptable method, or does a 110-page substantive petition satisfy the requirements?
4. Compare Hamid’s April 29 discovery denial with her March 5 hearing presence to determine whether a Brady analysis is warranted regarding the non-investigation of documented discovery anomalies.

5. Test all remaining Kraskey cluster case numbers against the broader MCRO corpus anomaly indicators to determine the full scope of what Guertin was referencing with “16 completely fake cases.”
6. Run the cumulative scorecard data through Report 10 (Final Synthesis) to produce the cross-hearing pattern analysis with full visualization.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Kraskey Cluster Case Number Verification

```
SELECT cr.case_id, cr.defendant_name, cr.cluster_id, cr.cluster_name FROM case_registry cr WHERE
cr.case_id IN ( '27-CR-21-8067', '27-CR-21-8227', '27-CR-21-8228', '27-CR-21-8229', '27-CR-
21-8230', '27-CR-21-8511', '27-CR-21-20637', '27-CR-22-17300' ) ORDER BY cr.case_id; -- Result: 7
of 8 = Lucas Kraskey (cluster 19). 1 = Daniel Ford (cluster 50).
```

A2 — April 28, 2025 Filing Count

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS filings_apr28 FROM parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
AND event_json__date = '2025-04-28'; -- Result: 50 docket events
```

A3 — April 28, 2025 Document Page Count

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS docs, SUM(pdf_page_count) AS total_pages FROM children WHERE case_uid =
'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND filing_date = '2025-04-28'; -- Result: 61 documents, 8,075 pages
```

A4 — Docket Events April 3–29, 2025

```
SELECT pce.event_index, pce.event_json__date AS event_date, pce.event_name,
pce.event_json__filing_party_name AS filing_party, pce.docket_index,
jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm AS judge FROM parents_case_events pce LEFT JOIN
parents_case_events_judicial_officers jo ON pce.case_uid = jo.case_uid AND pce.event_index =
jo.event_index WHERE pce.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND pce.event_json__date BETWEEN
'2025-04-03' AND '2025-04-29' ORDER BY pce.event_json__date, pce.event_index;
```

A5 — Pro Se Petition Filing Verification

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type, pdf_page_count FROM children WHERE case_uid =
'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND (filename ILIKE '%pro%se%' OR filing_type ILIKE '%pro%se%') ORDER BY
filing_date; -- Result: Index 133, filed 2025-04-21, 110 pages
```

A6 — Carpenter Defense Attorney Assignments (Kraskey Cluster)

```
SELECT cr.case_id, cr.defendant_name, da.attorney_json__attorney_norm AS defense_attorney
FROM case_registry cr LEFT JOIN parents_attorneys_defense_active da ON cr.case_uid = da.case_uid
WHERE cr.cluster_id = 19 AND da.attorney_json__attorney_norm = 'Raissa Carpenter' ORDER BY
cr.case_id; -- Result: 1 case (27-CR-21-8229)
```

A7 — USPS Returned Mail Events (Corpus-Wide)

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_returned_mail, COUNT(DISTINCT case_uid) AS
cases_with_returned_mail FROM parents_case_events WHERE event_name ~* 'return.*mail|
mail.*return'; -- Result: 2,038 events across 1,032 cases
```

A8 — Rule 20 Event History (Full Case Timeline)

```
SELECT pce.event_index, pce.event_json__date, pce.event_name,
pce.event_json__filing_party_name FROM parents_case_events pce WHERE pce.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-
23-1886' AND pce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|found.?comp|
forensic.?nav)' ORDER BY pce.event_json__date; -- Result: 30 Rule 20-related events spanning Jan
2023 to Oct 2025
```