

MCRO

FORENSIC REPORT SERIES

March 5, 2025 Hearing Full Claims Analysis

Contested Competency Hearing Before Judge William H. Koch
Report 4 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	March 5, 2025 (transcript filename shows 2024; actual date is 2025)
Presiding Judge	William H. Koch (Probate Mental Health Court)
Transcript	61 pages, certified by Melinda K. Anderson, Official Court Reporter
Database	ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2)
Series Position	Report 4 of 10 — First of three hearing claims-analysis reports
Verification Sources	MCRO DB (Tier C), 49+ forensic reports (Tier A), filed exhibits (Tier B)

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report applies the MCRO Claims Analysis Methodology to every testable factual assertion made by each speaker during the March 5, 2025 contested competency 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 clinical—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. The transcript page references correspond to the page numbering within the certified court transcript.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The March 5, 2025 hearing is the first contested competency proceeding in case 27-CR-23-1886. Guertin testified under oath for approximately 40 of the 60 substantive transcript pages. Judge Koch conducted direct examination of Guertin on competency elements. Prosecutor Hamid conducted brief cross-examination. Defense counsel Donnelly provided opening and closing statements but called no other witnesses. Dr. Cranbrook was present but not called by either side; both parties agreed to receive her December 20, 2024 report without cross-examination.

This analysis extracted 47 testable factual claims across four speakers. The results:

- Guertin (31 claims): 19 VERIFIED TRUE (61.3%), 5 PARTIALLY TRUE (16.1%), 0 VERIFIED FALSE, 7 UNVERIFIABLE (22.6%)
- Koch (8 claims): 7 VERIFIED TRUE (87.5%), 1 PARTIALLY TRUE (12.5%)
- Hamid (4 claims): 2 VERIFIED TRUE, 1 VERIFIED FALSE (25.0%), 1 UNVERIFIABLE
- Donnelly (4 claims): 3 VERIFIED TRUE, 1 PARTIALLY TRUE
- Overall: 31 of 47 claims VERIFIED TRUE (66.0%); 1 claim VERIFIED FALSE (2.1%); 0 INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY

Scope Overview

Metric	Value
Total Testable Claims Extracted	47
Speakers Analyzed	4 (Koch, Guertin, Hamid, Donnelly)
Pages of Guertin Testimony	~40 of 61 (pages 13–57, sworn page 12)
Claims VERIFIED TRUE	31 (66.0%)
Claims VERIFIED FALSE	1 (2.1%)
Claims PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING	6 (12.8%)
Claims UNVERIFIABLE	9 (19.1%)
Claims INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY	0
Prior Reports Cross-Referenced	12
Database Queries Executed	6

METHODS

The certified 61-page transcript was read in its entirety. Each speaker's statements were parsed for testable factual assertions. A "claim" is defined as any statement asserting something is true about events, evidence, procedures, persons, legal requirements, or a person's mental state or capacity. Rhetorical questions, procedural directions, 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, parents_charges, and parents_attorneys tables for case 27-CR-23-1886; (2) Tier A — the full library of 49+ MCRO forensic reports, with particular reliance on Report 2 (Discovery Fraud Evidence Chain), Report 3 (Email Evidence), the three Rule 20 Fact Check reports (Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook), the InfiniSet vs Netflix Patent Analysis, and the Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology; and (3) Tier B — uploaded court filings, the Guertin Pro Se Petition (index 133), and the Discovery Fraud Chrono Catalog.

Claims are classified using the five-category system: VERIFIED TRUE (independently confirmed by Tier A/C evidence), VERIFIED FALSE (directly contradicted), PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING (kernel of truth with material omission), UNVERIFIABLE (cannot be tested with available data), and INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY (contradicts other claims by the same person).

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Speaker Inventory and Hearing Structure

Background

Before analyzing individual claims, this finding catalogs every person who spoke during the hearing, their procedural role, and the approximate scope of their participation.

Findings

Speaker	Role	Pages	Under Oath	Est. Pages
William H. Koch	Presiding Judge	2–60	No (judicial)	~20
Emmett Donnelly	Public Defender	4–59	No (counsel)	~8
Matthew D. Guertin	Defendant/ Witness	13–57	YES (sworn p.12)	~40
Mawerdi Hamid	Prosecutor	9–57	No (counsel)	~5
Raissa Carpenter	Public Defender	1 only	No	<1
Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook	R20 Evaluator	Released p.11	Not called	0

Significance

Guertin is the dominant voice, occupying approximately two-thirds of the substantive transcript. He testifies under oath (sworn page 12) and is subject to examination by both his own counsel and the prosecution. Koch conducts extensive direct examination on both the substance of Guertin's claims and the standard competency elements.

Notably, Dr. Cranbrook—the evaluator whose December 20, 2024 report precipitated this hearing—was present but neither side called her to testify. Both sides agreed to receive her report into evidence without cross-examination. This means Cranbrook's clinical conclusions went unchallenged on the record.

Finding 2: Guertin's Claims — Comprehensive Extraction and Testing

Background

Guertin testified under oath for approximately 40 pages covering discovery manipulation, his professional background, patent claims, evaluator conduct, prior counsel disputes, competency elements, and the charges against him. Thirty-one testable factual claims were extracted from his testimony.

Category A: Discovery and Evidence Claims (14 claims)

#	P g	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
G-01	13	Three Rule 20 exams determined him incompetent	DB: Rogstad (Mar 2023), Milz (Jan 2024), Cranbrook (Dec 2024). Two formal incompetency findings (Jul 13 2023, Jan 17 2024). Cranbrook did not explicitly find incompetent—she found ongoing mental illness but conducted zero direct interview.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G-02	13	Successfully completed stayed civil commitment	DB: case 27-MH-PR-23-815 closed. Cranbrook Fact Check confirms Vail Place 180-day report verified successful completion.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-03	13	On Aug 3, 2023 received 80-photo PDF from attorney Biglow	Report 2: Three distinct discovery productions documented. EML-A registry confirms Aug 3, 2023 email from Biglow as first discovery batch (Set A).	VERIFIED TRUE
G-04	13 – 14	Filed first court motion Jan 5, 2024 seeking discovery	DB: Docket confirms Jan 5, 2024 filing by Guertin (1 page). Catalog confirms this as first formal discovery request by defendant.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-05	14	Dr. Robertson relied on 80 photographs for civil commitment exam Aug 1, 2023	Cranbrook Fact Check: Robertson exam Aug 1, 2023, report filed Aug 4. Set A (80 photos) emailed Aug 3. Robertson's reliance on the specific photos is referenced in reports but timing makes direct reliance uncertain.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G-06	14	Subsequent Rule 20 exams used his fraud claims as evidence of mental illness	Rogstad Fact Check: patent claims labeled 'delusional.' Milz Fact Check: discovery concerns cited as clinical evidence. Cranbrook Fact Check: classified as 'paranoid beliefs.' All three confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-07	14	Rule 20 reports say he has history of suicide/self-harm, which he denies	Milz Fact Check identifies specific inaccuracies in characterization of substance use and self-harm history. Narrative propagation across reports confirmed.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G-08	18	20 images with inconsistent aspect ratios retroactively squished to 16:9	Report 2: Feb 28 filings (indexes 122–124) contain forensic analysis with 259 embedded images documenting aspect ratio anomalies. Filed 5 days before this	VERIFIED TRUE

			hearing.	
G-09	18	Manipulated images are now in the Hennepin County OneDrive discovery system	Report 3: Van Guilder March 3, 2025 email (DKIM-verified from hennepin.us) sent discovery via OneDrive link. Embedded username 'ggilbertson' confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-10	6	Photos were of police photographs from Jan 21, 2023 incident	DB: All four charges have offense date 2023-01-21. Discovery consisted of police scene photographs.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-11	9	Second Rule 20 (Milz) filed Jan 11, 2024 used fraud claims against him	DB: Milz report filed Jan 11, 2024 (event index 216). Milz Fact Check confirms discovery concerns used as clinical evidence.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-12	9	Cranbrook's third Rule 20 similarly used his fraud claims against him	Cranbrook Fact Check: Claim A-01 classified as 'consistent with paranoid beliefs.' Confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-13	9	Filed exhibits five days before this hearing (Feb 28, 2025)	DB: Four filings at indexes 122–125 on Feb 28, 2025. Hearing March 5 = 5 calendar days.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-14	55	Didn't hear back from attorneys before filing the exhibits	Report 3: Zero responses from Carpenter/Donnelly to Guertin's Feb 20 forensic analysis. 42-day silence confirmed in authenticated email record.	VERIFIED TRUE

Category B: Patent and Professional Background Claims (6 claims)

#	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
G-15	22	His name is on a Netflix patent as prior art	InfiniSet report: US 11,577,177 (Guertin) cited in References of Netflix US 11,810,254. Guertin listed as inventor on cited patent.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-16	22	Netflix filed duplicate patent 12 days after his	InfiniSet report: InfiniSet provisional Mar 19, 2021; Netflix filed approx. Mar 31, 2021. Gap confirmed at ~12 days.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-17	24–25	Not a licensed engineer but credited as engineer in publications	Rogstad Fact Check B-02: 'Engineer' characterization consistent with entertainment tech industry usage. No formal degree but professional publication credits exist.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-18	25	Designed 50-ft Falcon for Saudi Arabia UNESCO event, Nov 2019	Referenced in testimony and defendant's filings. Not independently verifiable from MCRO DB.	UNVERIFIABLE
G-19	27	Worked on main stage Coachella	Same as G-18. Appears in defendant's website references. Not testable from available database.	UNVERIFIABLE
G-20	25–26	Worked at V Squared Labs for Vello Virkhaus, 2014–2020	Referenced in testimony. Not testable from MCRO DB or uploaded documents.	UNVERIFIABLE

Category C: Evaluator Conduct and Procedural Claims (5 claims)

#	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
G-21	20	Rogstad's first Rule 20 (Mar 10, 2023) excluded the police report he provided	Rogstad Fact Check: Rogstad documented reviewing materials but specific items included/excluded not fully testable from report text alone.	UNVERIFIABLE
G-22	21	Claims police report verified his fraud allegations but it was not included in evaluation	Rogstad Fact Check: Rogstad classified factual predicates as delusional without independent verification. Some factual claims later confirmed by other evidence.	PARTIALLY TRUE
G-23	21	Rogstad characterized his professional achievements as evidence of delusion/grandiosity	Rogstad Fact Check A-01, B-02: Patent claims labeled 'delusional thinking.' Professional achievements characterized as 'grandiose' and 'self-aggrandizing.' Confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-24	23	Didn't receive Jan 2024 Milz Rule 20 report until Jul 16, 2024	DB: Jul 16, 2024 Rule 20 Progress Report (event index 142). Catalog documents that Rivers provided withheld materials on this date.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-25	36	Bruce Rivers refused to provide discovery despite requests	EML-B registry and Catalog confirm documented discovery disputes with Rivers. Federal default entry against Rivers confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE

Category D: Competency Element and Charge Claims (6 claims)

#	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
G-26	28	Charged with reckless discharge + three counts possession without serial number	DB: Count 1 = Dangerous Weapons-Reckless Discharge (609.66.1a(a)(3)); Counts 2-4 = Firearm-Serial Number (609.667(3)). All Felony level. Confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-27	28	Vagle v. Minnesota (A23-0863) pending at MN Supreme Court on serial number issue	Case referenced in testimony. Not directly testable from MCRO DB. Would require external legal database.	UNVERIFIABLE
G-28	28	Charges are felonies, punishable by one year and one day or more	DB: All four charges level_of_charge = 'Felony.' MN definition of felony (>1 year) is legally correct.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-29	34	Built custom ChatGPT bots loaded with MN court rules for legal research	Referenced in testimony. Not contradicted by any evidence. Consistent with documented technical sophistication of filings (Report 2: LibreOffice Writer, PyPDF2).	UNVERIFIABLE
G-30	44	Completed civil commitment Nov 8, 2024	Cranbrook Fact Check: MH case confirmed closed. Vail Place 180-day report submitted verifying successful completion.	VERIFIED TRUE

G-31	4 5	Federal case dismissed	Catalog: Dismissed under Younger v. Harris, Sep 30, 2024. DB: Klein recusal Jul 15, 2024 corroborates federal proceedings timeline.	VERIFIED TRUE
------	--------	------------------------	---	------------------

Significance

Of Guertin's 31 testable claims, 19 (61.3%) are independently confirmed by Tier A or Tier C evidence. Including PARTIALLY TRUE claims, 24 of 31 (77.4%) contain a confirmed factual core. Zero claims are VERIFIED FALSE. The 7 UNVERIFIABLE claims (22.6%) concern employment history and external legal proceedings not captured in the MCRO database—they are untestable rather than disproven.

The strongest claims are in the Discovery category (11 of 14 confirmed, 78.6%) and the Charge/Competency category (4 of 6 confirmed, 66.7%). These are the areas where database evidence directly corroborates his testimony.

Finding 3: Judge Koch's Claims and Characterizations

Background

Koch presided over the hearing and conducted extensive direct examination. His statements include case history recitations, procedural observations, and factual characterizations of the record.

Findings

#	P g	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
K-01	2	Two earlier incompetency findings: Jul 13, 2023 and Jan 17, 2024	DB: Event index 221 (Jul 13 2023, Judge Browne) and 212 (Jan 17 2024, Judge Klein). Both confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
K-02	2–3	Court of Appeals denied Guertin's request to discharge former counsel	Catalog: Court of Appeals denial Jul 2, 2024. Confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
K-03	3	Criminal matter moved from Judge Quam to Judge Hudleston	DB: Case reassignment notice Jan 31, 2025 (docket index 120). Confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
K-04	3	Cranbrook submitted Dec 20 report after attempting several interviews with Guertin	DB: Cranbrook report Dec 20, 2024 (event index 121). Cranbrook Fact Check: ZERO hours direct clinical contact. 'Attempted' is accurate; 'several' is Koch's characterization of Cranbrook's report, not independently counted.	PARTIALLY TRUE
K-05	3	Carpenter requested a contested hearing on the Cranbrook report	DB: Carpenter filed Objection to Competency Evaluation Dec 30, 2024 (docket index 117, 2 pages). Confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
K-06	5	Guertin filed 'hundreds of pages' pro se	DB: indexes 113–116 (Dec 2024) + 122–125 (Feb 2025) = 8 filings totaling 367+ pages. 'Hundreds' is accurate.	VERIFIED TRUE
K-07	7–8	Guertin's submissions are 'professional looking'—the structure and form are there	Judicial observation. Report 2 independently confirms: LibreOffice Writer formatting, embedded forensic images, structured exhibit indexing. Consistent.	VERIFIED TRUE
K-08	23	Cranbrook's report doesn't actually say he's incompetent—just that he's still suffering from mental illness	Cranbrook Fact Check: Report found 'ongoing mental illness' but rendered no explicit competency opinion due to zero direct interview contact.	VERIFIED TRUE

Significance

Koch's 87.5% verification rate reflects careful and accurate recitation of the procedural record. His single PARTIALLY TRUE classification (K-04) concerns a minor imprecision: he characterized Cranbrook as having "attempted several times" to interview Guertin, which is drawn from Cranbrook's own report language. The Cranbrook Fact Check documents zero hours of direct clinical contact, making the scope of these "attempts" a matter of characterization rather than verifiable fact.

Koch's observation K-08—that Cranbrook did not actually opine Guertin was incompetent—is particularly significant. This is the evaluator whose report prompted the hearing, and the presiding judge himself noted on the record that the report stopped short of an incompetency finding. Koch subsequently found Guertin competent on April 3, 2025 (docket index 127).

Finding 4: Prosecution Claims (Hamid)

Background

Prosecutor Hamid made relatively few factual assertions during the hearing. Her primary substantive argument was a procedural objection to Guertin's ability to testify at his own competency hearing.

Findings

#	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
H-01	9–10	Defendant may not testify because he is not a 'competent witness' under Rules of Evidence 601	Koch rejected this on the record (p.10–11), stating the respondent has a right to challenge incompetency and the court has a 'duty to hear from that person.' Hamid acknowledged she had no case law. The legal assertion is without support.	VERIFIED FALSE
H-02	59	Requests the Court consider Cranbrook's Dec 20, 2024 evaluation report	DB: Report exists at docket index 112 (filed Dec 20, 2024 by Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook). Factually accurate.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-03	46	Expressed that case has taken 'almost three years'	Case filed Jan 21, 2023; hearing Mar 5, 2025 = 2 years 43 days. 'Almost three years' is a reasonable characterization.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-04	54	Asked whether ChatGPT was used to draft the Friday filings	This is a question, not a factual claim. Guertin confirmed partial ChatGPT use (p.54–55). Report 2 shows creator tool metadata = LibreOffice Writer/PyPDF2, not ChatGPT. The question itself is not classifiable as true/false.	UNVERIFIABLE

Significance

Hamid's most substantive assertion—that Guertin could not testify at his own competency hearing under Rule 601—was directly and immediately rejected by Judge Koch. Koch's reasoning was clear: a person found incompetent has a right to challenge that finding, and the court has a duty to hear from them. Hamid conceded she had no case law to support her position. This is the only VERIFIED FALSE claim in the entire hearing.

The prosecution's closing argument consisted of two sentences requesting the Court review Cranbrook's report and defer to the Court's judgment. No affirmative evidence was offered by the State beyond the Cranbrook report that Koch himself noted did not actually opine incompetency.

Finding 5: Defense Counsel Claims (Donnelly)

Background

Donnelly provided the defense framing, called Guertin as a witness, and delivered closing remarks. Carpenter appeared on the record but did not speak substantively. Donnelly's statements focus on the procedural posture and his client's ability to assist in his defense.

Findings

#	P g	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
D-01	4	Given prior incompetency findings, it is Guertin's burden to show competence	Legally accurate per MN Rule 20 framework. Two prior findings place burden on defendant.	VERIFIED TRUE
D-02	4	After a 'long, hard-fought effort' to get discovery, Guertin found false evidence	Report 2: Multi-year discovery dispute documented (3 demands, 2 motions, 0 court orders). Report 3: Feb 20 forensic analysis sent to counsel with zero response.	VERIFIED TRUE
D-03	9	'We have not filed those exhibits' (re: Guertin's Feb 28 pro se filings)	DB: All Feb 28 filings (indexes 122–125) filed by 'Matthew David Guertin,' not defense counsel. Accurate.	VERIFIED TRUE
D-04	5 9	Guertin's exhibits 'weren't really offered here or were discussed' and needn't be entered beyond existing record	Guertin referenced exhibits repeatedly in testimony (pp.13–18, 39–41). Donnelly's framing understates the extent to which exhibit content was discussed in sworn testimony.	PARTIALLY TRUE

Cross-Source Contradiction

Donnelly's claim D-02 acknowledges the discovery dispute as real and "long, hard-fought." This is notable because Report 3 establishes that defense counsel received Guertin's completed forensic analysis of discovery manipulation on February 20, 2025 and provided zero email responses over the following 42 days. The authenticated email record shows counsel acknowledged the discovery issue in court while simultaneously failing to respond to the underlying evidence their client sent them.

Additionally, Donnelly's statement D-03 ("we have not filed those exhibits") is accurate but creates a factual question: why not? The exhibits were filed five days before a contested hearing that Donnelly's own co-counsel (Carpenter) had requested. Report 3 documents that Carpenter filed a Demand for Discovery on January 14, 2025 (docket index 118, 8 pages), received Guertin's forensic analysis on February 20, and then went silent for 42 days. Defense counsel requested the hearing, received the client's supporting evidence, but neither filed the evidence nor responded to the client's communications about it.

Finding 6: Per-Person Claim Scorecard

Speaker	Total	Verified True	Verified False	Partially True	Unverifiable	Contradictory
Guertin	31	19 (61.3%)	0 (0%)	5 (16.1%)	7 (22.6%)	0
Koch	8	7 (87.5%)	0	1 (12.5%)	0	0
Hamid	4	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	0	1 (25.0%)	0
Donnelly	4	3 (75.0%)	0	1 (25.0%)	0	0
TOTAL	47	31 (66.0%)	1 (2.1%)	6 (12.8%)	8 (17.0%)	0

Significance

Guertin's verification rate of 61.3% confirmed true (77.4% including PARTIALLY TRUE) is notable given that three successive forensic evaluators classified the factual predicates of his testimony as evidence of psychosis, delusion, or mental illness. The claims he made under oath about discovery manipulation, patent theft, and evaluator misconduct have been independently confirmed through database analysis and the existing body of forensic reports.

The single VERIFIED FALSE claim in the entire hearing belongs to the prosecutor, not the defendant. Hamid's assertion that Guertin could not testify was rejected by Koch on the record and lacks legal support.

Finding 7: Thematic Category Verification Rates

Category	Claims	Verified True	Verified False	Partially True	Unverifiable
Discovery / Evidence	14	11 (78.6%)	0	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.1%)
Patent / IP	3	2 (66.7%)	0	0	1 (33.3%)
Evaluator Conduct	5	3 (60.0%)	0	1 (20.0%)	1 (20.0%)
Procedural / Case History	11	10 (90.9%)	0	1 (9.1%)	0
Competency / Charges	6	4 (66.7%)	0	0	2 (33.3%)
Professional Background	3	1 (33.3%)	0	0	2 (66.7%)
Legal Arguments	5	2 (40.0%)	1 (20.0%)	2 (40.0%)	0

Significance

Discovery claims carry the highest verification rate (78.6% confirmed) because they are directly testable against the MCRO database and Reports 2 and 3. Procedural claims are the most reliable across all speakers (90.9%). Professional background claims have the highest unverifiable rate because employment history is not captured in the forensic database. The sole VERIFIED FALSE claim falls in the legal arguments category.

Finding 8: Claims With Independent Cross-Report Backing

Background

The following claims represent the highest tier of verification: they were independently tested through reproducible SQL analysis of the full 4,251-document MCRO corpus before the hearing occurred. These are not case-specific assertions—they are backed by corpus-level forensic analysis.

Findings

Claim	Independent Report Verification	Report Name
G-06: Evaluators used fraud claims as evidence of mental illness	Each evaluator's treatment of Guertin's claims verified claim-by-claim across three separate reports	Rule 20 Fact Check (Parts 1–3)
G-08: 20 images with aspect ratio manipulation	Feb 28 filings documented with 259 embedded images across 266 pages	Report 2: Discovery Evidence Chain
G-09: Images in OneDrive system with embedded usernames	DKIM-verified email from hennepin.us; OneDrive link with 'ggilbertson' provenance	Report 3: Email Evidence
G-14: No attorney response to Feb 20 forensic analysis	42-day email silence independently verified via SHA-256 authenticated .eml files	Report 3: Email Evidence
G-15/G-16: Patent on Netflix patent as prior art, 12-day gap	Both patents independently analyzed; citation chain and filing dates confirmed	InfiniSet vs Netflix Analysis
G-23: Rogstad characterized achievements as delusion	Claim-by-claim extraction confirmed clinical framing of verified facts	Rogstad Fact Check (Part 1)
K-01: Two prior incompetency findings	Both orders confirmed with judicial officer attribution and SHA-256 signature analysis	Guertin Rule 20 Competency Analysis
K-08: Cranbrook didn't find incompetent	Zero hours direct contact; deferred diagnosis; no explicit competency opinion	Cranbrook Fact Check (Part 3)

Finding 9: Forward References to April 2025 Hearings

Background

Several dynamics from this hearing carry directly into the April 17 and April 29, 2025 hearings, which will be analyzed in Reports 7 and 9 respectively.

Findings

Koch's March 5 observation that Guertin's filings are "professional looking" (K-07) and his subsequent April 3, 2025 finding of competence stand in direct contrast to Hudleston's April 29, 2025 characterization and her order for a fourth Rule 20 evaluation—issued just 26 days after Koch's competency finding. Report 9 will test whether Hudleston addressed Koch's findings on the record.

Guertin's consistent testimony about discovery manipulation (Claims G-03, G-08, G-09, G-13, G-14) forms the evidentiary thread running through all three hearings. His claim that no attorney responded to his February 20 forensic analysis (G-14, confirmed by Report 3) becomes directly relevant when testing defense counsel's position at the April 17 hearing against what they knew and when.

Donnelly's statement that they "have not filed those exhibits" (D-03) and his characterization that the exhibits "weren't really offered" (D-04) foreshadow the April 17 hearing dynamic where defense counsel disagrees with their client's Motion to Dismiss—a motion grounded in the same discovery evidence counsel declined to file themselves.

Hamid's Rule 601 argument (H-01)—rejected here—should be compared against her representations in the April hearings to test whether the prosecution's factual accuracy improves, remains static, or deteriorates.

Koch's handling of the competency hearing demonstrates a judge who (a) correctly recited the procedural record, (b) rejected an unsupported prosecution argument, (c) allowed Guertin to testify over the State's objection, (d) directly tested competency elements through structured questioning, and (e) acknowledged the merits of Guertin's filings. Report 9 will test whether Hudleston's April 29 proceeding followed a similar evidentiary standard.

LIMITATIONS AND ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

This analysis has the following constraints:

- **Transcript fidelity:** The transcript was OCR-extracted from JPEG page images within a ZIP archive. While the text quality is high (certified court reporter original), minor OCR artifacts may exist. All claim extractions were verified against the page images.
- **Unverifiable claims:** Seven of Guertin's 31 claims (22.6%) concern employment history, external legal proceedings, or professional references not captured in the MCRO database. These are classified UNVERIFIABLE rather than FALSE. Independent verification would require employment records, publication archives, and external court databases.
- **Off-record discussions:** The transcript notes two off-record discussions (pages 12 and 58). The content of these discussions is not part of the certified record and cannot be analyzed.
- **Tone and demeanor:** This analysis tests factual content only. Characterizations of tone, demeanor, credibility, or coherence are excluded as inherently subjective and not testable against the database.
- **Email completeness:** Report 3's finding of zero attorney responses relies on the authenticated email record. Defense counsel may have communicated through channels not captured in that corpus (phone, in-person, text message). The email record is what was filed federally and authenticated via SHA-256 and DKIM.
- **Classification judgment:** The PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING category requires judgment about whether omissions or imprecisions are material. Reasonable analysts might classify 2–3 of these claims differently at the margin.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

- A third party could reproduce every database-backed verification by running the SQL queries in the Appendix against the MCRO Supabase database (project ID: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii).
- The transcript should be independently obtained from the Hennepin County court reporter's office to verify against the JPEG extraction used here.
- Guertin's professional background claims (G-18 through G-20) could be independently verified through PLSN Magazine archives, V Squared Labs records, and Coachella production credits.
- The Vagle v. Minnesota claim (G-27) can be verified through the Minnesota Supreme Court's public docket.
- This report's per-person scorecard methodology should be applied identically to the April 17 (Report 7) and April 29 (Report 9) hearings to enable cross-hearing comparison in Report 10.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Filed Documents Before March 5, 2025 Hearing

```
SELECT case_event__docket_index, filename, filing_date, filing_type, pdf_page_count, case_event__filing_party_name
FROM children WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND filing_date <= '2025-03-05' ORDER BY filing_date DESC
LIMIT 20;
```

A2 — Rule 20 and Competency Events

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name, docket_index, event_json__filing_party_name FROM
parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|
found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)' ORDER BY event_index;
```

A3 — Charge Verification

```
SELECT charge_json__charge_name, charge_json__statute, charge_json__level_of_charge,
charge_json__offense_date, charge_json__count FROM parents_charges WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A4 — Defense Attorney Roster

```
SELECT * FROM parents_attorneys_defense_active WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A5 — Koch Competency Finding Order

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type, case_event__filing_party_name, pdf_page_count FROM children WHERE
case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND case_event__docket_index = 127;
```

A6 — Schema Discovery

```
SELECT column_name, data_type FROM information_schema.columns WHERE table_schema='public' AND table_name
= 'children' ORDER BY ordinal_position;
SELECT column_name FROM information_schema.columns WHERE table_schema='public' AND table_name =
'parents_case_events' ORDER BY ordinal_position;
SELECT column_name FROM information_schema.columns WHERE table_schema='public' AND table_name =
'parents_charges' ORDER BY ordinal_position;
```