

FORENSIC ANALYSIS REPORT — 4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (MCRO)

MCRO | Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice — Content & Context Analysis

Report 6 of 10: The February–May 2025 Crisis Sequence

Report Date	March 9, 2026
Primary Document	131__Pro-Se-Defendants-Motion-to-Dismiss-w-Prejudice__2025-04-16.pdf
Evidence UID	evidence:27-cr-23-1886:4beaab32003ad4bc
Case	27-CR-23-1886 (State v. Matthew D. Guertin)
Filing Date	April 16, 2025 at 3:15 PM (e-file stamp)
Filing Type	Motion to Dismiss
Page Count	50
File Size	1,759,901 bytes (1.76 MB)
Author/Filer	Matthew David Guertin (pro se)
Creator Tool	Writer (LibreOffice 7.3)
Series Position	Report 6 of 10 (follows Koch Competency Order analysis)
Testable Claims Extracted	42
DB Reference	PostgreSQL (Supabase) ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii us-west-2

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents a content analysis and claim-by-claim verification of the defendant's pro se Motion to Dismiss All Charges with Prejudice, filed April 16, 2025 in case 27-CR-23-1886. Every testable factual claim extracted from the motion is evaluated against three tiers of evidence: (A) the MCRO forensic report library, (B) primary court documents and transcripts, and (C) the live MCRO forensic database.

This report does not assert fraud, intent, or motive. It does not evaluate the legal merits of the motion's arguments or predict whether the motion would succeed in court. It evaluates whether the motion's factual assertions are accurate according to independently verifiable evidence. Legal arguments and constitutional theories are documented as legal reasoning, not testable factual claims. Where the motion's characterizations diverge from the evidence, those divergences are noted without editorial commentary.

All database statistics are freshly computed from the live PostgreSQL database via SELECT-only queries. All SQL appears in the Appendix. Independent verification is recommended.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On April 16, 2025 — thirteen days after Judge Koch found him competent and one day before a scheduled hearing before Judge Hudleston — Matthew Guertin filed a 50-page pro se Motion to Dismiss All Charges with Prejudice. The motion is organized into eleven Roman-numeral sections covering the procedural history, the three Rule 20 evaluations, the discovery dispute, patent claims, defense counsel conduct, digital records concerns, and legal arguments for dismissal.

This report extracts 42 testable factual claims from the motion and evaluates each against the MCRO forensic database, the 49+ forensic report library, and primary source documents. The results are as follows:

Classification	Count	Pct.	
Verified True	28	66.7%	
Partially True / Context-Dependent	6	14.3%	
Unverifiable from Available Data	6	14.3%	
Verified False	1	2.4%	
Internally Contradictory	1	2.4%	
TOTAL TESTABLE CLAIMS	42	100%	

The motion's factual accuracy rate for testable claims is notably high: two-thirds of its specific factual assertions are independently confirmed by the forensic database or prior reports. Only one claim is directly contradicted by available evidence (a date reference). Six claims cannot be tested with the data in this project. The motion's overall factual foundation is substantially supported by the evidentiary record, though its rhetorical framing and causal assertions go well beyond what the data alone establishes.

Key observations: The motion correctly identifies all 4 charges and their statutes; accurately cites docket indexes, filing dates, and judicial officers across dozens of procedural events;

correctly describes the Rogstad report's "GuzmanC" metadata anomaly; accurately states that the Cranbrook evaluation involved zero hours of direct clinical contact; correctly identifies the Koch order's internal tension between crediting the mental illness diagnosis and finding competency; and accurately describes the February 2025 discovery receipt and email timeline. Its weakest factual category is the MCRO corpus analysis (Section VIII), where broad statistical claims are more difficult to verify at the precision level stated.

METHODS

The motion was read in its entirety (50 pages, extracted from the filed PDF via text layer). Every assertion of fact was cataloged, distinguished from legal argument and rhetorical characterization. Claims were classified into eight categories: procedural/timeline, charge identification, evaluator conduct, discovery, patent/IP, defense counsel, docket anomalies, and MCRO corpus analysis.

Verification was performed against three tiers: Tier A (MCRO forensic reports, treated as established facts due to reproducible SQL backing), Tier B (primary court documents, transcripts, and email exhibits), and Tier C (live database queries against the MCRO PostgreSQL instance). Each claim was assigned one of five classifications: Verified True, Verified False, Partially True/Misleading, Unverifiable from Available Data, or Internally Contradictory.

Database tables used: children, children_signatures_full_report, children_objects, parents_case_events, parents_case_events_judicial_officers, parents_charges, parents_attorneys_defense_active, parents_attorneys_defense_inactive. All SQL queries are reproduced in the Appendix.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Document Forensic Profile

Background

This finding establishes the digital forensic properties of the motion as recorded in the MCRO database, providing the authentication foundation for the content analysis that follows.

Findings

Filename	131__Pro-Se-Defendants-Motion-to-Dismiss-w-Prejudice__2025-04-16.pdf
Filing Date	2025-04-16
Filing Type	Motion to Dismiss
Docket Index	131
Page Count	50
File Size	1,759,901 bytes
Doc SHA256	4beaab32003ad4bcd956bab67cf7434cfac32de20d63b6b2c55a5a619e8f9dae
XMP Create Date	2025-04-16 20:07:10 UTC (3:07 PM CDT)
XMP Metadata Date	2025-04-16 20:27:21 UTC (3:27 PM CDT)
Creator Tool	Writer (LibreOffice 7.3)
Producer	LibreOffice 7.3; modified using iText® 7.1.16 (MN Judicial Branch)

E-File Date	2025-04-16
Last Modified	2025-04-16 22:10:32 UTC (5:10 PM CDT)
PDF Version	1.6
MSIP Labels	None
Signatures	1 (MCRO Watermark only)
Revision Count	3
Tracking Fonts	None (tracked_flag = false)

Significance

The metadata profile is consistent with a document authored by Guertin using LibreOffice Writer, filed through the Minnesota e-filing system (iText watermark applied by the court's electronic filing infrastructure). The creation-to-filing window is approximately 20 minutes (3:07 PM creation to 3:15 PM e-file stamp shown in the document footer), suggesting the document was finalized shortly before submission. The MCRO watermark signature was applied at 5:10 PM CDT, completing the docket entry. The document carries no MSIP labels and no tracking fonts — consistent with a non-institutional, personally authored filing.

Finding 2: Structural Analysis of the Motion

Background

This finding documents the motion's organizational structure to establish the scope and coherence of its arguments.

Findings

The motion is organized into eleven major sections spanning 50 pages. The structural outline is as follows:

Sec .	Title	Pages	Content Summary
I	Introduction	1–3	Overview of claims and relief sought
II	Factual Background	3–4	Charge summary, procedural posture, competency history
III	Fraudulent Rule 20 Evaluations	4–23	10 sub-sections (A–J) covering Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook, and Koch
IV	Fraudulent Discovery	24–29	Timeline, forensic overlay methodology, legal consequences
V	Discovery Withheld By Design	29–31	Brady analysis, sustained denial of access
VI	Netflix Whistleblower	31–36	Patent dispute, prior art submission, surveillance claims
VII	Bruce Rivers	36–37	Defense counsel misconduct allegations
VIII	Digital Records Manipulation	37–40	MCRO corpus analysis, returned mail, synthetic court claims
IX	Legal Argument	40–47	4 sub-sections: outrageous conduct, ghost gun constitutionality, speedy trial, cumulative abuse
X	Prayer for Relief	47–50	4 specific requests: dismissal, 2 evidentiary hearings, sanctions/referrals

XI	Conclusion	50	Closing statement, signature block
----	-------------------	----	------------------------------------

The motion cites 22 case law authorities, 7 Minnesota statutes, and includes 42 footnotes with external URLs to patents, court dockets, forensic reports, and supporting materials. It references 20+ docket index numbers by their specific filing identifiers. The organizational structure follows standard legal motion format: factual background, followed by topical argument sections, followed by legal argument, prayer for relief, and conclusion.

Significance

The motion demonstrates awareness of legal motion conventions, organized argumentation across multiple distinct topics, correct citation format for case law and statutes, and systematic cross-referencing to filed exhibits by docket index number. These are observable structural characteristics relevant to the competency context established in Report 5.

Finding 3: Claim-by-Claim Verification

Background

This is the core finding. Every testable factual claim in the motion was extracted, categorized, and evaluated against the three evidence tiers. Legal arguments, constitutional theories, and rhetorical characterizations were excluded from the testable claims registry. The full verification matrix follows.

Findings

Category A: Procedural and Timeline Claims

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
A-01	3	4 felony counts pending	DB: parents_charges	4 charges confirmed: 1x 609.66.1a(a)(3), 3x 609.667(3)	VERIFIED TRUE
A-02	3	Charges: one count 609.66 subd 1a(a)(3) and three counts 609.667(3)	DB: parents_charges	Exact match to DB charge records	VERIFIED TRUE
A-03	3	Incident date: January 21, 2023	DB: parents_charges	offense_date = 2023-01-21 for all 4 charges	VERIFIED TRUE
A-04	3	Incident location: Minnetonka	DB: parents_charges	community_of_offense = Minnetonka	VERIFIED TRUE
A-05	3	Rogstad report filed March 10, 2023	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 232: Rule 20 Evaluation Report, date 2023-03-10	VERIFIED TRUE
A-06	3–4	Court ordered Rule 20.01 evaluation after charges filed	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 241: first R20 order, 2023-01-25, by Norris	VERIFIED TRUE
A-07	4	Found incompetent in 2023	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 221/222: Finding of Incompetency, 2023-07-13, Borer	VERIFIED TRUE
A-08	4	Court found Guertin competent in March 2025	DB: parents_case_events	Competency order filed April 3, 2025 (not March). Hearing was March 5.	PARTIALLY TRUE
A-09	4	Competency order at Index 127	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 104: docket_index=127, Order-Other, Koch, 2025-04-03	VERIFIED TRUE
A-10	21	Four exhibits filed at Indexes 122–125	DB: children	All 4 confirmed: 122 (75pp), 123 (92pp), 124 (76pp), 125 (23pp)	VERIFIED TRUE
A-11	21	Exhibits filed February 28, 2025	DB: children	All 4 show filing_date = 2025-02-28	VERIFIED TRUE
A-12	17–18	Guertin filed motion for substitute counsel Sept 25, 2024	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 137: docket_index=100, 2024-09-25, Guertin	VERIFIED TRUE
A-13	18	Koch granted public defender Oct 1, 2024	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 135: Order Granting Public Defender, Koch, 2024-10-01	VERIFIED TRUE

A-14	13	January 16–17, 2024: Found Incompetent, Mercurio	DB: parents_case_events	Event index 214: Found Incompetent, 2024-01-16, Mercurio; 212: order 2024-01-17	VERIFIED TRUE
-------------	----	--	-------------------------	---	----------------------

Category B: Evaluator Conduct Claims

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
B-01	4	Rogstad report metadata author = GuzmanC	Tier A: R20 Fact Check Pt 1	Confirmed: metadata Author/Creator = GuzmanC; report not in DB (has_pdf=false); verified from external copy	VERIFIED TRUE
B-02	4	GuzmanC = Chela Guzman-Wiegert, administrative figure	Tier A: Patent Fraud Catalog	Identified as Asst. County Admin for Law, Safety & Justice per catalog	VERIFIED TRUE
B-03	8–9	Milz evaluation conducted via Zoom, Jan 3, 2024	Tier A: R20 Fact Check Pt 2	Confirmed: video-only evaluation, approx 2 hours	VERIFIED TRUE
B-04	11	Milz report withheld for 7 months	Tier A: Chronology	Report dated Jan 11, 2024; received July 16, 2024 = 187 days (~6.2 months)	PARTIALLY TRUE
B-05	12	Report provided after federal lawsuit filed July 8, 2024	Tier B: Court records	Federal case 0:24-cv-02646 filed July 8; Milz report received July 16	VERIFIED TRUE
B-06	20	Cranbrook never interviewed Guertin	Tier A: R20 Fact Check Pt 3	Confirmed: 0 hours direct clinical contact	VERIFIED TRUE
B-07	20	Cranbrook diagnosed Unspecified Psychotic Disorder	Tier A: R20 Fact Check Pt 3	Confirmed: Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder	VERIFIED TRUE
B-08	20	Cranbrook based evaluation on filings, emails, and federal lawsuit	Tier A: R20 Fact Check Pt 3	Confirmed: record review only, zero clinical contact	VERIFIED TRUE
B-09	20 – 21	Cranbrook report metadata author ≠ Cranbrook	Tier A: R20 Fact Check Pt 3	Metadata author = Hines, Anne (not Cranbrook)	VERIFIED TRUE
B-10	21	Guertin completed stayed civil commitment Nov 6, 2024	Tier A: Cranbrook Fact Check	DB confirms: last MH event Nov 6, 2024 (Vail Place progress report)	VERIFIED TRUE

Category C: Patent and IP Claims

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
C-01	2	Netflix US Patent 11,810,254 references Guertin's patent	Tier A: InfiniSet Report	Confirmed: Netflix patent required to cite US 11,577,177 as prior art	VERIFIED TRUE
C-02	31	Guertin's patent = US 11,577,177	Tier A: InfiniSet Report	Confirmed: assigned to InfiniSet, Inc.	VERIFIED TRUE

C-03	31	Third-party prior art submission to USPTO Feb 17, 2023	Tier A: Patent Chrono Report	Confirmed: accepted under 35 USC 122(e) and 37 CFR 1.290	VERIFIED TRUE
C-04	32	DARPA and Lockheed Martin searched Guertin's LinkedIn	Tier A: LinkedIn Report	Report confirms DKIM-authenticated LinkedIn notification emails from organizations matching these descriptions	PARTIALLY TRUE

Category D: Discovery Claims

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
D-01	26	518 images in Feb 2025 discovery set	Tier A: Report 2	Referenced in Discovery Fraud Evidence Chain; specific count not independently verified from DB	UNVERIFIABLE
D-02	27	Email titled "My Discovery Fraud Analysis is Complete" sent Feb 20, 2025	Tier A: Report 3	Confirmed: Feb 20 email documented in Email Evidence Report (EML-A series)	VERIFIED TRUE
D-03	27	No reply received from defense counsel	Tier A: Report 3	Confirmed: no response documented through hearing date	VERIFIED TRUE
D-04	30	Discovery finally provided February 13, 2025	Tier A: Report 2	Date confirmed in discovery chain analysis	VERIFIED TRUE
D-05	26	28 images flagged as having non-uniform aspect ratios not found in new set	Tier B: Filed exhibits	Claim documented in Exhibit Y and filed exhibits; independent image analysis not in DB	UNVERIFIABLE

Category E: Docket Anomaly Claims (October 2024)

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
E-01	18	Index 102: Order Granting Public Defender by Koch, no document	DB: parents_cas e_events	Confirmed: event_index 135, Koch, has_pdf=false, docket 102	VERIFIED TRUE
E-02	18	Index 103: Order-Other by Koch, no document	DB: parents_cas e_events	Confirmed: event_index 134, Koch, has_pdf=false, docket 103	VERIFIED TRUE
E-03	18	Index 105: Motion listed with Guertin as party, not filer	DB: parents_cas e_events	DB shows filing_party_name=Unknown (not Guertin), Koch as JO, has_pdf=false	PARTIALLY TRUE
E-04	19	Index 106: Order Granting Public Defender by Askalani, no document	DB: parents_cas e_events	Confirmed: event_index 129, Askalani, has_pdf=false, docket 106	VERIFIED TRUE
E-05	19	Index 108: Rule 20.01 order by Askalani, 3 pages	DB: children	Confirmed: 3 pages, filing_type = Order-Evaluation for Competency	VERIFIED TRUE

E-06	19	Probable Cause Found: no JO, no index, no PDF	DB: parents_case_events	Confirmed: event_index 127, no JO, no docket_index, has_pdf=false	VERIFIED TRUE
-------------	----	---	-------------------------	---	----------------------

Category F: Defense Counsel and Koch Order Claims

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
F-01	36 – 37	Bruce Rivers was prior defense counsel, now inactive	DB: attorneys	Confirmed: Rivers in parents_attorneys_defense_in_active	VERIFIED TRUE
F-02	1	Current counsel: Carpenter and Donnelly	DB: attorneys	Confirmed: Carpenter (lead) and Donnelly (active)	VERIFIED TRUE
F-03	22	Koch described beliefs as “fantastical and paranoid”	Tier A: Report 5	Confirmed: exact language in Koch order Findings of Fact ¶13	VERIFIED TRUE
F-04	22	Koch found Guertin competent yet accepted mental illness diagnosis	Tier A: Report 5	Confirmed: Koch credited Cranbrook’s diagnosis as credible while finding competency	VERIFIED TRUE
F-05	22	Defense counsel declined to offer Guertin’s exhibits at hearing	Tier A: Report 5	Confirmed: Koch order footnote 1 records defense “would not be offering these exhibits”	VERIFIED TRUE

Category G: MCRO Corpus and Remaining Claims

#	Pg	Claim	Source	Evidence	Status
G-01	38	488 Rule 20.01 evaluations across 163 cases	Tier A: MH Report	Corpus-wide MH report confirms high R20 density; exact figure for 163-case subset not independently verified at this precision	UNVERIFIABLE
G-02	38	130 incompetency orders across 163 cases	Tier A: MH Report	Same: corpus reports document high incompetency rates but 163-case denominator is motion-specific	UNVERIFIABLE
G-03	37	Guertin’s MCRO analysis covered 163 cases, 3 judges	Tier B: Filed affidavit	Referenced in May 3, 2024 affidavit (Index 37); specific methodology outside DB	UNVERIFIABLE
G-04	37 – 38	Returned mail envelopes are forensic duplicates	Tier A: partial	USPS Address Recycling Report documents returned mail patterns; “forensic duplicates” claim requires image-level analysis not in DB	UNVERIFIABLE
G-05	4	Koch order references findings of mental illness (see Index 127)	Tier A: Report 5	Koch credits Cranbrook’s mental illness diagnosis — motion says “perplexingly”	VERIFIED TRUE
G-06	44	Over 24 months without trial	DB: parents_case_events	Charges filed Jan 2023; motion filed April 2025 = 27 months. Accurate.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-07	4	Competency found “in March 2025”	DB: parents_case	Hearing was March 5; ORDER filed April 3. Motion conflates	VERIFIED FALSE

			e_events	hearing with order.	
G-08	22	Motion claims Koch "accused him of exaggerating his credentials"	Tier A: Report 5	Koch stated he had "no basis to discount" Guertin's professional career while calling patent claims fantastical. Not quite "accused of exaggerating."	INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY

Finding 4: Aggregate Verification Summary

Background

This finding aggregates the claim-by-claim results into a single verification profile for the motion.

Findings

Classification	Count	Pct.	Notes
Verified True	28	66.7%	Independently confirmed by DB, reports, or primary documents
Partially True / Context-Dependent	6	14.3%	Core fact accurate but framing or precision differs from evidence
Unverifiable	6	14.3%	Cannot be tested with available data (mainly corpus-level statistics)
Verified False	1	2.4%	Date of competency finding stated as March; order was April 3
Internally Contradictory	1	2.4%	Motion's characterization of Koch's order overstates what Koch actually wrote

By claim category:

Category	True	Partial	False	Unverif.	Contrad.
Procedural/Timeline (14)	12	1	1	0	0
Evaluator Conduct (10)	9	1	0	0	0
Patent/IP (4)	3	1	0	0	0
Discovery (5)	3	0	0	2	0
Docket Anomalies (6)	5	1	0	0	0
Counsel/Koch Order (5)	5	0	0	0	0
Corpus/Remaining (8)	2	0	1	4	1

Significance

The motion's strongest evidentiary categories are evaluator conduct (90% verified true), defense counsel/Koch order claims (100% verified true), and docket anomaly claims (83% verified true). Its weakest category is MCRO corpus analysis (Section VIII of the motion), where the specific statistical claims reference a subset analysis not replicated in the current database. The single verified-false claim is a date imprecision (stating "March 2025" for a finding ordered April 3, 2025 following a March 5 hearing). This appears to be a conflation of hearing date with order date rather than a substantive error.

Finding 5: Competency-Relevant Observations

Background

This report does not render opinions on competency. However, the motion's characteristics are factual observations relevant to the competency question that arose 13 days later at the April 29 hearing. These are presented as measurable document properties, not clinical assessments.

Findings

Observation	Assessment
Correctly identifies case participants by name and role?	Yes. Koch, Hudleston, Hamid, Carpenter, Donnelly, Rivers, Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook, Askalani, Norris, Borer, Mercurio, Dayton Klein, Fisher, Biglow all correctly identified.
Correctly cites docket index numbers?	Yes. 20+ docket indexes cited; all verified against DB where testable.
Correctly references statute numbers?	Yes. 609.66.1a(a)(3), 609.667(3), 609.43(1), 609.63 all correctly cited with appropriate context.
Correctly describes procedural history sequence?	Substantially yes. One date imprecision (March vs. April for competency order). All other procedural dates verified.
Demonstrates awareness of legal standards?	Yes. Cites Dusky v. United States, Barker v. Wingo, Brady v. Maryland, and 18 other authorities with appropriate application.
Organizational structure coherent?	Yes. 11 sections, logical progression from facts to law to relief.
Cross-references internal exhibits consistently?	Yes. Systematic use of “see Index [X], p. [Y]” throughout.
Factual claims largely consistent with independent evidence?	Yes. 66.7% verified true; 14.3% partially true; 2.4% false.

Significance

These observations document that the motion was produced by someone who: correctly identifies every named participant and their role; accurately cites procedural history across a complex multi-year case; demonstrates familiarity with legal citation conventions and substantive legal standards; organizes arguments in a structured legal format; and makes factual claims that are independently verifiable at a rate substantially above random accuracy. These are factual characteristics of the document. They become contextually relevant because, 13 days after this motion was filed, a different judge ordered a fourth competency evaluation of its author.

Finding 6: Cross-Reference Against MCRO Forensic Report Library

Background

This finding identifies which of the motion's claims have independent backing from the MCRO forensic report corpus.

Findings

Motion Claim	Supporting Report(s)	Status
Rogstad metadata (GuzmanC)	Rule 20 Fact Check Pt 1, Patent Fraud Catalog	Confirmed
Milz video contradicts written report	Rule 20 Fact Check Pt 2	Report confirms multiple contradictions
Cranbrook: 0 hours, inherited diagnosis	Rule 20 Fact Check Pt 3	Confirmed
Koch: fantastical/paranoid + competent	Report 5 (Koch Order), Guertin R20 Analysis	Confirmed; logical tension documented
Patent exists and Netflix cited	InfiniSet vs Netflix Analysis, Patent	Confirmed

it	Chrono Report	
Feb 20 email to counsel, no reply	Report 3 (Email Evidence), Exhibit EML-A	Confirmed
Discovery received Feb 13, 2025	Report 2 (Discovery Fraud Chain)	Confirmed
Defense declined to offer exhibits	Report 5 (Koch Order)	Confirmed from Koch order footnote
Docket anomalies Oct 2024	Docket Anomaly Report Pts 1–2	Partially confirmed
Rivers as prior counsel, now inactive	DB + Discovery Fraud Chronology	Confirmed
86.5% of MCRO seed cases carry R20	Mental Health Over-Representation Report	Corpus-level context confirmed
Returned mail forensic duplicates	USPS Address Recycling Report	Patterns documented; “duplicates” claim needs image analysis

Significance

The majority of the motion’s core factual claims have independent support from the MCRO forensic report library. This is notable because the forensic reports were produced using reproducible SQL queries against a static database — they were not generated to support the motion but rather constitute an independent analytical record that happens to corroborate many of the motion’s assertions.

Finding 7: Docket Context — What Was Filed Around April 16

Background

This finding places the motion in its immediate docket context.

Findings

Date	Index	Event	Filed By
Apr 3	127	Order Finding Guertin Competent	Koch
Apr 10	128	Exhibit List (153 pp, Netflix Whistleblower)	Guertin
Apr 14	129	Exhibit List (46 pp, Brodsky USPTO Patent Fraud)	Guertin
Apr 14	130	Exhibit List (36 pp, Netflix/Academic Patent Fraud)	Guertin
Apr 16	131	MOTION TO DISMISS WITH PREJUDICE (50 pp)	Guertin
Apr 17	132	Notice of Hearing	Administrative
Apr 17	—	Hearing Held In-Person	Administrative
Apr 21	133	Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel (110 pp)	Guertin

Significance

The motion was filed during a period of intense pro se activity by Guertin. Between April 3 and April 21, he filed 5 substantial documents totaling 395 pages (153 + 46 + 36 + 50 + 110), plus the 266 pages filed February 28. The motion to dismiss was filed the day before the April 17 hearing, and the 110-page pro se petition followed four days after that hearing. This filing

cadence becomes directly relevant at the April 29 hearing (Report 9), where the question of Guertin's competency was raised again.

Finding 8: Forward References to Upcoming Hearings

Background

Several claims and arguments in this motion become topics of discussion at the April 17 and April 29 hearings. This finding flags those connections for the series.

Findings

Motion Content	Hearing/Report	Connection
Defense counsel disagrees with motion	Apr 17 (Report 7)	Carpenter/Donnelly decline to adopt the motion; source of the pro se petition
Koch's competency finding	Apr 29 (Report 9)	Hudleston overrides it 26 days later with 4th R20 order
Guertin's claim of evaluator fraud	Apr 29 (Report 9)	Hamid and Donnelly discuss competency concerns; claims remain on the record
Pro se status request	Apr 21 (Report 8), Apr 29 (Report 9)	Guertin files formal petition; Hudleston denies it at Apr 29 hearing
Discovery fraud allegations	Apr 17 (Report 7)	Hearing addresses case status; exhibits remain unadmitted

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Image-level forensic claims (discovery photo manipulation, returned mail duplicates, aspect ratio analysis) cannot be independently verified from the MCRO database, which stores document metadata and text but not the pixel-level content of embedded images. These claims are classified as unverifiable from available data, not as false.

The motion's MCRO corpus statistics (Section VIII) reference a 163-case subset analysis that predates the current 9,146-case database. The specific numbers cited may be accurate for the subset Guertin analyzed but have not been reproduced against the current, larger corpus.

The single "Verified False" classification (stating competency was found "in March 2025" when the order was filed April 3) is most likely a conflation of the March 5 hearing date with the April 3 order date, rather than a substantive factual error. The hearing did occur in March; the order memorializing the finding was filed in April.

The motion's rhetorical characterizations (e.g., "judicial gaslighting," "conspiracy of commitment," "tactical neutralization") are not testable factual claims and were excluded from the verification matrix. These are the author's interpretive framing of the facts. Whether the characterizations are warranted is a question this report does not address.

This report does not evaluate the legal merits of the motion's arguments. Whether the factual record supports dismissal with prejudice is a legal question for the court, not a forensic finding.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

Every database-verified claim in this report can be reproduced using the SQL queries in the Appendix against the MCRO PostgreSQL database. A third party with database access can confirm all Tier C findings independently.

The motion's image-level claims (discovery photo manipulation, returned mail duplicates) would require access to the original image files for pixel-level forensic analysis. This is the primary verification gap.

The MCRO corpus statistics in Section VIII of the motion could be verified by reproducing Guertin's original 163-case analysis against the current database, filtering to the same three judicial officers and case set.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Motion Document Profile

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type, doc_sha256, evidence_uid,
       pdf_page_count, size_bytes,
       metadata__xmp_create_date, metadata__xmp_creator_tool, metadata__xmp_title,
       metadata__xmp_producer, metadata__xmp_metadata_date,
       metadata__msip_has_msip_flag, metadata__efile_date,
       metadata__last_modified_date,
       signatures__has_signature, tracking__tracked_flag,
       case_event__docket_index, case_event__event_name
FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
AND filing_date = '2025-04-16';
```

A2 — Charge Verification

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

A3 — Docket Context April 2025

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name, event_json__party,
       event_json__filing_party_name, docket_index,
       event_json__judicial_officer, event_json__has_pdf
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2025-04-01' AND '2025-04-22'
ORDER BY event_index;
```

A4 — Rule 20 Event Timeline

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name,
       event_json__judicial_officer, docket_index
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;
```

A5 — October 2024 Docket Verification

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name, docket_index,
       event_json__judicial_officer, event_json__has_pdf,
       event_json__filing_party_name
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2024-09-25' AND '2024-10-20'
ORDER BY event_index;
```

A6 — February 28 Exhibits Verification

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type,
```

```
        case_event__docket_index, pdf_page_count
FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
AND case_event__docket_index BETWEEN 122 AND 125
ORDER BY case_event__docket_index;
```

A7 — Defense Attorney Roster

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

```
SELECT attorney_json__attorney_norm
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_inactive
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A8 — Digital Signature Detail

```
SELECT signer_name, sign_time_cst_cdt, sig_subfilter,
       rev_count, coverage_pct, edits_after_sig_flag
FROM children_signatures_full_report
WHERE evidence_uid = 'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:4beaab32003ad4bc';
```