

MCRO

F O R E N S I C R E P O R T S E R I E S

The Narrative Arc

Case 27-CR-23-1886 and the February–May 2025 Crisis

Report 1 of 10 — Series Introduction & Narrative Overview

Report Date: March 9, 2026 | Database Queried: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2)

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents objective statistical findings and chronological reconstructions derived from structured database queries, court-filed documents, and hearing transcripts. All database metrics are reproducible via the SQL provided in the Appendix. This report does not allege fraud, assign intent, or draw legal conclusions. Observations are statements directly supported by database output or court records. Claims attributed to hearing participants reflect what the transcript records them as having said, not independently verified truth. Forensic report findings cited herein are independently reproducible from the frozen MCRO database. Each finding represents a measurable pattern requiring independent verification by qualified experts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Case 27-CR-23-1886 (State of Minnesota v. Matthew D. Guertin) is a felony criminal proceeding in Hennepin County District Court that has been open since January 24, 2023, with 4 felony charges, 0 dispositions, and 246 docket events spanning 1,043 days as of the last recorded event.
- The case has accumulated 29 Rule 20 competency events (94.9th percentile among cases with Rule 20 activity), 200 court-filed PDF documents (100th percentile in the MCRO corpus), and has been handled by 13 unique judicial officers (99th percentile).
- Three separate forensic evaluators assessed the defendant's competency between March 2023 and December 2024, with a combined total of approximately 4–5 hours of clinical contact across all three evaluations. None of the three evaluation reports carry metadata authorship matching the named evaluator.
- On April 3, 2025, Judge William H. Koch found the defendant competent to proceed after a contested evidentiary hearing. Twenty-six days later, on April 29, 2025, Judge Sarah Hudleston ordered a fourth competency evaluation under Rule 20.01.
- Between February 28 and April 28, 2025, the defendant filed approximately 103 documents into the case docket, including 4 exhibit lists on February 28 (indexes 122–125), a 50-page Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice on April 16, a 110-page Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel on April 21, and approximately 50 forensic reports on April 28 (indexes 135–184).
- Four documents in case 27-CR-23-1886 carry Microsoft Information Protection (MSIP) sensitivity labels. Of the 4,251 PDFs in the MCRO forensic corpus, only 34 total carry MSIP labels. The defendant's April 3 competency order was the first MSIP-labeled document in the entire corpus by filing date.
- This report is the first in a 10-report series that will systematically extract, catalog, and evaluate every testable factual claim made by each key person during three critical hearings (March 5, April 17, and April 29, 2025) and in related filings.

Corpus Overview

Metric	Value
Total Docket Events	246 (99.9th percentile)
Docket Span	January 24, 2023 – December 2, 2025 (1,043 days)
Rule 20 / Competency Events	29 (94.9th percentile among R20-active cases)
Court-Filed PDFs	200 (100th percentile)
Unique Judicial Officers	13 (99th percentile; corpus median: 4)
Defense Attorneys (DB-Confirmed)	3 (Rivers [inactive], Carpenter [lead], Donnelly)
Prosecution Attorneys (Active)	Hamid, Arneson, Cole, Murphy, Prochazka
Charges	4 felony counts (1x reckless discharge, 3x serial number)
Dispositions	0
Case Status	Open
Competency Evaluations Ordered	4 (Jan 2023, Nov 2023, Oct 2024, Apr 2025)
Incompetency Findings	2 (Jul 2023, Jan 2024)
Competency Findings	1 (Apr 3, 2025 — Koch)
MSIP-Labeled Documents (This Case)	4 of 34 corpus-wide (11.8%)
Cluster Cases	27-CR-23-1886 (CR, Open) + 27-MH-PR-23-815 (MH, linked)
Documents Filed Feb–May 2025	103 (52.0% of all case documents)
Defendant Pro Se Filings (Total)	139 docket entries
Existing MCRO Forensic Reports	49+

BACKGROUND: THE MCRO FORENSIC DATABASE

The MCRO (Minnesota Court Records Observatory) forensic database is a structured analytical repository containing 4,251 court-filed PDF documents from 9,146 cases in the Hennepin County District Court system, with full docket-level data for 2,903 of those cases. The database was constructed through a systematic process of downloading publicly available court documents from the Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO) system, then applying automated forensic analysis pipelines to extract metadata, digital signatures, embedded objects, text content, and structural properties from each PDF.

The database contains approximately 2.9 million rows across 53 tables and 11 views, organized into four hierarchical trees: a *children* tree (PDF forensic analysis), a *parents* tree (case-level docket data), a *hashpack* tree (content hashing), and a *source* tree (scrape provenance). The database is frozen and static: all queries return consistent results across all reports in the series. Every statistic in this report and the subsequent 9 reports is reproducible from the SQL queries provided in the Appendix.

The 163-case “MCRO seed” set was initially selected through forensic document review, not random sampling. Prior reports have established that 86.5% of those seed cases carry formal “Found Incompetent” orders—a rate dramatically higher than published national baselines of approximately 0.4–2.4% of criminal defendants. Cluster expansion analysis (documented in **Cluster Expanded Origin MH Outcome Analysis**) revealed that the seed cases connect to over 400 additional cases, with civil commitment rates exceeding 99% among linked mental health cases.

BACKGROUND: RULE 20.01 IN MINNESOTA PRACTICE

Minnesota Rule of Criminal Procedure 20.01 governs competency evaluations in criminal proceedings. When a question is raised about whether a defendant is competent to stand trial—meaning whether the defendant can understand the proceedings and participate in their own defense—the court may order a forensic evaluation by a qualified examiner. The evaluation typically involves clinical interviews, psychological testing, record review, and collateral contacts.

If the evaluator finds the defendant incompetent, the court may issue a “Finding of Incompetency and Order,” which suspends criminal proceedings and may trigger civil commitment proceedings under Minnesota Statutes Chapter 253B. The defendant’s case enters “Dormant” status until competency is restored. If the defendant is found competent, proceedings resume.

In this case, the competency question has been raised repeatedly. The standard process has been applied four times between January 2023 and April 2025, involving three different evaluators from the same institutional unit (Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services), producing approximately 4–5 total hours of clinical contact, and yielding two findings of incompetency (July 2023, January 2024) and one finding of competency (April 2025). A fourth evaluation was ordered April 29, 2025, twenty-six days after the competency finding.

METHODS

This report employs a three-tier methodology combining database queries, primary source document review, and cross-referencing against the existing body of 49+ MCRO forensic reports.

Tier A — Database Queries: All statistical claims are computed from live SELECT queries against the frozen MCRO Supabase/Postgres database. Key tables used include `case_registry`, `parents`, `parents_case_events`, `parents_case_events_judicial_officers`, `parents_charges`, `parents_attorneys_defense_active`, `parents_attorneys_defense_inactive`, `parents_attorneys_prosecution_active`, `children`, and `children_signatures` tables. All SQL is reproduced in the Appendix.

Tier B — Primary Source Documents: Court transcripts (March 5, April 17, and April 29, 2025 hearings), filed motions (Motion to Dismiss, Pro Se Petition, Emergency Motions), court orders (Koch

competency finding, Hudleston R20 order), and authenticated email exhibits (EML series) were reviewed for chronological reconstruction. Transcript text is treated as court-record fact that the statement was made; the truth of the statement's content is a separate analytical question.

Tier C — Cross-Reference: Findings from existing MCRO forensic reports are cited by report name. Because all reports query the same frozen database, their figures remain consistent and are not re-verified in this report unless specifically noted.

Corpus-Wide Percentiles: All percentile rankings are computed against the full corpus of 2,903 cases with complete docket data in the parents table. Rule 20 percentiles are computed against the 1,602 cases (55.2%) that have at least one Rule 20 event.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Case Overview & Statistical Positioning

Background

Case 27-CR-23-1886 was filed January 24, 2023 in Hennepin County District Court, Fourth Judicial District, Minnesota. The defendant, Matthew David Guertin, faces four felony charges: one count of Dangerous Weapons—Reckless Discharge of Firearm Within a Municipality (Minn. Stat. § 609.66.1a(a) (3)) and three counts of Firearm—Serial Number—Receive/Possess With No Serial Number (Minn. Stat. § 609.667(3)). The offense date for all charges is January 21, 2023. The prosecuting agency is the Hennepin County Attorney's Office; the law enforcement agency is the Minnetonka Police Department.

Findings

As of the last recorded docket event (December 2, 2025), the case has been open for 1,043 days with no disposition. The case status remains “Open.” The database records 246 docket events, 200 court-filed PDF documents, 29 Rule 20/competency events, 13 unique judicial officers, 3 defense attorneys, and 5 active prosecution attorneys. Of the 246 events, 139 (56.5%) were filed by the defendant.

Corpus Percentile Rankings

Metric	This Case	Corpus Median	P95	Percentile
Docket Events	246	45	~120	99.9th
Rule 20 Events	29	6	~30	~95th
Filed Documents	200	—	—	100th
Judicial Officers	13	4	10	99th

R20 percentiles computed among the 1,602 cases with at least one R20 event.

Significance

By every measurable axis—event count, document volume, judicial officer rotation, and Rule 20 activity—case 27-CR-23-1886 occupies the extreme tail of the MCRO corpus distribution. The case has more filed documents than any other case in the 4,251-document corpus. It has more docket events than 99.9% of the 2,903 fully scraped cases. Its 13-officer judicial rotation matches the 99th percentile, against a corpus median of 4. These are not marginal outliers; the case occupies a statistical position that sets it apart from virtually the entire corpus.

Connecting Context

The cluster_id (1570) links this criminal case to one additional case: 27-MH-PR-23-815, a Mental Health branch case. The **Cluster Expanded Origin MH Outcome Analysis** report documents that among MH cases linked to the MCRO seed cluster network, 99.2% contain civil commitment orders. The **Guertin Case Update (March 8, 2026)** report confirms the case has continued accumulating events, reaching at least 259 events and a 6th Rule 20 evaluation cycle by January 2026.

Finding 2: The Six Key Persons

Background

Six individuals are central to the February–May 2025 crisis sequence. Their roles, first appearances in the case docket, and actions during this period form the foundation for the claims analysis in Reports 4, 7, and 9.

Findings

Person	Role	First Event	Key Actions in Feb–May 2025 Window
William H. Koch	Judge	Jul 16, 2024	Presided over March 5, 2025 contested competency hearing; found Guertin competent April 3, 2025 (docket 127); 11 events total
Sarah Hudleston	Judge	Jan 31, 2025	Presided over April 17 and April 29 hearings; denied pro se petition; ordered 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation 26 days after Koch's competency finding; 8 events total
Mawerdi Hamid	Prosecutor	DB: Active	Hennepin County Attorney; made representations during hearings regarding case status and defendant's conduct; claims to be tested in Reports 4, 7, 9
Emmett Donnelly	Public Defender	DB: Active	Co-counsel; disagreed with client's Motion to Dismiss on the record at April 17 hearing; present at all three hearings
Raissa Carpenter	Public Defender (Lead)	DB: Active (Lead)	Lead counsel; received discovery materials; recipient of Feb 20 email from defendant documenting forensic concerns; present at hearings
Matthew D. Guertin	Defendant	Jan 24, 2023	Filed 139 docket entries; testified at March 5 hearing about discovery fraud; filed 103 documents Feb–May 2025 including forensic exhibits, Motion to Dismiss, Pro Se Petition, and emergency motions

Significance

The six persons represent the full spectrum of institutional roles: two judges (one who found the defendant competent, one who overrode that finding), the lead prosecutor, both assigned defense attorneys, and the defendant. The transition from Koch to Hudleston is a pivotal structural event. Koch presided over the contested competency hearing on March 5, 2025, heard testimony for nearly the entire session, took the matter under advisement, and issued a competency finding 29 days later on April 3. Hudleston's first docket appearance is January 31, 2025; by April 29, she had ordered a new competency evaluation that effectively set aside Koch's finding.

An additional detail from the database: the inactive defense attorney Bruce Rivers was predecessor counsel who was discharged. Guertin filed a federal lawsuit (0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) naming Rivers among the defendants. The federal case was dismissed under Younger abstention on September 30, 2024.

Finding 3: The Judicial Officer Rotation

Background

The number of judicial officers assigned to a single criminal case is a measurable indicator of case complexity, institutional handling, and procedural stability. The MCRO corpus provides a distribution baseline for comparison.

Findings

Thirteen judicial officers have been attributed to events in case 27-CR-23-1886 between January 2023 and December 2025:

Judicial Officer	First Event	Last Event	Events	Key Actions
Edward Wahl	2023-01-24	2023-01-24	1	Complaint
Lyonel Norris	2023-01-25	2023-01-25	1	1st Rule 20.01 order
Jay Quam	2023-01-26	2024-10-15	3	Notices of Hearing
Julia Dayton Klein	2023-06-14	2025-10-06	13	R20 orders, extensions, recused Jul 2024
George Borer	2023-07-07	2023-07-13	5	1st incompetency finding
Michael Browne	2023-07-13	2023-07-13	2	Incompetency finding
Danielle Mercurio	2024-01-16	2025-12-02	7	2nd incompetency finding, hearings
Lee Cuellar	2024-04-12	2024-04-12	1	Correspondence
Christa Rutherford-Block	2024-05-13	2024-05-13	1	Appellate
William Koch	2024-07-16	2025-08-04	11	Competency finding (Apr 3, 2025)
Shereen Askalani	2024-10-15	2024-10-15	5	3rd R20 order + forensic navigator
Sarah Hudleston	2025-01-31	2025-05-30	8	4th R20 order (Apr 29, 2025)
Lori Skibbie	2025-07-31	2025-10-07	2	Hearings

Significance

The 13-officer rotation places this case at the 99th percentile of the corpus (median: 4; P90: 9; P95: 10; P99: 13). The case includes 3 referees and 10 judges. The Docket Anomaly Forensic Report (Parts 1 and 2) previously documented 12 officers; the updated database query reveals a 13th (Christa Rutherford-Block, a single appellate event). The critical sequence for this report series is Koch (competency hearing judge) to Hudleston (reassigned judge who ordered the 4th evaluation).

Finding 4: The Rule 20 Pipeline — Four Competency Cycles

Background

The docket records four distinct cycles of Rule 20.01 competency evaluation orders between January 2023 and April 2025. Each cycle involves an evaluation order, an evaluator assignment, a report, and (in some cycles) a formal finding. This finding reconstructs each cycle from the database and cross-references the three Rule 20 Fact Check reports (Rogstad — Part 1, Milz — Part 2, Cranbrook — Part 3).

Findings

#	Order Date	Ordering Judge	Evaluator	Report Date	Outcome	Key Fact Check Finding
1	Jan 25, 2023	Norris	Dr. Jill Rogstad	Mar 10, 2023	Found Incompetent (Jul 13, 2023)	~2 hrs (postdoc-led); metadata author "GuzmanC"; pre-hearing prosecution meeting
2	Nov 15, 2023	Dayton Klein	Dr. Adam Milz	Jan 11, 2024	Found Incompetent (Jan 16, 2024)	~2 hrs (video only); deferred diagnosis; 8-min collateral call to compromised attorney
3	Oct 15, 2024	Askalani	Dr. K. Cranbrook	Dec 20, 2024	(No finding recorded)	0 hrs direct contact; inherited diagnosis; metadata author "Hines, Anne"; self-assigned after conflict removal
—	Mar 5, 2025	Koch	(Hearing)	—	Found Competent (Apr 3, 2025)	Contested evidentiary hearing; defendant testified; Koch issued order after 29-day advisement
4	Apr 29, 2025	Hudleston	(Pending)	—	Evaluation ordered	Ordered 26 days after Koch competency finding; forensic navigator appointed same day

Cross-Evaluation Comparison: Across the three completed evaluations (Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook), the combined clinical contact totaled approximately 4–5 hours. None of the three evaluation reports carry metadata authorship matching the named evaluator (Rogstad = "GuzmanC," Milz = not in database, Cranbrook = "Hines, Anne"). All three evaluators came from the same institutional unit: Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services. The **Rule 20 Fact Check** series (Parts 1–3) documents these findings in detail.

Significance

Among the 1,602 cases with Rule 20 activity in the corpus, the median number of R20 events is 6. Case 27-CR-23-1886's 29 events place it at approximately the 95th percentile. Four separate evaluation orders in 27 months is a high recurrence rate. The most structurally notable feature is the 26-day interval between Koch's competency finding (April 3, 2025) and Hudleston's fourth evaluation order (April 29, 2025), with no documented appellate or review proceeding between them.

Finding 5: The Discovery Dispute Arc

Background

A central theme of the case's pretrial history is a dispute over the authenticity and completeness of discovery materials provided to the defense. The Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology report documents this dispute in detail; this section provides a summary orientation for readers encountering the case for the first time.

Findings

The docket records three distinct discovery-related filings by date. Outside the docket, the Master Filing Catalog (referenced in the Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology) documents 28 discovery-fraud-related filings across 16 months and three courts (4th District, Minnesota Court of Appeals, and U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota). The following is the summary arc:

Three Discovery Productions: The record documents three separate sets of discovery materials provided to the defendant at different times: (1) a PDF batch provided by initial counsel Michael Biglow in approximately August 2023; (2) JPEG photographs provided by Bruce Rivers in approximately July 2024; and (3) a new set of photographs provided by Carpenter/Donnelly in February 2025. Guertin's filed exhibits allege that forensic comparison of these three sets reveals inconsistencies—specifically, non-uniform aspect ratios, missing images, and metadata anomalies—that he characterizes as evidence of manipulation.

February 28, 2025 Filing: On this date, Guertin filed four exhibit lists at docket indexes 122–125, totaling approximately 266 pages of forensic analysis documentation. These filings were entered eight days before the March 5 contested competency hearing and formed the evidentiary basis for Guertin's hearing testimony. The database confirms all four filings at this date, filed by “Matthew David Guertin.”

Court Response: The Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology report notes that as of the last docket scrape, zero court orders have been identified in the docket that substantively address or rule on the discovery manipulation claims. The claims were entered as sworn testimony at the March 5, 2025 hearing and documented in filed exhibits, but no responsive order is recorded. Full analysis of this gap is provided in **Report 2: Discovery Fraud Evidence Chain**.

Connecting Context

The **Cloned Discovery Template Forensic Report** found that case 27-CR-23-1886 is designated “Outlier A”—its discovery demand documents show 78% unique text content compared to the template norm, indicating substantial original content rather than boilerplate. The defendant's discovery filings are measurably distinct from the template pattern observed in the broader corpus.

Finding 6: The February–May 2025 Crisis Sequence

Background

Between February 13 and May 7, 2025—an 83-day window—the case underwent a rapid sequence of filings, hearings, and orders that are the central focus of this 10-report series. Each event is verified against the docket database and document corpus where possible.

Findings

Date	Event	Detail	DB Verification
Feb 13	Discovery received	Guertin receives discovery photographs in person from Carpenter/Donnelly	Not in docket (in-person exchange)
Feb 20	Email sent	Guertin emails Carpenter/Donnelly with forensic proof of discovery manipulation	Authenticated in EML-A exhibit series; no docket entry
Feb 28	Exhibits filed	4 exhibit lists at indexes 122–125 (~266 pages of forensic analysis)	Confirmed: 4 events, filer “Matthew David Guertin”
Mar 5	Hearing	Contested competency hearing before Judge Koch; defendant testifies about discovery fraud	Confirmed: “Hearing Held In-Person” + “Taken Under Advisement” (Koch)
Apr 3	Order issued	Koch finds Guertin competent (docket 127)	Confirmed: “Found Competent” + “Order-Other” (Koch)
Apr 16	Motion filed	Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice (docket 131)	Confirmed: “Motion to Dismiss” (Guertin)
Apr 17	Hearing	Hearing before Hudleston; defense counsel disagrees with client’s motion on the record	Confirmed: “Hearing Held In-Person”
Apr 21	Petition filed	110-page Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel (docket 133)	Confirmed: “Petition to Proceed as ProSe Counsel” (Guertin)
Apr 28	Mass filing	~50 MCRO forensic exhibits filed (indexes 135–184)	Confirmed: 50 events on this date, all filed by Guertin
Apr 29	Hearing + Orders	Hudleston denies pro se, orders 4th R20.01 evaluation + forensic navigator	Confirmed: R20 order (docket 187) + FN order (docket 188), both Hudleston
May 7	Emergency motions	Emergency Motion to Stay/Vacate + Motion to Confirm Pro Se Status	Confirmed: 2 “Notice of Motion and Motion” (dockets 190–191, Guertin)

Filing Volume: During this 83-day window, 103 documents were filed into the case docket, representing 51.5% of the case’s total 200-document corpus. On April 28 alone, 61 documents were filed—the single largest filing day in the case’s history and likely one of the largest single-day filing volumes for any case in the corpus.

Following the April 29 hearing, Guertin filed 16 Notices of Appeal on May 29, 2025 (docket indexes 192–211), followed by appellate case filing notices from the Clerk of the Appellate Courts on May 30.

Significance

Every major event in the crisis sequence is verified in the docket database. The timeline shows a rapid escalation: the defendant files forensic evidence (Feb 28), testifies under oath (Mar 5), receives a competency finding (Apr 3), files a motion to dismiss (Apr 16), has counsel disagree with the motion on the record (Apr 17), petitions for pro se status (Apr 21), files approximately 50 forensic exhibits (Apr 28), and is then ordered into a 4th competency evaluation (Apr 29). The 26-day gap between Koch's competency finding and Hudleston's new evaluation order is the structural fulcrum of the entire series.

Finding 7: The Structural Paradox

Background

The events of February–May 2025 present a series of measurable structural features that, taken together, form a pattern warranting detailed analysis. This finding presents those features without editorial commentary; the subsequent 9 reports in this series will test each element against the evidence.

Findings

Feature 1: Competency Override Without Appellate Process. A defendant found competent by Judge Koch on April 3, 2025 was ordered into a new competency evaluation by Judge Hudleston on April 29, 2025. The docket shows no appellate proceeding, motion for reconsideration, or formal challenge to Koch's competency order between those two dates. The mechanism by which one judge's competency finding was effectively set aside by another judge in the same proceeding is an open procedural question that Report 9 will examine in the context of the April 29 hearing transcript.

Feature 2: Temporal Correlation Between Filing Activity and Competency Action. The 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation was ordered on the same day as a hearing that was itself prompted by the defendant's filing of a Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice (Apr 16), a Pro Se Petition (Apr 21), and approximately 50 forensic exhibits (Apr 28). The temporal proximity between the defendant's most intense period of evidentiary filing and the initiation of a new competency evaluation is a measurable structural feature of the docket.

Feature 3: Statistical Outlier Status. The case's pretrial duration (1,043+ days with no disposition), event count (99.9th percentile), document volume (100th percentile), judicial officer rotation (99th percentile), and Rule 20 event count (~95th percentile) collectively place it in the extreme tail of the MCRO corpus. No single metric would be remarkable in isolation; the combination of all five at extreme percentile levels is the distinguishing feature.

Feature 4: Defense Counsel Disagreement with Client. The April 17, 2025 hearing transcript records defense counsel stating disagreement with their own client's Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice. The structural implication—defense attorneys opposing a motion filed by the person they represent—is analyzed in detail in **Report 7: April 17 Hearing Claims Analysis**.

Feature 5: MSIP Metadata Anomaly. Koch's April 3, 2025 competency order is the first document in the 4,251-document MCRO corpus to carry a Microsoft Information Protection (MSIP) sensitivity label. Only 34 documents corpus-wide (0.8%) carry MSIP labels; 4 of those 34 (11.8%) are from case 27-CR-23-1886. The MSIP set date on Koch's order is March 17, 2025—17 days before the April 3 filing date. A separate MSIP-labeled order filed May 30, 2025 carries a set date of January 9, 2025—141 days before filing. The significance of these metadata timestamps is examined in **Report 5: Koch Competency Order Document Forensics**.

Significance

These five features are presented as measurable observations, not conclusions. Each can be independently verified: the 26-day gap is in the docket, the temporal correlation is visible in the filing dates, the percentile rankings are computed from the corpus, the defense disagreement is in the transcript, and the MSIP data is in the document metadata. The 10-report series exists to determine what these observations mean when tested against the full evidentiary record.

SERIES ROADMAP: REPORTS 2–10

The following nine reports build on this narrative foundation. Each report is self-contained but designed to connect to the others through cross-references and shared database queries.

#	Report Title	What It Analyzes	Core Question
2	Discovery Fraud Evidence Chain	The full documentary trail from Jan 2024–Feb 28, 2025: three discovery productions, forensic analysis filings, email communications, and court response (or lack thereof)	Is there a verifiable evidentiary basis for the discovery manipulation claims?
3	Email Evidence: Carpenter/Donnelly Communications	The EML-A authenticated email thread (40+ emails through Apr 2025): what was communicated, when, and what response was received	What does the authenticated email record show about defense counsel's handling of the discovery concerns?
4	March 5, 2025 Hearing — Claims Analysis	Every testable factual claim from the 61-page transcript, speaker by speaker, tested against DB and forensic reports	Which hearing claims are verified true, verified false, or untested?
5	Koch Competency Order — Document Forensics	MSIP metadata, digital signatures, ESolutions authentication, and document properties of the Apr 3 order	What does the document metadata reveal about when and how the order was created?
6	Motion to Dismiss — Content & Context Analysis	The 50-page motion's claims, legal arguments, and the procedural context of defense counsel's refusal to adopt it	What does the motion actually argue, and what is its evidentiary basis?
7	April 17 Hearing — Claims Analysis	Full claims extraction and verification from the hearing where defense counsel disagreed with client on the record	What positions did each party take, and are the factual claims verifiable?
8	Pro Se Petition — Content & Context Analysis	The 110-page petition's claims, organization, and legal sophistication, analyzed in light of the competency question	What does the petition's content and structure reveal about the author's capabilities?
9	April 29 Hearing — Claims Analysis (Series Centerpiece)	The pivotal hearing where Hudleston ordered the 4th R20 evaluation: full claims extraction, verification, and cross-reference against all prior reports	What was said, what is verifiable, and what claims can be independently tested?
10	Emergency Motions & Series Synthesis	The May 7 emergency motions, the appellate filings, and a synthesis of all verified/refuted/untested claims across the full series	What is the cumulative verified evidence record?

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Database Coverage: The MCRO database contains the last-scraped state of each case docket. Events occurring after the final scrape (December 2, 2025 for case 27-CR-23-1886) are not reflected. The Guertin Case Update report documents events through March 2026 from a separate scrape.

Selection Bias: The MCRO seed corpus was not randomly selected. It was identified through forensic document review, which biases toward cases with document-level anomalies. Percentile rankings describe this case's position within the corpus, not within the full Hennepin County caseload.

Judicial Discretion: Judges have broad discretion to order competency evaluations. The 26-day gap between Koch's competency finding and Hudleston's evaluation order may reflect legitimate judicial concern about changed circumstances, new information, or procedural requirements not visible in the docket. This report does not evaluate the legal propriety of that decision.

Defense Counsel Conduct: Defense attorneys may have legitimate professional and ethical reasons for disagreeing with a client's litigation strategy, including concerns about the client's best interests. The transcript records the disagreement; it does not necessarily indicate improper conduct.

Clinical Validity: This report does not evaluate the clinical validity of any competency diagnosis. The procedural and methodological flags identified in the Rule 20 Fact Check series (metadata authorship anomalies, limited clinical contact, dependency chain) are documented patterns; they do not establish that any diagnosis was clinically incorrect.

Causation vs. Correlation: The temporal correlation between the defendant's filing activity and the 4th competency evaluation order does not establish causation. Correlation is documented; causation is not claimed.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

Any third party seeking to verify the findings in this report can do so through the following steps:

- 1. Docket Verification:** Access the public docket for case 27-CR-23-1886 via Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO). Verify the event counts, dates, judicial officer assignments, and filing parties against the SQL output in the Appendix.
- 2. Document Retrieval:** Download the PDF documents at docket indexes 122–125 (Feb 28 exhibits), 127 (Koch competency order), 131 (Motion to Dismiss), 133 (Pro Se Petition), 187–188 (Hudleston R20 order and forensic navigator order), and 190–191 (emergency motions). Verify their existence, filing dates, and metadata properties.
- 3. Transcript Review:** Obtain the transcripts for the March 5, April 17, and April 29, 2025 hearings (docket indexes 134 and 189). Verify that the speakers made the statements attributed to them in this and subsequent reports.
- 4. Corpus Statistics:** The MCRO forensic database SQL queries in the Appendix are designed to run against the frozen database. Access to the database would allow independent reproduction of all percentile rankings and corpus-wide comparisons.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Case Identity & Basic Metrics

```
SELECT cr.case_uid, cr.case_id, cr.defendant_name,
       cr.cluster_id, cr.cluster_name,
       p.case_type, p.case_status
FROM case_registry cr
LEFT JOIN parents p ON cr.case_uid = p.case_uid
WHERE cr.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A2 — Docket Event Counts & R20 Events

```
SELECT COUNT(*) as total_events,
       MIN(event_json__date) as first_event,
       MAX(event_json__date) as last_event,
       COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE event_name ~*
        '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)')
       as r20_events
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A3 — Judicial Officer Rotation

```
SELECT jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm as judge,
       COUNT(*) as event_count,
       MIN(pce.event_json__date) as first_date,
       MAX(pce.event_json__date) as last_date
FROM parents_case_events_judicial_officers jo
JOIN parents_case_events pce
  ON jo.case_uid = pce.case_uid AND jo.event_index = pce.event_index
WHERE jo.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
GROUP BY jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm
ORDER BY first_date;
```

A4 — Rule 20 Events Timeline

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name, docket_index,
       event_json__judicial_officer, event_json__examiners
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 — Corpus Percentile Rankings

```
WITH case_stats AS (  
  SELECT pce.case_uid, COUNT(*) as event_count,  
    COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE event_name ~*  
      '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)')  
      as r20_count  
  FROM parents_case_events pce GROUP BY pce.case_uid  
)  
,  
ranked AS (  
  SELECT case_uid, event_count, r20_count,  
    PERCENT_RANK() OVER (ORDER BY event_count) as evt_pctile  
  FROM case_stats  
)  
SELECT event_count, r20_count,  
  ROUND(evt_pctile::numeric*100,1) as event_percentile  
FROM ranked WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A6 — MSIP-Labeled Documents

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type,  
  metadata__msip__msip_label_name_primary,  
  metadata__msip__msip_set_date_primary  
FROM children  
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'  
  AND metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true  
ORDER BY filing_date;
```

A7 — Feb–May 2025 Event Timeline

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name, docket_index,  
  event_json__judicial_officer, event_json__filing_party_name  
FROM parents_case_events  
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'  
  AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2025-02-01' AND '2025-05-31'  
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index DESC;
```

A8 — Charges

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

A9 — Defense & Prosecution Attorneys

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

-- Defense (Inactive)
SELECT attorney_json__attorney_norm
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_inactive
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';

-- Prosecution
SELECT 'active', attorney_json__attorney_norm
FROM parents_attorneys_prosecution_active
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
UNION ALL
SELECT 'inactive', attorney_json__attorney_norm
FROM parents_attorneys_prosecution_inactive
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A10 — JO Distribution (Corpus-Wide)

```
WITH jo_per_case AS (
  SELECT case_uid,
    COUNT(DISTINCT judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm)
      as jo_count
  FROM parents_case_events_judicial_officers
  GROUP BY case_uid
)
SELECT
  PERCENTILE_CONT(0.5) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY jo_count) as median,
  PERCENTILE_CONT(0.9) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY jo_count) as p90,
  PERCENTILE_CONT(0.95) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY jo_count) as p95,
  PERCENTILE_CONT(0.99) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY jo_count) as p99,
  MAX(jo_count) as max
FROM jo_per_case;
```