

MCRO | Rule 20 Competency Chain Analysis

Case 27-CR-23-1886 — State of Minnesota v. Matthew David Guertin

Evaluation Independence, Procedural Gaps, and Logical Contradictions

Report Date	March 7, 2026
Scope	Seven primary source documents from a single criminal case + live database contextualization
Case	27-CR-23-1886 Fourth Judicial District, Hennepin County, Minnesota
Defendant	Matthew David Guertin (DOB: 07/17/1981)
Time Span	January 2023 – April 2025 (27 months of competency proceedings)
Source Documents	3 psychological evaluation reports, 2 incompetency court orders, 1 competency court order, 1 prosecution witness preparation memo
Database Context	MCRO forensic database: 4,251 PDFs across 245 cases, 155,357 docket events
Reproducibility	All database statistics are query-reproducible. All document citations reference specific uploaded source files.

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents a document-based forensic analysis of seven primary source documents from Minnesota criminal case 27-CR-23-1886, supplemented by database queries against the MCRO forensic database. The methodology is dual: close-reading and cross-comparison of the uploaded documents, plus quantitative database contextualization.

This report does not assert conclusions about fraud, fabrication, intent, or motive. Each finding documents measurable patterns, structural comparisons, procedural sequences, and logical relationships within and across the source documents. Where the documents contain internal contradictions, those contradictions are presented objectively.

All database statistics are freshly computed from the live PostgreSQL database and are independently reproducible using the SQL queries provided in the Appendix. All document citations reference specific language in the seven uploaded source files.

Findings are classified by evidentiary strength: (1) things directly stated in the documents, (2) things demonstrable by structural comparison across documents, and (3) things that require inference. This classification appears in the Evidentiary Strength Classification section.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Three psychological evaluations spanning March 2023 to December 2024 all reached the same diagnosis and substantially the same conclusions. However, the degree of independent clinical work declined with each successive evaluation: 2-hour in-person interview (Rogstad) → 2-hour videoconference (Milz) → no interview at all (Cranbrook).
- Dr. Milz’s report explicitly defers to Dr. Rogstad’s for background information and delusional belief descriptions, stating the defendant’s background “was outlined in the previous report submitted to the Court and will not be reiterated herein.”
- Dr. Cranbrook never met the defendant. Her diagnosis is explicitly “maintained based upon record review” of prior examiners’ reports — not independently derived. She is the supervisor of both prior examiners, both of whom were named in a federal lawsuit filed by the defendant.

- A prosecution witness preparation memo dated June 12, 2023, records Dr. Rogstad stating that “even if he did have patents approved, this would not change her mind about her ultimate opinion” — a pre-committed position stated three weeks before the evidentiary hearing at which the court found her “credible and persuasive.”
- The July 2023 incompetency order followed a full evidentiary hearing with testimony from both the expert and the defendant. The January 2024 incompetency order was entered “administratively” with no hearing, no testimony, and no opportunity for the defendant to contest it — yet it triggered civil commitment screening with a 5-day deadline.
- The July 2023 order is a 7-page document with case-specific findings. The January 2024 order is a 4-page template-style document with 14 operative paragraphs, most establishing a civil commitment infrastructure not present in the July 2023 order.
- The April 2025 competency order simultaneously finds (a) Cranbrook’s mental illness conclusion “credible” and (b) the defendant competent — based solely on his testimony, with no competing expert opinion and over the only expert’s assessment that his prognosis was “poor.”
- Across all five documents addressing the defendant’s legal claims, no document engages with the merits of his patent claim (US Patent No. 11,577,177 B2 — verified as real). The act of making legal arguments is itself classified as evidence of mental illness in multiple documents.
- The case docket contains 245 events spanning January 2023 through December 2025. The defendant filed over 100 pro se documents including forensic analysis exhibits, notices of appeal, and motions. The case remains open with a fourth Rule 20 evaluation ordered on April 29, 2025.
- Database analysis confirms the defendant’s case is linked to MH-branch case 27-MH-PR-23-815 (now closed), confirming the civil commitment triggered by the January 2024 order was executed.

Document Inventory

#	Document	Date	Author	Type	Key Conclusion
1	Rogstad Evaluation Report	2023-03-10	Jill E. Rogstad, PhD, ABPP	Rule 20 Evaluation	Incompetent; Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum diagnosis
2	Perez Witness Statement	2023-06-12	Jacqueline Perez, ACA	Witness Prep Memo	Rogstad pre-commits: patents would not change opinion
3	July 2023 Incompetency Order	2023-07-13	Referee George Borer	Court Order	INCOMPETENT after full evidentiary hearing
4	Milz Evaluation Report	2024-01-11	Adam A. Milz, PhD, ABPP	Rule 20 Evaluation	Incompetent; same diagnosis; defers to Rogstad
5	January 2024 Incompetency Order	2024-01-17	Referee Danielle Mercurio	Court Order	INCOMPETENT — administrative, no hearing; triggers civil commitment
6	Cranbrook Evaluation Report	2024-12-20	Katheryn Cranbrook, PsyD, ABPP	Rule 20 Evaluation	Never met defendant; diagnosis “maintained based upon record review”
7	April 2025 Competency Order	2025-04-03	Judge William H. Koch	Court Order	COMPETENT; finds mental illness credible but defendant competent

METHODS

Dual Methodology

This report employs two complementary analytical approaches:

- 1. Close-Reading Analysis:** Each of the seven uploaded source documents was read in its entirety. Specific language, structural elements, procedural details, diagnostic reasoning, and conclusions were extracted and catalogued. Cross-document comparisons identify where conclusions in later documents trace back to (or adopt without independent verification) conclusions from earlier documents.
- 2. Database Contextualization:** Live SQL queries against the MCRO forensic database (PostgreSQL/Supabase, project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii) provide the docket timeline, document inventory, signature forensics, tracking font analysis, clone group membership, attorney/judicial officer assignments, and corpus-level statistical context. All queries are SELECT-only and appear in the Appendix.

Scope and Definitions

The analytical corpus consists of seven documents from a single criminal case (27-CR-23-1886) spanning January 2023 through April 2025. The defendant, Matthew David Guertin, was charged with one count of reckless discharge of a firearm within a municipality (felony) and three counts of possessing a firearm without a serial number (felony) arising from a January 21, 2023 incident.

Three Rule 20.01 competency evaluations were performed by psychologists from the same organizational unit (Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services). Two incompetency orders and one competency order were issued by three different judicial officers. A prosecution witness preparation memo provides a pre-hearing record of the first evaluator's positions.

Database Tables and Views Referenced

The following database objects were queried for this report: case_registry, parents, children, children_signatures_full_report, children_tracking_groups, hashpack, hashpack_rows, parents_case_events, parents_attorneys_defense_active, parents_attorneys_defense_inactive, parents_attorneys_prosecution_active. All SQL appears in Appendix A1–A8.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Evaluation Independence — How Much Is Original Clinical Work?

Background

Three forensic psychologists — all employed by Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services — evaluated the defendant's competency to proceed over a 22-month period. Each produced a written report. All three reached the identical diagnosis (Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder) and substantially the same conclusion (incompetent or declining prognosis). This finding examines the degree to which each evaluation represents independent clinical work versus adoption of prior conclusions.

Findings

Evaluation Comparison Matrix

Examiner	Date	Format	Duration	Direct Obs.	Indep. Dx	Diagnosis	Opinion
Rogstad	2023-03-10	In-person	~2 hours	Yes	Yes	Unspec. Schiz. Spectrum	Incompetent
Milz	2024-01-11	Video	~2 hours	Yes	Partial	Unspec. Schiz. Spectrum	Incompetent
Cranbrook	2024-12-20	None	0 hours	No	No	Unspec. Schiz. Spectrum	"Poor" prognosis

Dr. Rogstad (March 2023): Conducted the only fully independent evaluation. She performed a 2-hour in-person interview (administered by postdoctoral fellow Dr. Casey Boland under her supervision), reviewed extensive records and discovery materials, and made her own clinical observations. Her report documents original diagnostic reasoning. She explicitly acknowledged the limits of her expertise regarding the defendant's technology claims, noted she was unable to reach the defendant's patent attorney, and stated that "even if the technological aspects of the defendant's statements prove true... his views remain consistent with delusions." This qualified acknowledgment represents the only attempt in any document to engage with the possibility that some of the defendant's claims have a factual basis.

Dr. Milz (January 2024): Conducted a 2-hour videoconference interview and made his own behavioral observations. However, significant portions of his report defer to Rogstad's findings. Key deferral passages include:

- ***"The defendant's background was outlined in the previous report submitted to the Court and will not be reiterated herein."***
- ***"Please refer to Dr. Rogstad's report for a full description of these beliefs."***

Milz arrives at the same diagnosis through substantially similar reasoning, but his report contains independent behavioral observations from the videoconference interview (e.g., the expanded list of entities the defendant believes are surveilling him, the self-incriminating statements). His diagnostic reasoning replicates Rogstad's framework rather than approaching the question independently.

Dr. Cranbrook (December 2024): Never met the defendant. Her report states she "attempted to complete Mr. Guertin's evaluation" but the defendant declined to participate. The entirety of her clinical analysis rests on: (a) review of Rogstad's and Milz's reports, (b) email communications with the defendant, (c) a single phone call with a Vail Place case manager, and (d) review of court and commitment records. The key diagnostic passage states:

"Prior examiners have provided a diagnosis of Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder, which is currently maintained based upon record review."

This sentence establishes that the diagnosis is maintained, not independently arrived at. No new clinical data from direct contact with the defendant informed the diagnostic conclusion. Every diagnostic statement in Cranbrook's report traces to observations made by Rogstad or Milz.

Significance

The three evaluations form a dependency chain, not three independent assessments. Rogstad's March 2023 evaluation is the sole root of independent clinical observation. Milz partially defers to Rogstad. Cranbrook entirely defers to both. At no point after March 2023 did any examiner perform independent diagnostic reasoning that could have produced a different result. The diagnostic label — Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder — propagated unchanged through all three reports over 22 months.

Connecting Context

This dependency chain is relevant to the broader MCRO forensic analysis because the Finding of Incompetency clone analysis (prior report) identified that the majority of incompetency orders in the corpus follow a standardized template. Here, the underlying clinical opinions themselves follow a similarly standardized pattern — each building on the last rather than starting from independent first principles. The database confirms that the same organizational unit (Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services) produced all three evaluations, and the docket shows three sequential Rule 20 evaluation orders issued by three different judges (Norris, Dayton Klein, Askalani) all returning to the same evaluation unit.

Finding 2: Witness Preparation Memo — The Neutrality Gap

Background

Dr. Rogstad was appointed by the court as a neutral forensic evaluator. The Perez witness preparation memo documents a private meeting between Rogstad and the prosecution on June 12, 2023 — three weeks and four days before the July 7, 2023 evidentiary hearing. The memo was authored by Jacqueline Perez, Assistant Hennepin County Attorney, and became part of the public record through the defendant's federal lawsuit (Case 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM, Doc. 43, Filed 08/07/24, Page 195 of 196).

Findings

Chronological Sequence

Date	Event
March 1, 2023	Rogstad and Dr. Boland interview the defendant in person (~2 hours)
March 10, 2023	Rogstad files evaluation report opining defendant is incompetent
June 12, 2023	Rogstad meets privately with ACA Perez for witness preparation
July 7, 2023	Evidentiary hearing; Rogstad testifies; defendant testifies and presents patent
July 13, 2023	Court issues Finding of Incompetency and Order (Referee Borer)

Side-by-Side Comparison: Patent Claim Treatment

Rogstad Report (Mar 2023)	Witness Prep Memo (Jun 2023)	July 2023 Court Order
"...the limits of my expertise in relation to technology matters must be acknowledged... even if the technological aspects of the defendant's statements prove true... his views remain consistent with delusions."	"Even if he did have patents approved, this would not change her mind about her ultimate opinion as opinion is based on delusional beliefs and not the patents themselves."	Court finds Rogstad "credible and persuasive" and "the most credible and persuasive evidence regarding Mr. Guertin's competency to proceed."
Framing: Qualified acknowledgment with stated expertise limitations	Framing: Unqualified pre-commitment; patents verified or not, opinion unchanged	Framing: Court credits neutrality without apparent knowledge of prosecution meeting

Significance

The witness preparation memo records a substantive shift in Rogstad's position. In her written report, the patent question is framed with appropriate epistemic humility ("the limits of my expertise... must be acknowledged"). In the prosecution meeting, the same question becomes an unqualified pre-commitment: the existence of verified patents would not change her opinion. The distinction is between "even if true, the views remain consistent with delusions" (a clinical judgment that acknowledges uncertainty) and "this would not change her mind" (a fixed position regardless of evidence).

The procedural context compounds this observation: Rogstad was appointed as a neutral court examiner, yet she met privately with the prosecution to prepare testimony. There is no indication in any document that the defense was notified of or participated in this meeting. The court's subsequent characterization of Rogstad as "credible and persuasive" does not reference and may not reflect awareness of this pre-hearing coordination.

Connecting Context

The case file number on the Perez memo (27-CR-23-2118) differs from the case file number in all other documents (27-CR-23-1886). The defendant's name and charges match. This discrepancy is noted but unexplained by the documents. The memo was produced as a federal court exhibit, not through the state criminal proceeding.

Finding 3: Legal Claims Treated as Symptoms of Mental Illness

Background

The defendant consistently raised several categories of claims across all proceedings: (i) his patent was stolen by corporations, (ii) discovery materials in his case were altered or fraudulent, (iii) his constitutional rights were violated, (iv) prior evaluators provided inaccurate reports, and (v) there is judicial misconduct. This finding tracks how each document characterizes these claims.

Findings

Claim Treatment Classification Summary

Document	Patent Claims	Discovery Fraud	Const. Rights	Evaluator Critique	Judicial Misconduct	Engagement w/ Merits
Rogstad (2023)	Symptom	N/A	Symptom	N/A	N/A	Partial
Milz (2024)	Symptom	Symptom	Symptom	Symptom	Symptom	None
Cranbrook (2024)	Symptom	Symptom	Symptom	Symptom	Symptom	None
Jul 2023 Order	Symptom	N/A	Symptom	N/A	N/A	Minimal
Jan 2024 Order	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	None
Apr 2025 Order	Symptom	Ack.	Ack.	Ack.	N/A	Minimal

Legend: “Symptom” = claim cited as evidence of delusional thinking. “Ack.” = acknowledged without classification. “Partial” / “Minimal” = limited engagement with factual basis. “None” = no engagement with merits. “N/A” = claim not addressed in document.

Verified fact: The defendant holds US Patent No. 11,577,177 B2, issued February 14, 2023. This patent was received as Exhibit 1 at the July 7, 2023 hearing. Its existence is not disputed in any document. The July 2023 court order notes the defendant “is listed as the inventor and the applicant” on the patent and his company is the assignee. Despite this, every document that references the defendant’s patent-related beliefs classifies the broader narrative (corporate theft, surveillance, targeting) as delusional — without engaging with the verified factual anchor that the patent exists.

Circular reasoning in Cranbrook’s report: Cranbrook characterizes the defendant’s refusal to participate in evaluation as itself a symptom of mental illness (“it appears that Mr. Guertin has declined to participate in evaluation due to ongoing symptoms of mental illness”). She further classifies his federal lawsuit and allegations of malfeasance by prior examiners as evidence of “paranoid beliefs and impaired thought processes.” This creates a logical loop: alleging that prior evaluations were flawed is classified as evidence of the mental illness those evaluations diagnosed. The defendant cannot challenge the diagnostic process without the challenge itself being cited as confirmation of the diagnosis.

Significance

Across the full document set, no examiner or court engaged with the merits of any specific claim on its own terms. The sole partial exception is Rogstad’s acknowledgment of her expertise limitations regarding the technology. No document evaluates whether discovery materials were in fact altered. No document addresses the constitutional claims substantively. The treatment is uniformly classificatory: the act of making these claims is itself evidence of the condition.

Connecting Context

The defendant’s docket shows he filed over 100 pro se documents including detailed forensic analysis exhibits, exhibit lists organized by topic (e.g., “Discovery Fraud Proven,” “Netflix Patent Theft”), and multiple notices of appeal. The volume and organizational specificity of these filings are observable in the database (see Appendix A2) but are not examined substantively in any of the evaluation reports or court orders.

Finding 4: Structural and Procedural Comparison of the Two Incompetency Orders

Background

Two separate incompetency orders were issued in this case: July 13, 2023 (after a full evidentiary hearing) and January 17, 2024 (entered administratively). This finding documents the structural and procedural differences between them.

Findings

Element	July 2023 Order	January 2024 Order
Court Division	Probate/Mental Health Division	Criminal Division
Hearing Type	Full evidentiary hearing (Jul 7, 2023)	Administrative agreement — no hearing
Defendant Testimony	Yes — extensive	None
Expert Testimony	Yes — Dr. Rogstad testified in person	None — Milz report only
Exhibits Received	3 (Patent, CV, Evaluation Report)	0
Defense Presentation	Defendant testified, presented patent evidence	Defense agreed without contest
Evidentiary Standard Stated	“Greater weight of the evidence” analysis	“Parties agreed to a finding of incompetency entered administratively”
Pages / Operative Paragraphs	7 pages / case-specific factual findings	4 pages / 14 numbered operative paragraphs
Civil Commitment Trigger	Not in this order	Orders 3–14 create civil commitment pipeline with 5-day PSP deadline
Record Access Authorization	Not in this order	Sweeping record access order (¶7) covering all conceivable record types
Judicial Signers	Borer (Referee) + Browne (Judge)	Mercurio (Referee) + Dayton Klein (Judge)
Signature Crypto Status	NULL (inconclusive)	Valid for both signers
MCRO Filing Type	Finding of Incompetency and Order	Finding of Incompetency and Order
fp_text_sha256 (Clone Hash)	e27cf... (unique)	7be6f9... (unique)
Tracking Font Group	None detected	TTF-C/C1 + TTF-E/E1

Significance

The procedural contrast is stark. The July 2023 order followed a contested hearing in which the defendant testified, presented a physical exhibit (his patent), and actively challenged the expert’s conclusions. The January 2024 order was entered by agreement before the hearing began, with no testimony, no exhibits, and no opportunity for the defendant to contest the finding. Despite this, the January 2024 order carried substantially greater consequences: it immediately triggered civil commitment screening with a 5-day deadline and authorized sweeping access to the defendant’s records across every conceivable category of record-keeper.

The January 2024 order contains tracking font groups TTF-C/C1 and TTF-E/E1, placing it within the document production infrastructure identified in the broader MCRO forensic corpus. The July 2023 order has no detected tracking font group. Neither order shares its fp_text_sha256 with the dominant clone groups identified in the Finding of Incompetency clone analysis, indicating both have unique text content — but their structural templates differ significantly.

Connecting Context

The database confirms that the civil commitment triggered by the January 2024 order was executed: cluster_id 1570 links case 27-CR-23-1886 (CR) to case 27-MH-PR-23-815 (MH, now closed). The defendant was placed under a stayed order of civil commitment, as referenced in both the Milz and Cranbrook evaluation reports.

Finding 5: The April 2025 Competency Finding — Internal Logical Tensions

Background

On April 3, 2025, Judge William H. Koch found the defendant competent to proceed after a full evidentiary hearing on March 5, 2025. The only expert evidence before the court was Cranbrook's December 20, 2024 report, which opined that the defendant's prognosis for competency was "poor." The court took judicial notice of the report and heard testimony from the defendant.

Findings

The court's order contains three key holdings that exist in logical tension:

1. Finds Cranbrook's mental illness conclusion "credible" (§16 of Conclusions of Law): "the Court ultimately finds Dr. Cranbrook's conclusion that Mr. Guertin is suffering from a mental illness credible."
2. Describes the defendant's corporate claims as "fantastical and paranoid" (§13 of Findings of Fact): "his claims that Netflix and Microsoft have engaged in theft of intellectual property does not appear to have support. His beliefs in that regard appear to be fantastical and paranoid."
3. Finds the defendant competent (§15 of Findings of Fact): "Mr. Guertin has demonstrated an understanding of Court processes and the charges he is facing, as well as the ability to consult with his counsel about his defense."

This is not necessarily contradictory under the legal standard (competency requires ability to consult with counsel and understand proceedings, not absence of mental illness). However, the prior orders found the defendant incompetent based on the same diagnosis and substantially similar presentations. The court does not explain what changed between January 2024 and April 2025 — particularly since Cranbrook's report (the most recent expert assessment) concluded his prognosis was poor and he had not received antipsychotic treatment.

Evidentiary asymmetry: The court credited the defendant's own testimony over the only expert opinion. Cranbrook opined that the defendant declined evaluation due to mental illness and his competency prognosis was poor. The court rejected this on the competency question based solely on the defendant's hearing testimony — without a competing expert. The court does not explain why it credited defendant testimony over the expert report on competency while simultaneously crediting the expert's mental illness diagnosis.

Burden of proof shift: The April 2025 order states the defendant "bears the burden to prove, by a preponderance of evidence, he is competent" (citing *State v. Curtis*, 921 N.W.2d 342). In the July 2023 order, the standard was framed as "the greater weight of the evidence establishes that Mr. Guertin is incompetent," with the court noting "the defense has not met their burden of proof." Both orders cite Rule 20.01, subd. 5(c), but the April 2025 order explicitly places the burden on the defendant to prove his own competence when contesting an expert report.

What the court credited: The defendant's testimony about creating "custom ChatGPT bots" to analyze his case, his understanding of plea bargaining, his willingness to work with counsel, and his understanding of the charges and court processes. The court noted he "recognizes the value of having legal representation" and "will work with his legal team." These demonstrations address the specific competency standard (ability to consult with counsel and understand proceedings) but are substantially similar to demonstrations the defendant made at the July 2023 hearing, where the court found him incompetent.

Significance

The April 2025 order implicitly concedes that the diagnosed mental illness does not necessarily preclude competency. If this is true in April 2025, the question arises whether it was also true in July 2023 and January 2024 — or what intervening change justified the different outcome. The documents do not identify any such change. The defendant had not received antipsychotic treatment (per Cranbrook's report). The diagnosis remained identical. The court's own findings describe the same “fantastical and paranoid” beliefs that formed the basis of prior incompetency findings.

Connecting Context

The database reveals that despite the April 2025 competency finding, a fourth Rule 20 evaluation was ordered on April 29, 2025 by Judge Sarah Hudleston — just 26 days after Koch found the defendant competent. The docket shows the case remains open with continued Rule 20 progress reports through at least December 2025. The defendant also filed 18 notices of appeal on May 29, 2025 and multiple motions to stay the new evaluation order.

Finding 6: Cranbrook's Institutional Role and Evaluator Independence

Background

Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook signs her report as “Chief of Psychological Services.” She is the administrator of the unit that employs both prior evaluators (Rogstad and Milz), both of whom were named defendants in the federal lawsuit filed by Guertin.

Findings

Cranbrook's report documents the following sequence:

1. *“In August of 2024, I learned that Mr. Guertin had filed a federal lawsuit against the two prior examiners, his attorney, and several others.”*
2. *“Given the resulting conflict of interest, I removed Dr. Milz from the case.”*
3. *“I attempted to complete Mr. Guertin's evaluation.” — i.e., she assigned herself as the replacement evaluator.*

The same individual who (i) supervised the evaluation unit, (ii) determined that a conflict of interest existed, (iii) removed the conflicted evaluator, and (iv) assigned herself as the replacement is now the evaluator rendering a clinical opinion. The defendant had sued both prior examiners — both of whom work in the unit Cranbrook leads.

What Cranbrook did not do: She did not assign an external evaluator from outside Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services. She did not recuse the entire unit despite two of its members being named defendants in a federal lawsuit. She did not request that DHS or another judicial district provide an independent evaluation. She did not note or address the structural independence concern in her report.

Significance

The independence concern is structural, not personal. Cranbrook may well be a highly qualified forensic psychologist acting in good faith. The issue is that the institutional structure placed the supervisor of the sued examiners in the role of replacement evaluator for the same case, evaluating the same defendant who sued her subordinates, and the resulting evaluation adopted her subordinates' diagnostic conclusions without independent clinical contact.

Connecting Context

The docket confirms the evaluation assignment timeline: on May 9/15, 2024, Judge Dayton Klein ordered a third evaluation (originally assigned to Milz). On July 15, 2024, Judge Dayton Klein recused from the case. On October 15, 2024, Judge Askalani issued a new evaluation order. Cranbrook's report was filed December 20, 2024. The database also shows that Cranbrook appears as an examiner in the docket for the first time in this case.

Finding 7: Database Contextualization — Case 27-CR-23-1886 in the Broader Corpus

Background

This finding places the Guertin case within the statistical context of the MCRO forensic database.

Findings

Case Profile: Case 27-CR-23-1886 is classified as Open (case type CR). The defendant's cluster_id (1570) links to one additional case: 27-MH-PR-23-815, a Mental Health (MH) branch case that is now Closed. This confirms the civil commitment process was initiated and concluded.

Docket Scale: The case contains 245 docket events spanning January 24, 2023 through December 2, 2025. Of these, the defendant filed over 100 documents (motions, exhibit lists, notices of appeal, affidavits). The case has had at least 7 judicial officers involved at various stages: Norris, Barnette, Dayton Klein, Borer, Browne, Mercurio, Koch, Askalani, and Hudleston.

Rule 20 Event Intensity: The docket contains at least 4 separate Rule 20 evaluation orders (Jan 2023, Nov 2023, May/Oct 2024, Apr 2025), 3 evaluation reports, 2 incompetency findings, 1 competency finding, and multiple Rule 20 progress reports extending through October 2025. This places the case among the more Rule 20-intensive cases in the corpus.

Attorney Representation: Defense: Bruce Rivers (inactive; represented defendant through January 2024), Raissa Carpenter (lead, active) and Emmett Donnelly (active). Prosecution: Mawardi Hamid, Thomas Arneson, Judith Cole, Elizabeth Murphy, Thomas Prochazka. Notably, Raissa Carpenter and Emmett Donnelly — the current defense attorneys — also appear in the Rule 20 pipeline statistics from the Initial Forensic Analysis Report as attorneys with elevated Rule 20 involvement rates.

PDF Corpus for This Case: The children table contains 140+ PDF documents filed in this case, totaling thousands of pages. The defendant's pro se filings account for the majority by volume. The April 3, 2025 competency order (127__Order-Finding-Guertin-Competent__2025-04-03.pdf) is the first MSIP-labeled document in the entire MCRO corpus and carries a 'High' sensitivity label from Microsoft 365 tenant 8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f.

Signature Forensics on Key Documents: The July 2023 order carries 10 signatures (Borer + Browne + 7 ESolutions CA + MCRO watermark) with 9 revisions. The January 2024 order carries 3 signatures (Mercurio + Dayton Klein + MCRO watermark) with 9 revisions; both judicial signatures show valid crypto status. The April 2025 order carries 6 signatures (Koch + 4 ESolutions CA using the same cloned PDF object 306 0 obj + MCRO watermark) with 5 revisions; the Koch and ESolutions signatures both have edits_after_sig_flag = true.

EVIDENTIARY STRENGTH CLASSIFICATION

Tier 1 — Directly Stated in Documents

- Cranbrook's diagnosis is "currently maintained based upon record review" of prior examiners (Cranbrook Report, Diagnostic Summary)
- Milz's report defers to Rogstad for background and delusional belief descriptions (Milz Report, Relevant Background)
- Cranbrook never interviewed the defendant (Cranbrook Report, Evaluation Process)
- Rogstad stated in the witness prep meeting that verified patents would not change her opinion (Perez Memo)
- The January 2024 order was entered administratively without a hearing: "the parties agreed to a finding of incompetency entered administratively" (Jan 2024 Order)
- The January 2024 order triggered civil commitment screening with a 5-day PSP deadline (Jan 2024 Order, ¶¶3-14)
- Judge Koch finds Cranbrook's mental illness conclusion "credible" while finding the defendant competent (Apr 2025 Order, ¶6 CoL)
- Cranbrook removed Milz from the case due to the federal lawsuit and assigned herself (Cranbrook Report, Evaluation Process)
- The defendant's US Patent No. 11,577,177 B2 was received as Exhibit 1 at the July 2023 hearing (Jul 2023 Order)
- Cranbrook classifies the defendant's refusal to participate as a symptom of mental illness (Cranbrook Report, Forensic Opinions)

Tier 2 — Demonstrable by Cross-Document Comparison

- The diagnostic label propagated unchanged through all three reports without independent clinical re-derivation
- The shift from qualified acknowledgment (Rogstad report) to unqualified pre-commitment (witness prep memo) on the patent question
- The procedural de-escalation from full evidentiary hearing (July 2023) to administrative agreement (January 2024) while consequences escalated
- The January 2024 order carries tracking font groups (TTF-C/C1, TTF-E/E1) while the July 2023 order does not, indicating different document production pathways
- The defendant's demonstrations of competency at the April 2025 hearing (understanding charges, willingness to work with counsel) parallel similar demonstrations at the July 2023 hearing where he was found incompetent
- The defendant's cluster links to a closed MH case (27-MH-PR-23-815), confirming civil commitment was executed

Tier 3 — Requires Inference

- The evaluation dependency chain may have functioned as a self-reinforcing loop in which the first diagnosis constrained all subsequent assessments
- The prosecution witness preparation meeting may have compromised or appeared to compromise Rogstad's neutrality as a court-appointed examiner
- The structural escalation from the July 2023 order to the January 2024 order (adding civil commitment infrastructure) may reflect systematic processing patterns rather than case-specific judicial reasoning
- The April 2025 competency finding may reflect a changed standard application or judicial reassessment rather than a changed clinical presentation

KEY METRICS

0 hours — Direct clinical contact between Cranbrook and the defendant before rendering her evaluation

0 exhibits — Received at the January 2024 hearing that triggered civil commitment

0 independent diagnostic derivations — After Rogstad's March 2023 evaluation

1 sentence — Cranbrook's diagnostic basis: "currently maintained based upon record review"

5 days — PSP deadline imposed by the administrative (no-hearing) January 2024 order

22 months — Duration of competency proceedings before the defendant was found competent

245 docket events — In a case that has not yet reached trial

3 evaluators, 1 unit, 1 diagnosis — All from Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services; all reaching the same conclusion

26 days — Between the competency finding (April 3, 2025) and the next Rule 20 evaluation order (April 29, 2025)

LIMITATIONS AND ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Data Coverage Gaps

The three evaluation reports are confidential court documents uploaded for this analysis; they are not MCRO-downloadable PDFs and cannot be independently verified against the court's internal records through the MCRO system.

The Perez witness preparation memo was obtained through the federal lawsuit record, not the state criminal docket. Its completeness and accuracy depend on Perez's contemporaneous recollection of the meeting.

The database does not contain the civil commitment case file (27-MH-PR-23-815) in full — only its existence and status are confirmed through the parents table and cluster linkage.

Plausible Alternative Explanations

Evaluation consistency: Three evaluators reaching the same diagnosis may reflect genuine clinical consensus on a straightforward case rather than diagnostic dependency.

Milz's deferrals: Referring to a prior report for background information is standard practice in sequential forensic evaluations and does not necessarily indicate a lack of independent diagnostic reasoning.

Administrative incompetency finding: Defense agreement to an administrative finding may represent strategic decision-making by defense counsel (Bruce Rivers) rather than a procedural deficiency.

Cranbrook's self-assignment: Limited availability of qualified forensic psychologists within the district may have constrained the assignment options.

Prosecution witness preparation: Meeting with a court-appointed expert before testimony may be procedurally permissible under Minnesota practice, even if it raises appearance-of-neutrality concerns.

Competency reversal: The April 2025 competency finding may reflect genuine improvement in the defendant's ability to engage with the legal process, possibly attributable to factors not documented in the record.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

1. Independent Clinical Review: Engage a forensic psychologist outside the Fourth Judicial District system to review the three evaluation reports and assess whether the diagnostic conclusions reflect independent clinical reasoning or diagnostic propagation.
2. Witness Preparation Protocols: Determine whether Minnesota rules of criminal procedure or local practice rules govern private meetings between court-appointed neutral examiners and one party, and whether the June 12, 2023 meeting conformed to applicable standards.
3. Patent Verification: Independently verify US Patent No. 11,577,177 B2 through the USPTO database and assess whether the defendant's claims about his technology have any factual foundation that was not investigated by any evaluator.
4. Civil Commitment Record: Obtain the complete 27-MH-PR-23-815 case file to document the commitment process, treatment provided (if any), and the basis for the stayed order's eventual expiration.
5. Discovery Integrity: Independently compare the discovery materials provided to Dr. Michael Roberts (the civil commitment examiner referenced in Cranbrook's report) against the original discovery to evaluate the defendant's allegations of alteration.
6. Forensic Examiner Assignment Policies: Review Fourth Judicial District policies regarding evaluator assignment when prior examiners from the same unit are subject to pending litigation by the defendant.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

All queries executed against the MCRO forensic database (Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii). All queries are SELECT-only.

A1 — Case Registry and Status

```
SELECT cr.case_uid, cr.case_id, cr.defendant_name, cr.cluster_id, cr.cluster_name,
       p.case_status, p.case_type
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 — Full Docket Timeline

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date AS event_date, event_name,
       event_json__party AS party, event_json__filing_party_name AS filing_party,
       event_json__judicial_officer AS judicial_officer,
       event_json__examiners AS examiners, event_json__has_pdf AS has_pdf
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A3 — All PDFs Filed in Case

```
SELECT evidence_uid, filing_date, filing_type, filename, doc_sha256,
       pdf_page_count, size_bytes, metadata__xmp_creator_tool,
       metadata__msip__has_msip_flag, signatures__has_signature
FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
ORDER BY filing_date;
```

A4 — Signature Forensics on Key Orders

```
SELECT s.evidence_uid, s.filing_date, s.filing_type, s.signer_name,
       s.sig_index, s.sig_crypto_valid_flag, s.edits_after_sig_flag,
       s.rev_count, s.sign_time_cst_cdt, s.field_name, s.v_obj
FROM children_signatures_full_report s
WHERE s.evidence_uid IN (
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332', -- Jul 2023
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:d1c60e5543fb330a', -- Jan 2024
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2' -- Apr 2025
)
ORDER BY s.evidence_uid, s.sig_index;
```

A5 — Clone Analysis (fp_text_sha256)

```
SELECT h.evidence_uid, h.fp_text_sha256, h.n_pages, h.filing_type, h.filing_date
FROM hashpack h
WHERE h.evidence_uid IN (
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332',
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:d1c60e5543fb330a',
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2'
);
```

A6 — Tracking Font Groups

```
SELECT evidence_uid, font_group, pdf_group, font1_name, font1_sha256
FROM children_tracking_groups
WHERE evidence_uid IN (
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332',
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:d1c60e5543fb330a',
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2'
);
```

A7 — Cluster and MH Branch Cases

```
SELECT cr.case_uid, cr.case_id, cr.defendant_name, p.case_type, p.case_status
FROM case_registry cr
LEFT JOIN parents p ON cr.case_uid = p.case_uid
WHERE cr.cluster_id = 1570
ORDER BY cr.case_id;
```

A8 — Attorney Assignments

```
-- Defense Active
SELECT 'defense_active' AS role, attorney_json__attorney_norm AS attorney
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_active WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
-- Defense Inactive
SELECT 'defense_inactive' AS role, attorney_json__attorney_norm AS attorney
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_inactive WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
-- Prosecution Active
SELECT 'prosecution_active' AS role, attorney_json__attorney_norm AS attorney
FROM parents_attorneys_prosecution_active WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

Document Citation Index

All citations in this report reference the following uploaded source documents:

#	Document	Date	Role in Analysis
1	Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Rogstad_2023-03-10.docx	2023-03-10	Primary source: 1st evaluation
2	Perez_Witness_Statement_Dr_Rogstad.docx	2023-06-12	Primary source: witness prep memo
3	MCRO_27-CR-23-1886_Finding_of_Incompetency_and_Order_2023-07-13_...docx	2023-07-13	Primary source: 1st incompetency order
4	Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Milz_2024-01-11.docx	2024-01-11	Primary source: 2nd evaluation
5	MCRO_27-CR-23-1886_Finding_of_Incompetency_and_Order_2024-01-17_...docx	2024-01-17	Primary source: 2nd incompetency order
6	Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Cranbrook_2024-12-20.docx	2024-12-20	Primary source: 3rd evaluation
7	127__Order-Finding-Guertin-Competent__2025-04-03.docx	2025-04-03	Primary source: competency order