

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

MCRO | Rule 20 Evaluation Fact-Check

Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook (December 20, 2024)

Part 3 of 3 — Claim-by-Claim Verification Against the MCRO Forensic Record

Report Date	March 8, 2026
Subject Case	27-CR-23-1886 State of Minnesota v. Matthew David Guertin
Evaluator	Katheryn Cranbrook, PsyD, LP, ABPP (Forensic), Chief of Psychological Services
Evaluation Date	December 20, 2024 (NO interview conducted)
Series Position	Part 3 of 3 (Rogstad → Milz → Cranbrook)
DB Reference	PostgreSQL (Supabase) ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii us-west-2
Cluster ID	1570 (MATTHEW GUERTIN)
Reproducibility	All DB statistics are query-reproducible. SQL in Appendix.

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents a forensic fact-check of the Rule 20.01 evaluation report authored by Katheryn Cranbrook, PsyD, LP, ABPP (Forensic), dated December 20, 2024. The analysis verifies individual factual claims against the MCRO forensic database, uploaded source documents, and the Master Filing Catalog. This is Part 3 of a three-part series covering Rogstad (March 2023), Milz (January 2024), and Cranbrook (December 2024).

This report does not evaluate the clinical validity of any diagnosis. It does not assert conclusions about fraud, intent, motive, or professional misconduct. Each finding documents measurable patterns, structural comparisons, and verifiable facts. Where the evaluation report’s characterizations diverge from documented evidence, those divergences are presented objectively.

Critical structural context: The Cranbrook evaluation is unique in this series: zero hours of direct clinical contact with the defendant; diagnosis explicitly “maintained based upon record review” rather than independently derived; and the evaluator is the supervisor of the organizational unit that produced all three evaluations. These structural facts are documented in the evaluation report itself.

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Zero hours of direct clinical contact.** Cranbrook never interviewed, met, or spoke with Guertin. Her entire evaluation is based on record review, email communications, and one phone call with a Vail Place case manager.
- **Diagnosis inherited, not derived.** Cranbrook explicitly states the diagnosis is “currently maintained based upon record review” of Rogstad’s and Milz’s reports. No new clinical data from direct contact informed the diagnostic conclusion.
- **7 claims classified as symptomatic/delusional (A-01 through A-07).** Of these, 5 have substantially documented factual predicates in the forensic record. None were independently investigated by Cranbrook.
- **7 competency indicators documented by Cranbrook herself (B-01 through B-07).** These include: Vail Place compliance, employment, treatment engagement, symptom self-awareness, no acute symptoms, sophisticated legal communication, and stayed commitment allowed to expire. None are discussed as mitigating the diagnosis.
- **3 circular reasoning instances documented (C-01 through C-03).** Refusal to participate, filing a federal lawsuit, and challenging the evaluation process are each classified as symptoms rather than evaluated as legitimate acts with factual bases.
- **5 procedural flags (D-01 through D-05).** Zero clinical contact, inherited diagnosis, self-assignment after conflict-of-interest removal, no medication verification, and metadata authorship anomaly (“Hines, Anne”).
- **Treatment catch-22 (E-01).** Cranbrook’s prognosis assumes the diagnosis is correct, prescribes antipsychotics as the only path to competency, acknowledges no compulsory treatment is available, and concludes the prognosis is “poor.”
- **GUERTIN case set: 88 documents (2,136 pages) filed by Cranbrook’s evaluation date.** This represents a 6.3x increase from the 14 documents available at Milz’s evaluation. 74 documents and 2,101 pages were filed between Milz and Cranbrook.
- **29 Rule 20 events in this case (94.9th percentile).** The case remains in the Rule 20 pipeline through at least December 2025, with a fourth evaluation ordered 26 days after Guertin was found competent.
- **Civil commitment (27-MH-PR-23-815): Closed.** The stayed commitment was allowed to expire. The state’s own system determined Guertin no longer met commitment criteria. Last MH event: November 6, 2024 (Vail Place progress report).

Corpus Overview

Metric	Value
Total docket events (27-CR-23-1886)	246 (Jan 24, 2023 – Dec 2, 2025)
Rule 20 competency events	29 (94.9th percentile)
GUERTIN case set documents	200 total 88 by Dec 20, 2024
Total pages across all PDFs	12,077 total 2,136 by Dec 20, 2024
Guertin pro se filings	139 docket entries

Defense attorneys (DB-confirmed)	Rivers (inactive) Carpenter, Donnelly (active)
Civil commitment case status	27-MH-PR-23-815: Closed
Criminal case status	27-CR-23-1886: Open
MSIP-labeled documents (this case)	3 of 34 corpus-wide
Rule 20 evaluation cycles	4 (Jan 2023, Nov 2023, Oct 2024, Apr 2025)

KEY METRICS

Hours of direct clinical contact in this evaluation: 0. Clinical conclusion: psychotic disorder with poor prognosis.

Diagnosis independently derived: No. Inherited from evaluators whose evaluations had documented procedural issues.

Constitutional acts classified as symptoms: 2 (filing federal lawsuit; refusing evaluation with articulated reasons).

Competency indicators documented by Cranbrook herself: 7. None discussed as mitigating the diagnosis.

Stayed commitment expired because: the state's own system determined he no longer met commitment criteria.

Months of defendant's life affected by 3 evaluations totaling ~5 hours of contact: 27 months (January 2023 – April 2025).

Documents available to Cranbrook that she did not independently analyze: 88 documents (2,136 pages) in the GUERTIN case set.

Rule 20 evaluation reports with metadata author matching the named evaluator: 0 of 3 (Rogstad = "GuzmanC"; Cranbrook = "Hines, Anne"; Milz = not in DB).

METHODS

Dual-Source Methodology: This report employs the same methodology as Parts 1 and 2: (1) close-reading analysis of uploaded source documents, and (2) live SQL queries against the MCRO forensic database.

Primary Source: The Cranbrook Rule 20.01 evaluation report (December 20, 2024), systematically extracted into 6 verification sections (A through F) in the claim extraction checklist.

Context Documents: Guertin Rule 20 Competency Analysis (master chain document), Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology, Patent Duplication Analysis, Financial Valuation Report, Military Simulation Alignment Report, and Patent Trademark Chronological Report. All are used for cross-reference only; every statistic is freshly computed from the live database.

Database Tables: case_registry, children, children_case_set, children_signatures_full_report, hashpack_rows, parents, parents_case_events, parents_case_events_examiners, parents_case_events_evidence_uids, parents_attorneys_defense_active, parents_attorneys_defense_inactive.

Verification Status Scale: Consistent with Parts 1 and 2:

Symbol	Status	Meaning
	VERIFIED	Claim has documented factual support in the DB or filed documents
	PARTIAL / NUANCED	Factual predicates are documented but characterization may exceed evidence
	UNTESTED	Claim cannot be verified from available database or documents
	UNSUPPORTED	No evidence found supporting the claim
	CIRCULAR	Claim involves circular reasoning (critique = symptom of diagnosed condition)

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Case Context at Time of Cranbrook Evaluation

Background: The Cranbrook evaluation was filed on December 20, 2024, approximately 11 months after Milz's January 11, 2024 evaluation. This finding establishes the state of the case during that interval.

Findings

The database confirms 97 docket events between January 1, 2024 and December 31, 2024 for case 27-CR-23-1886. Key events during the Milz-to-Cranbrook gap include:

Date	Event	Significance
Jan 5, 2024	Demand for Discovery (Guertin)	First formal discovery request
Jan 16-17, 2024	Found Incompetent / Finding of Incompetency Order (Mercurio)	2nd incompetency; administrative
Apr 3-12, 2024	Pro se petition, motions, order denying motions (Dayton Klein)	Pro se filing surge begins
May 9, 2024	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Rule 20.01) (Dayton Klein)	3rd evaluation ordered
May 10-15, 2024	25+ pro se filings (Other Document, Notices of Appeal)	Massive filing activity
Jul 2, 2024	Appellate Court Order (Worke)	Appeals court action
Jul 15, 2024	Order to Recuse (Dayton Klein)	Judge recuses from case
Oct 1, 2024	Order Granting Public Defender (Koch)	Carpenter appointed
Oct 15, 2024	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Askalani) + Forensic Navigator	4th evaluation ordered
Dec 20, 2024	Rule 20 Evaluation Report (Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook)	Cranbrook report filed

Document growth across evaluation dates (see Appendix A1):

Metric	Rogstad (Mar 2023)	Milz (Jan 2024)	Cranbrook (Dec 2024)
Documents in GUERTIN case set	8	14	88
Total pages	16	35	2,136
Growth from prior evaluation	—	+6 docs	+74 docs (+2,101 pages)

Attorney changes: Rivers (inactive in DB) was replaced by Carpenter and Donnelly (both active). Koch granted public defender on October 1, 2024. Dayton Klein recused July 15, 2024.

Civil commitment (27-MH-PR-23-815): Last event November 6, 2024 (Vail Place progress report, docket 45). Case status: Closed. The stayed commitment was allowed to expire, consistent with Cranbrook's own report.

Time since last clinical contact: Milz's video interview was January 3, 2024 (~23.5 months before the April 2025 hearing). Rogstad's in-person interview was March 1, 2023 (~21.5 months

before the Cranbrook evaluation date). By December 2024, no evaluator had directly observed Guertin in nearly 12 months (since Milz).

Significance: The 11-month gap between Milz and Cranbrook saw extraordinary case activity: 74 documents filed (most by Guertin pro se), a judicial recusal, an appellate court order, attorney substitution, and the expiration of the civil commitment. Cranbrook's evaluation was based on reviewing records of a case that had fundamentally transformed since the last in-person contact.

Finding 2: Section A — Claims Labeled as Symptomatic or Delusional

Background: Cranbrook’s evaluation characterizes seven categories of Guertin’s statements as symptomatic of mental illness. This finding verifies each claim against the forensic record.

A-01: “Allegations of wide-ranging violations of due process, fraud, judicial misconduct, civil conspiracy”

Cranbrook framed this as a summary of Guertin’s email communications, presenting them as evidence of ongoing delusional thinking. Verification of each sub-claim:

- **Due process violations:** 22+ months of suspended participation confirmed by docket timeline. January 2024 incompetency order entered administratively without hearing (DB-confirmed: docket index 25, “Finding of Incompetency and Order,” Mercurio, with “Waiver of Appearance” on same date). Motions filed and unaddressed for months (139 Guertin filings in docket vs. minimal court response).
- **Discovery fraud:** Three Demand or Request for Discovery events confirmed in DB (docket indices 10, 22, 118). Template cloning and discovery inconsistencies documented in Discovery Fraud Chronology and Master Catalog. Forensic image analysis filed with court.
- **Judicial misconduct:** Cloned judicial signature images documented via SHA256 hash analysis across the corpus (Initial Forensic Analysis Report, Finding 2). Scheduling anomalies documented.
- **Civil conspiracy:** Inferential. No forensic report proves conspiracy as such. Multiple reports document systemic patterns but conspiracy requires intent proof.

Verification: **SUBSTANTIALLY SUPPORTED** for due process, discovery, and signature anomalies. Civil conspiracy: **UNTESTED** for intent.

A-02: “Prior evaluators provided blatant lies and deceptive reports”

Cranbrook classified this as a “delusional belief.” Documented procedural issues with both prior evaluations:

- **Rogstad:** Prosecution witness prep meeting (June 12, 2023, documented in Perez memo); postdoctoral fellow conducted interview; patent not independently verified; “GuzmanC” metadata authorship anomaly. Rogstad pre-committed that verified patents would not change her opinion.
- **Milz:** Zero engagement with merits of any factual claim; no patent verification; sole collateral contact was 8-minute call with Rivers (the attorney Guertin alleged was compromised); diagnostic framework deferred to Rogstad’s.

Verification: **PARTIAL.** “Blatant lies” is Guertin’s characterization. Documented procedural issues with both evaluations are extensive. Whether these constitute “lies” vs. negligence vs. standard practice is unresolved.

A-03: “Target of widespread fraud, conspiracy, misconduct, negligence, and retaliation”

Same factual predicates as A-01. Cranbrook characterized as “consistent with the paranoid beliefs.” No independent investigation. **Verification:** **FACTUAL PREDICATES DOCUMENTED.**

A-04: “Fraudulent discovery materials provided to the civil commitment examiner”

Dr. Roberts conducted civil commitment exam August 1, 2023 (DB-confirmed: MH case docket index 16, “Taken Under Advisement,” August 1, 2023). Examiner’s Report filed August 4, 2023 (docket index 20). Discovery material inconsistencies documented in filed forensic image analysis. **Verification: PARTIAL.** Inconsistencies documented; specific comparison of what Roberts received not available from DB.

A-05: “Entire basis of civil commitment rests on fraud”

Logical chain verified: Rogstad evaluation (March 2023) → incompetency finding (July 13, 2023) → civil commitment petition (July 20, 2023, MH docket 1). If root evaluation was procedurally flawed, downstream consequences inherit that flaw. **Verification: LOGICAL CHAIN SOUND;** “fraud” threshold is a legal question.

A-06: “Blatant deceptions and lies in the last two Rule 20.01 exams”

Guertin identified specific false statements in Milz’s report (substance use history, self-harm history). Rogstad’s prosecution witness prep meeting not disclosed in her report. **Verification: SPECIFIC IDENTIFIED INACCURACIES DOCUMENTED;** “lies” implies intent.

A-07: “Defense counsel directly involved in fraudulent discovery materials”

Rivers provided discovery July 16, 2024 (DB-confirmed: docket 96-97). Guertin analyzed and found inconsistencies with prior sets. Rivers failed to respond to federal lawsuit; default entered August 29, 2024. Rivers refused to withdraw; now listed as inactive in DB. **Verification: DISCOVERY INCONSISTENCIES DOCUMENTED;** “directly involved” is inferential.

Finding 3: Section B — Competency Indicators Cranbrook Documented

Background: Cranbrook’s report documents seven indicators of functional competence and treatment compliance. These are observations made by Cranbrook herself or by the professionals who actually interacted with Guertin. This finding verifies each indicator and notes that none are discussed as mitigating the diagnostic conclusion.

#	Indicator	Evidence	Source	Status
B-01	Compliance with stayed commitment	Vail Place 180-day summary confirmed; MH case closed	DB + Report	
B-02	Employment	Painting homes for friend in exchange for housing	Report	
B-03	Treatment engagement	Remote psychiatric treatment (CA); seeing therapist; Vail Place cooperation	Report	
B-04	Symptom self-awareness	Acknowledged difficulty concentrating and depressive symptoms	Report	
B-05	No acute symptoms	Vail Place: “had not recently exhibited acute symptoms”	Report	
B-06	Sophisticated legal/technical output	139 docket filings; federal lawsuit; forensic database; 88 docs by Dec 2024	DB + Report	
B-07	Stayed commitment expired	MH case 27-MH-PR-23-815: Closed. State determined he no longer met criteria	DB	

Significance: Cranbrook documented 7 indicators of functional competency, treatment engagement, and absence of acute symptoms—yet maintained the diagnosis and concluded the prognosis was “poor.” These indicators are presented as background observations, not as evidence that might mitigate or qualify the diagnostic conclusion. The report does not explain how a person exhibiting all 7 indicators simultaneously meets criteria for a psychotic disorder severe enough to render him incompetent.

Finding 4: Section C — The Circular Reasoning Problem

Background: The Guertin Rule 20 Competency Analysis identifies a circular reasoning framework in the evaluation series. Cranbrook’s evaluation presents the clearest instances.

C-01: Refusal to Participate = Symptom

Cranbrook wrote: “It appears that Mr. Guertin has declined to participate in evaluation due to ongoing symptoms of mental illness.”

Guertin stated specific, articulable reasons: (1) wants effective defense counsel present, (2) proved discovery fraud, (3) prior evaluations contained inaccuracies. Each reason has documented factual support (see A-02, A-06, A-07). Cranbrook classified the refusal itself as a symptom without evaluating whether his stated reasons were legitimate. **Status:**

CIRCULAR.

C-02: Filing a Federal Lawsuit = Symptom

Cranbrook cited Guertin’s federal lawsuit (0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) as evidence consistent with his “paranoid beliefs.” Filing a lawsuit is a constitutionally protected act under the First Amendment (Petition Clause). The lawsuit was accepted for filing by the U.S. District Court. Default was entered against Rivers (one defendant). The existence of a federal lawsuit is presented as evidence of psychosis rather than legal advocacy. **Status:** **CIRCULAR.**

C-03: Challenging the Evaluation Process = Confirmation of the Diagnosis

Every stated reason for non-cooperation traces to documented concerns about the evaluation process. Cranbrook classifies each reason as a symptom. As the Guertin Rule 20 Competency Analysis found: “The defendant cannot challenge the diagnostic process without the challenge itself being cited as confirmation of the diagnosis.” The result is a closed logical loop where no amount of evidence can change the outcome. **Status:** **CIRCULAR.**

Significance: The three circular reasoning instances share a common structure: the defendant articulates a factual basis for his position; the evaluator classifies the act of articulating that position as a symptom; the symptom classification reinforces the diagnosis that motivated the evaluation. This structure means the evaluation methodology cannot produce a result inconsistent with its premise.

Finding 5: Section D — Procedural and Methodological Flags

Background: Five procedural flags distinguish the Cranbrook evaluation from standard forensic practice.

#	Flag	Detail	Source
D-01	Zero clinical contact	No in-person, video, or phone interview. Entire evaluation from records + emails.	Cranbrook Report
D-02	Diagnosis inherited	“Prior examiners have provided a diagnosis... which is currently maintained based upon record review.”	Cranbrook Report
D-03	Self-assignment	Removed Milz for conflict (federal lawsuit), then assigned herself—as Milz’s supervisor.	Cranbrook Report
D-	No medication verification	“Current psychiatric treatment records were not	Cranbrook

04		available.” Used absence of antipsychotics as evidence.	Report
D-05	Metadata authorship anomaly	Report carries author “Hines, Anne”—not Cranbrook. 3rd authorship anomaly (Rogstad = “GuzmanC”).	Master Catalog

Connecting Context: The self-assignment (D-03) is particularly notable in context. Cranbrook removed Milz because Guertin’s federal lawsuit created a conflict of interest. She then assigned herself—the head of the unit that employed both sued evaluators—as the replacement. She did not assign an external evaluator from outside Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services. The resulting evaluation adopted the diagnostic conclusions of her subordinates without independent clinical verification.

Finding 6: Section E — The Treatment Catch-22

Background: Cranbrook’s prognosis follows a logical structure that creates a catch-22:

Step	Cranbrook’s Logic
1	Premise: Guertin has a psychotic disorder requiring antipsychotic medication.
2	Observation: No evidence he has received antipsychotic medication.
3	Inference: Without antipsychotic treatment, he cannot become competent.
4	Limitation: Stayed commitment expired; cannot compel treatment.
5	Conclusion: “Prognosis for attaining capacity for competent participation appears poor.”

Significance: This logic chain assumes the correctness of the diagnosis at Step 1. If the “delusional beliefs” have verified factual predicates (as documented in Sections A-01 through A-07), the diagnosis itself is in question. The catch-22 is structural: if correct, the defendant needs medication he cannot be compelled to take; if incorrect, the entire chain is moot. Cranbrook does not address this contingency. Additionally, she acknowledges lacking the treatment records (D-04) needed to evaluate whether his actual treatment was appropriate.

Finding 7: Section F — Guertin’s Stated Conditions for Cooperation

Background: Guertin did not simply refuse to participate. He stated specific preconditions for cooperation. This finding verifies the reasonableness of each condition.

Condition	Reasonableness	Evidence Support	Status
Effective defense counsel present during evaluation	Standard right	Multiple filings requesting substitute counsel	Reasonable
Counsel not involved in discovery issues	Supported	Rivers: inconsistent discovery; default in federal case	Reasonable
An “ACTUAL defense attorney”	Supported	Rivers refused to withdraw; court eventually replaced	Reasonable
Prior evaluation inaccuracies addressed first	Supported	Milz inaccuracies documented; Rogstad prep meeting	Reasonable

		documented	
--	--	------------	--

Significance: Every condition Guertin stated has documented factual support. None are unreasonable requests. Cranbrook classified them as products of mental illness rather than as legitimate preconditions with factual bases. This is the circularity problem (C-01) in action.

Finding 8: The Three-Evaluation Dependency Chain

Background: This finding maps the dependency chain across all three evaluations, showing how each evaluation's conclusions trace back to original evidence.

Element	Rogstad (Part 1)	Milz (Part 2)	Cranbrook (Part 3)
In-person contact	~2 hrs (postdoc-led)	~2 hrs (video)	0 hours
Independent diagnosis	Partially (with limitations)	No (deferred to Rogstad)	No (maintained from prior)
Patent verified	No (attempted, failed)	No	No
Collateral contacts	Patent atty (failed)	Rivers (8 min)	Vail Place case mgr (1 call)
Engagement w/ factual claims	Partial (ack. tech limits)	Zero	Zero
DB-confirmed examiner	Dr. Jill Rogstad	Dr. Adam Milz	Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook
Metadata author	"GuzmanC"	Not in DB	"Hines, Anne"
Docs available at eval.	8 (16 pages)	14 (35 pages)	88 (2,136 pages)

Significance: The dependency chain shows declining clinical independence while the available evidence base expanded dramatically. By December 2024, there were 88 documents and 2,136 pages in the GUERTIN case set—74 documents filed since Milz's evaluation. Despite this vastly expanded record, Cranbrook's evaluation relied primarily on the prior evaluators' conclusions rather than independent analysis of the new material. The total independent clinical observation across all three evaluations was approximately 4–5 hours (2 Rogstad + 2 Milz + 0 Cranbrook), resulting in 27 months of competency proceedings.

MASTER VERIFICATION MATRIX

ID	Claim / Indicator / Flag	Evidence Summary	Status
A-01	Due process / fraud / misconduct	22+ mo. suspension; admin. incompetency; cloned sigs; discovery issues	Substantially Supported
A-02	Prior evaluators: "lies and deceptive reports"	Prosecution prep meeting; postdoc interview; no patent verification	Partial
A-03	Target of widespread fraud etc.	Same predicates as A-01; classified as "paranoid beliefs"	Predicates Documented
A-04	Fraudulent discovery to commitment examiner	Roberts exam Aug 1; Set B Aug 3; inconsistencies documented	Partial
A-05	Civil commitment rests on fraud	Logical chain: Rogstad → incompetency → commitment	Chain Sound
A-06	Lies in prior Rule 20 exams	Specific false statements in Milz; prosecution prep in Rogstad	Inaccuracies Documented
A-07	Defense counsel involved in fraudulent discovery	Rivers: inconsistent discovery; federal default; refused to withdraw	Partial
B-01	Compliance with stayed commitment	MH case 27-MH-PR-23-815 Closed; Vail Place 180-day report	Verified
B-02	Employment	Painting homes for friend in exchange for housing	Reported
B-03	Treatment engagement	CA psychiatrist, therapist, Vail Place case management	Reported
B-04	Symptom self-awareness	Acknowledged concentration and depressive symptoms	Reported
B-05	No acute symptoms	Vail Place: "not recently exhibited acute symptoms"	Verified
B-06	Sophisticated legal/technical communication	139 docket filings; federal lawsuit; forensic database system	DB-Confirmed
B-07	Stayed commitment expired	MH case Closed; state determined no longer meets criteria	DB-Confirmed
C-01	Refusal to participate = symptom	Stated reasons have documented factual support	Circular
C-02	Filing federal lawsuit = symptom	Lawsuit accepted by USDC; default entered; constitutional right	Circular
C-03	Challenging evals = confirms diagnosis	Critique of process cited as evidence of condition diagnosed by process	Circular
D-01	Zero clinical contact	No interview of any kind conducted	Confirmed

D-02	Diagnosis inherited	"Maintained based upon record review"	Confirmed
D-03	Self-assignment after COI removal	Removed Milz; assigned self as Milz's supervisor	Confirmed
D-04	No medication verification	"Current psychiatric treatment records were not available"	Confirmed
D-05	Metadata: "Hines, Anne"	3rd authorship anomaly across 3 evaluations	Catalog-Confirmed
E-01	Treatment catch-22	Assumes diagnosis → prescribes antipsychotics → prognosis poor	Logic Mapped
F-01	Guertin's stated conditions	All 4 conditions have documented factual support	All Reasonable

SERIES SUMMARY — Parts 1, 2, and 3

This section aggregates key statistics across the full three-part Rule 20 Evaluation Fact-Check series.

Metric	Part 1: Rogstad	Part 2: Milz	Part 3: Cranbrook
Evaluation date	March 10, 2023	January 11, 2024	December 20, 2024
Clinical contact hours	~2 (postdoc-led)	~2 (video)	0
Independent diagnosis	Partially	No (deferred)	No (inherited)
Symptomatic claims tested	Multiple	Multiple	7
Claims with verified predicates	Majority	Majority	5 of 7 (71%)
Circular reasoning instances	Partial	Present	3 explicit
Procedural flags	Multiple	Multiple	5
Competency indicators documented	Some	Some	7
Metadata authorship match	No ("GuzmanC")	N/A (not in DB)	No ("Hines, Anne")
Docs in GUERTIN case set	8	14	88

Series totals: Total independent clinical observation across 3 evaluations: approximately 4–5 hours. Total months of proceedings: 27 (January 2023 – April 2025 competency finding). Total months including post-competency fourth evaluation: 35+ (through December 2025). All three evaluations were produced by the same organizational unit (Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services). None of the three evaluation reports carry metadata authorship matching the named evaluator.

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

- **Evaluation reports not directly in DB:** The three Rule 20 evaluation reports (Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook) are not stored as downloadable PDFs in the MCRO database. They appear as docket events with examiner metadata. Metadata authorship claims (“GuzmanC,” “Hines, Anne”) are sourced from the Master Filing Catalog and uploaded documents, not from direct DB extraction.
- **Clinical validity:** This report does not evaluate the clinical validity of any diagnosis. The Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum diagnosis may be clinically sound despite the procedural issues documented herein.
- **Cranbrook operated under difficult circumstances:** The defendant refused to participate. The federal lawsuit created genuine conflict-of-interest complications. An evaluator in this position faces limited options.
- **Self-assignment may reflect resource constraints:** Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services may have limited forensic evaluators. Cranbrook’s self-assignment may reflect practical necessity rather than structural choice.
- **Metadata authorship anomalies may have benign explanations:** “Hines, Anne” may be a template manager, administrative assistant, or IT staff member who maintains the evaluation report template. This is common in institutional settings.
- **Federal lawsuit status:** The federal case (0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) was dismissed under Younger abstention (September 30, 2024). The default against Rivers was entered before dismissal. Federal case details are not in the MCRO database.
- **Guertin’s characterizations vs. documented facts:** Where Guertin uses terms like “fraud,” “lies,” and “conspiracy,” this report verifies the underlying factual predicates without endorsing or rejecting the characterizations.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

- Obtain the original Rule 20 evaluation report files for all three evaluations. Extract metadata (author, creator tool, create date) directly from the PDF properties. Verify the “GuzmanC,” “Hines, Anne” and any Milz authorship anomalies.
- Request an independent evaluation from an evaluator outside Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services—one who has no institutional connection to any prior evaluator, who is directed to independently verify the patent and other factual claims, and who conducts an in-person interview.
- Commission a forensic document examiner to compare discovery material sets across the multiple disclosed versions to determine whether material differences exist.
- Review the Vail Place 180-day summary and treatment records directly to verify the competency indicators Cranbrook documented (B-01 through B-07).
- Evaluate whether the circular reasoning structure (C-01 through C-03) meets established standards for forensic psychological evaluation methodology.
- All database findings are reproducible using the SQL queries in the Appendix against the PostgreSQL database (Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii).

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Document Growth Across Evaluation Dates

```
SELECT
  SUM(CASE WHEN c.filing_date <= '2023-03-10' THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) as docs_at_rogstad,
  SUM(CASE WHEN c.filing_date <= '2024-01-11' THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) as docs_at_milz,
  SUM(CASE WHEN c.filing_date <= '2024-12-20' THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) as docs_at_cranbrook,
  COUNT(*) as total_docs
FROM children c
JOIN children_case_set ccs ON c.evidence_uid = ccs.evidence_uid
WHERE ccs.value = 'GUERTIN';
```

A2 — Docket Events — Milz-to-Cranbrook Gap (Jan-Dec 2024)

```
SELECT event_json__date, event_name, docket_index,
  event_json__filing_party_name, event_json__judicial_officer
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
  AND event_json__date::date BETWEEN '2024-01-01' AND '2024-12-31'
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A3 — Case Overview — Cluster 1570

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

A4 — Defense Attorney Status

```
SELECT 'active' as status, attorney_json__name as name
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_active
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
UNION ALL
SELECT 'inactive', attorney_json__name
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_inactive
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A5 — Rule 20 Examiner Data

```
SELECT pce.event_json__date, pce.event_name, pcex.examiner_json
FROM parents_case_events_examiners pcex
JOIN parents_case_events pce
  ON pcex.case_uid = pce.case_uid AND pcex.event_index = pce.event_index
WHERE pcex.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
  AND pcex.examiner_json IS NOT NULL
ORDER BY pce.event_json__date;
```

A6 — MH Case Events — Civil Commitment Timeline

```
SELECT event_json__date, event_name, docket_index, event_json__judicial_officer
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-mh-pr-23-815'
ORDER BY event_json__date;
```

A7 — Rule 20 Percentile Calculation

```
WITH case_r20 AS (
  SELECT p.case_uid,
    COUNT(CASE WHEN pce.event_name ILIKE '%rule 20%'
      OR pce.event_name ILIKE '%competenc%'
      OR pce.event_name ILIKE '%incompeten%'
      OR pce.event_name ILIKE '%forensic nav%' THEN 1 END) as r20_count
  FROM parents p
  JOIN parents_case_events pce ON p.case_uid = pce.case_uid
  GROUP BY p.case_uid
  HAVING COUNT(CASE WHEN pce.event_name ILIKE '%rule 20%'
    OR pce.event_name ILIKE '%competenc%'
    OR pce.event_name ILIKE '%incompeten%'
    OR pce.event_name ILIKE '%forensic nav%' THEN 1 END) > 0
)
SELECT
  (SELECT r20_count FROM case_r20
    WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886') as guertin_r20,
  COUNT(*) as total_r20_cases,
  ROUND(100.0 * (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM case_r20
    WHERE r20_count <= (SELECT r20_count FROM case_r20
      WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'))::numeric
    / COUNT(*)::numeric, 1) as percentile
FROM case_r20;
```

A8 — Key Court Order Signatures

```
SELECT sf.evidence_uid, sf.signer_name, sf.sig_crypto_valid_flag,
  sf.edits_after_sig_flag, sf.sign_time_cst_cdt, sf.v_obj,
  sf.sig_index, c.filename, c.filing_date
FROM children_signatures_full_report sf
JOIN children c ON sf.evidence_uid = c.evidence_uid
WHERE sf.evidence_uid IN (
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2',
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332',
  'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:d1c60e5543fb330a'
)
ORDER BY c.filing_date, sf.sig_index;
```

A9 — Case Statistics Summary

```
SELECT
  COUNT(*) as total_events,
  MIN(event_json__date) as first_event,
```

```

MAX(event_json__date) as last_event,
SUM(CASE WHEN event_json__filing_party_name ILIKE '%guertin%'
  THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) as guertin_filings
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';

```

V1 — Dependency Chain Visualization (Python/Matplotlib)

```

import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import matplotlib.patches as mpatches

fig, ax = plt.subplots(1, 1, figsize=(10, 5))
ax.set_xlim(0, 10); ax.set_ylim(0, 6)
ax.axis('off')
ax.set_title('Rule 20 Evaluation Dependency Chain', fontsize=14, fontweight='bold')

# Nodes
for x, y, label, hours, dx in [
    (1.5, 3, 'Rogstad\nMar 2023', '~2 hrs (postdoc)', 'Partial'),
    (5, 3, 'Milz\nJan 2024', '~2 hrs (video)', 'Deferred'),
    (8.5, 3, 'Cranbrook\nDec 2024', '0 hrs', 'Inherited')]:
    color = '#C00000' if hours == '0 hrs' else '#4472C4'
    ax.add_patch(mpatches.FancyBboxPatch((x-1, y-0.8), 2, 1.6,
        boxstyle='round,pad=0.1', facecolor=color, alpha=0.15, edgecolor=color, lw=2))
    ax.text(x, y+0.3, label, ha='center', va='center', fontsize=10, fontweight='bold')
    ax.text(x, y-0.15, hours, ha='center', va='center', fontsize=9, color=color)
    ax.text(x, y-0.5, f'Dx: {dx}', ha='center', va='center', fontsize=8,
        style='italic')

# Arrows
for x1, x2 in [(2.5, 4), (6, 7.5)]:
    ax.annotate('', xy=(x2, 3), xytext=(x1, 3),
        arrowprops=dict(arrowstyle='->', color='#595959', lw=2))

plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('dependency_chain.png', dpi=150, bbox_inches='tight')

```

Source: *Matthew Guertin v. State of Minnesota* | 27-CR-23-1886 | MCRO Forensic Database | MattGuertin.com