

MCRO | Rule 20 Evaluation Fact-Check — Dr. Adam Milz

Transcript Verification Supplement

Field	Value
Series	Rule 20 Evaluation Fact-Check — Part 2 Supplement
Subject Evaluation	Adam A. Milz, PhD, LP, ABPP — Supervising Forensic Psychologist, Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services
Evaluation Date	January 11, 2024 (interview conducted January 3, 2024)
Subject Case	27-CR-23-1886 State of Minnesota v. Matthew David Guertin
Primary Source	AI-generated transcript of the January 3, 2024 Zoom meeting (~2 hours)
Cluster ID	1570 (verified from live database)
Report Date	March 9, 2026

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents an objective, line-by-line comparison between the AI-generated transcript of the January 3, 2024 Rule 20.01 evaluation meeting and the evaluation report Dr. Adam Milz subsequently filed on January 11, 2024. The transcript derives from a video recording of the actual meeting, made by the subject (Matthew Guertin) and subsequently filed publicly in federal court.

This report measures three dimensions: (1) accuracy of characterization — whether the report accurately represents what was said during the meeting; (2) completeness of representation — whether materially relevant statements were omitted; and (3) consistency between observation and conclusion — whether behavioral observations in the transcript match the clinical characterizations applied.

This report does not evaluate whether the DSM-5-TR diagnosis is clinically correct or incorrect. It does not assert fraud, intent, or motive. It does not evaluate the clinical judgment methodology itself. It measures only the accuracy of the factual substrate the evaluator relied upon and reported. Findings represent measurable patterns requiring independent verification.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This supplement adds a new evidentiary layer to the Part 2 Milz Fact-Check: the verbatim transcript of the actual meeting. The transcript, derived from a video recording that Guertin made and subsequently filed in federal court, allows direct comparison between what occurred during the evaluation and what was written about it eight days later. Key findings:

- **Substance Use Fabrication:** Milz attributed “problematic use” of crack cocaine, LSD, and methamphetamine to Guertin. The transcript shows Guertin was directly asked about meth and cocaine and denied both. LSD is never mentioned by either speaker. Crack cocaine is never mentioned by either speaker. These substances appear sourced from “records” — not from the recorded interview.
- **DMT Mischaracterization:** Guertin described a single, transformative DMT experience in early 2018 that led him to stop drinking and start exercising. Milz listed DMT alongside crack cocaine and methamphetamine as substances with “a history of problematic use.”
- **Self-Harm Contradiction:** Milz wrote that Guertin “has a history of threatening to harm himself.” The transcript records Guertin explicitly stating: “I’ve never had any of those thoughts in my life” (00:06:23) and “There’s never been any plan in my life to hurt myself or anyone else” (00:21:18). Milz’s own report internally contradicts itself: the Mental Health History section reports “no suicidal thinking” while the Imminent Risk section asserts a “history of threatening to harm himself.”
- **Delusional Belief Classification:** Of the 19 claims Milz classified as delusional, the transcript shows Guertin citing specific verifiable facts for the majority: patent numbers, filing dates, FBI report filings, police reports, DKIM-authenticated emails, and HTML source code analysis. Part 2 independently verified 12 of 19 claims (63.2%) from the forensic database.
- **Competency Indicators:** The transcript reveals at least 12 distinct competency indicators, including correct identification of all charges and maximum sentences, understanding of the bifurcated trial structure, discussion of multiple defense strategies (duress, “laboring under defective reason”), technical articulation of patent law, and awareness of benzo addiction potential. Milz documented the charge identification but characterized all legal strategy discussion as “based on his delusional thinking.”
- **Evaluator Attentiveness:** The federal court filing (Doc. 78) documents that Milz appeared to be reading from another screen for an estimated 20–25 minutes of the ~2-hour meeting, with sustained eye movement patterns visible in the zoomed video analysis.
- **Rogstad Critique Was Specific:** Milz characterized Guertin’s complaints about the prior Rogstad evaluation as “perseverative.” The transcript shows these complaints were specific and factual: Rogstad focused disproportionately on “two cars” and medication misuse, used “perceived achievements” despite an issued patent, and failed to verify the patent. Part 1 of this series documented each of these procedural issues.
- **Timeline Compression:** The interview was conducted January 3. The report was filed January 11 (8 days). Guertin was found incompetent January 16 (5 days later) with no hearing. The Finding of Incompetency order was created in Microsoft Word for M365 on January 16 and filed January 17.

Corpus Overview (Verified from Live Database)

Metric	Value
Total PDFs in forensic corpus	4,251
Total cases in registry	9,146
Cases with full docket scrape	2,903
Total docket events	155,357
Guertin case (27-CR-23-1886) — total documents	200 (12,077 pages)
Guertin case — documents at time of Milz evaluation	14 (35 pages)
Guertin case — total docket events	246
Guertin case — Rule 20 events	29 (top 5.7% of all R20 cases; corpus avg: 9.74)
Guertin case — pro se filings	156 documents (11,947 pages)
Guertin cluster (ID 1570) — cases	2 (CR: Open; MH: Closed)

SOURCE PROVENANCE

The primary source for this analysis is the verbatim transcript of the January 3, 2024 Rule 20.01 evaluation meeting conducted via Zoom between Dr. Adam Milz and Matthew Guertin. The chain of custody for this transcript is as follows:

Recording: Video recorded by Guertin during the January 3, 2024 Zoom meeting. The Zoom interface identifies the platform as “Zoom for Government.”

Federal filing: Video publicly filed as part of Exhibit AB in CASE 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM, Document 78, filed September 26, 2024 (Guertin v. State of Minnesota et al., U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota).

Public hosting: Video hosted at multiple publicly accessible platforms (see Video Evidence Links table below).

Transcript generation: AI speech-to-text model applied to the video recording. The transcript may contain minor spelling variations from AI transcription but substantive content, context, and sequence are faithful to the recording.

Milz report: Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Milz_2024-01-11.docx — the complete text of the report Dr. Milz filed on January 11, 2024, eight days after the interview.

Video Evidence Links

Source	URL
Full Meeting (Rumble)	rumble.com/v5g369h
Full Meeting (Odysee)	ody.sh/QSmwuASLVs
Full Meeting (Storj)	Storj Direct Download
Full Meeting (Proton)	Proton Drive
Milz Incoming Text Edition (Rumble)	rumble.com/v5g37e5
Milz Incoming Text Edition (Storj)	Storj Direct Download
Federal Filing (CourtListener)	Doc. 78 — Exhibit AB
Substack (Both Videos)	matt1up.substack.com

METHODS

This report employs a three-source methodology:

Source 1 — Meeting Transcript: AI-generated speech-to-text transcription of the ~2-hour January 3, 2024 Zoom meeting between Dr. Milz and Guertin. The transcript includes timestamps throughout, enabling precise citation of specific passages. The video from which the transcript was generated has been publicly filed in federal court and hosted at multiple platforms.

Source 2 — Milz Evaluation Report: The complete text of the Rule 20 evaluation report dated January 11, 2024, filed with the Fourth Judicial District Court. Each section of the report was parsed and every factual claim, characterization, and conclusion identified.

Source 3 — MCRO Forensic Database: The PostgreSQL forensic database (Supabase, us-west-2) was queried to provide contextual bolstering for the transcript-vs-report comparison. Queries verified case metadata, docket timelines, document counts, and Rule 20 event statistics. All SQL queries are reproduced in the Appendix.

The analytical approach for each finding follows a consistent structure: (a) identify the specific claim or characterization in the Milz report; (b) locate the corresponding passage(s) in the transcript; (c) extract the relevant quotes with timestamps; (d) assess accuracy, completeness, and consistency; (e) cross-reference with the forensic database where applicable.

Tables and views used: case_registry, parents, parents_case_events, children, hashpack.

Claim codes: This report references the 19 “delusional belief” claim codes (A-01 through A-19), 7 competency indicator codes (B-01 through B-07), and the Verification Status Scale established in Part 2 of this series.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Substance Use History — Transcript vs. Report

Background

The Milz evaluation report's Substance Use History section attributes to Guertin "a history of problematic use of several substances, including alcohol, marijuana, methamphetamine, crack cocaine, dimethyltryptamine (DMT), and lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD)." This section compares each substance attribution against what was actually said during the recorded meeting.

Findings

The following table presents a substance-by-substance comparison between the transcript evidence and the Milz report characterization:

Substance	What Guertin Said (Transcript)	How Milz Characterized It	Accurate?
Alcohol	"I used to drink a lot" (00:11:16). "I haven't had any problems with alcohol since the end of the beginning of 2018" (00:11:23). Described past bar-going habit, acknowledged problematic use was historical. Mentioned possibly having "a beer at one point" since March (00:11:14).	Reported "possibly consuming alcohol since March 2023 but noted no problematic use since 2018." Also listed under "problematic use."	Partially Accurate
DMT	"That's when I smoked DMT and I traveled through the lab where my DNA was coded into existence. And then three minutes later I returned" (00:11:41). Described as a one-time transformative experience in 2018 that led to stopping drinking and starting gym. Never characterized as problematic.	Listed alongside crack cocaine and meth as substances with "a history of problematic use."	NOT ACCURATE
Crack Cocaine	NEVER MENTIONED by Guertin. When Milz asked "Meth, cocaine, pills, anything?" (00:13:34), Guertin said "No" (00:13:36). "Crack" is never spoken by either party.	Listed under "history of problematic use."	NOT SUPPORTED BY TRANSCRIPT
Methamphetamine	NEVER MENTIONED by Guertin. When asked directly ("Meth, cocaine, pills, anything?" at	Listed under "history of problematic use."	NOT SUPPORTED BY

	00:13:34), Guertin denied: “No” (00:13:36).		TRANSCRIPT
LSD	NEVER MENTIONED by either speaker in the entire ~2-hour transcript. Zero occurrences.	Listed under “history of problematic use.”	NOT SUPPORTED BY TRANSCRIPT
Marijuana	When asked “Any weed, anything like that?” (00:13:27), Guertin said “No” (00:13:30). The only weed reference was about the welder: “He smoked more weed than anyone” (01:06:06).	Listed under “history of problematic use.”	NOT SUPPORTED BY TRANSCRIPT
Adderall (Rx)	Prescription from Dr. Schuster since ~2016. “If you misuse it, then you run out” (00:13:52). “I’m very particular about what I put in my body” (00:18:52). Discussed taking extra dose during Coachella work (01:18:48–01:19:09).	“A history of taking additional doses of Adderall than what was prescribed.”	Partially Accurate
Klonopin (Rx)	0.5mg as needed. “I’m very aware of the addiction potential of benzos” (00:19:11). “It scares me. So I treat it with respect” (00:19:33–36). No misuse reported.	Noted as antianxiety; no mischaracterization.	Accurate

Significance

Of seven substances Milz attributed to Guertin under “problematic use,” four (crack cocaine, methamphetamine, LSD, and marijuana) are not supported by anything Guertin said during the recorded meeting. A fifth (DMT) was described as a single transformative experience, not “problematic use.” Milz’s attribution language (“Records indicated”) suggests these claims were sourced from older records or the Rogstad evaluation, not from the interview itself. However, the report does not distinguish between what Guertin reported during the interview and what was drawn from prior records, creating the impression that Guertin himself endorsed this substance history.

Guertin was asked directly about meth, cocaine, and weed during the meeting and denied all three. The report does not note these denials.

Connecting Context

Part 1 (Exhibit EML-E) cataloged Guertin’s claim EML-E-FC-026: “fabricated substance abuse history” and EML-E-FC-027: “No history of crack cocaine or DMT use as characterized.” This transcript now provides primary source verification: Guertin denied cocaine and meth use when directly asked, described DMT as a one-time experience, and never mentioned crack cocaine or LSD.

Finding 2: Self-Harm History — Transcript vs. Report

Background

The Milz report's Imminent Risk section states: "Mr. Guertin has a history of threatening to harm himself, which elevates his long-term risk of similar behavior." This section examines every passage in the transcript where self-harm, suicide, or safety was discussed.

Findings

The transcript contains five distinct exchanges on this topic:

Timestamp	Transcript Quote	Speaker
00:06:13–23	Milz: "If you tell me you're having thoughts of hurting or killing yourself or anybody else, I have to take steps to get you into a hospital to keep you safe." Guertin: "I've never had any of those thoughts in my life, so we should be all good."	Both
00:20:53–57	Milz: "Any thoughts about hurting or killing yourself since March?" Guertin: "Absolutely not."	Both
00:20:58–01	Milz: "Have you tried to hurt or kill yourself since March?" Guertin: "Absolutely not."	Both
00:21:07–14	Milz: "Any thoughts now about hurting or killing yourself? Any plan to do that?" Guertin: "No." / "No."	Both
00:21:16–23	Guertin: "There's never been any plan in my life to hurt myself or anyone else. And there isn't now either."	Guertin

Internal Inconsistency in Milz Report: The Milz report contains an internal contradiction on this topic:

Mental Health History Section	Imminent Risk Section
"He reported no suicidal thinking, self-injurious behavior, or suicide attempts since March 2023."	"Mr. Guertin has a history of threatening to harm himself, which elevates his long-term risk of similar behavior."

The "history" Milz references appears sourced from records documenting "an admission in 2009 prompted by paranoia and threatening to harm himself in the context of alcohol and LSD use." This is a 15-year-old incident. Guertin was never asked about this 2009 incident during the meeting. He affirmatively and repeatedly stated he has never had thoughts of self-harm.

Significance

The transcript provides five separate data points in which Guertin explicitly denies any history of self-harm or suicidal ideation, including the unprompted statement “I’ve never had any of those thoughts in my life.” The Milz report acknowledges the current denial (“no suicidal thinking”) in one section while asserting a “history of threatening to harm himself” in another, based on a 15-year-old record entry that was never discussed with the subject during the evaluation.

Connecting Context

Part 1 (Exhibit EML-E) cataloged claim EML-E-FC-028: “No history of self-harm or suicidal ideation.” The federal filing (Doc. 78, page 2) states Guertin has “absolutely ZERO history of self harm of any type.” The transcript now provides primary source verification of this claim through five separate denials during the recorded meeting.

Finding 3: “Delusional Beliefs” — Transcript vs. Report

Background

The Milz report classified 19 specific assertions as evidence of “delusional thinking (i.e., fixed false beliefs that are inconsistent with external reality).” Part 2 of this series independently verified each claim against the forensic database. This finding adds the transcript dimension: for each claim, what did Guertin actually say, and did he present these as fixed beliefs impervious to evidence, or as assertions supported by cited evidence?

Findings

The following table maps each claim code to transcript evidence. Due to report length constraints, representative transcript passages are provided for the most significant claims.

Co de	Claim	Transcript Evidence	Part 2 Status	Transcript Assessment	
A-01	Insanely valuable patent	“It’s worth billions and billions of dollars. It’s not an exaggeration” (00:37:17). Read from investor pitch. Described technical specifications.	VERIFIED	Cited specific patent, filing date (March 19, 2021), investor pitch. Offered documentation.	
A-02	Stalked by named entities	Named 10+ entities with specifics: “U.S. Air Force has searched for me four times. DARPA has searched for me two times” (00:22:27–30). Described methodology: LinkedIn email headers, PGP verification.	VERIFIED	Cited DKIM-authenticated emails, offered verification method. Not a fixed belief — evidence-based claim.	
A-03	Stalking stems from patent	“It obviously has something to do with my insanely valuable patent that I filed 12 days before Netflix” (00:24:02–10).	VERIFIED	Temporal correlation cited. Acknowledged uncertainty: “that’s something I would have to ask them.”	
A-04	Became aware via LinkedIn	“This whole graph’s from automated, just LinkedIn emails I didn’t ask for” (00:24:53–58). “I never had to log into LinkedIn once” (00:32:52).	VERIFIED	Described email authentication: “PGP headers are what you use to prove an email” (01:51:43–48).	

A-05	Netflix fraud — 12 days	“I filed mine on March 19th, 2021, and Steven Trojanski filed his on March 31st, 2021” (00:36:46–53).	VERIFIED	Cited exact dates, inventor name, and patent filing sequence. Offered ChatGPT analysis.	
A-06	Reported fraud to law enforcement	“I have police report from the first round of fraud. I filed an FBI report. I filed an FTC report” (00:34:46–52). Contacted Secret Service Chicago office (00:34:56–01:35:10).	VERIFIED	Named specific agencies, dates, and described 22-minute phone call with agent.	
A-07	Phone calls monitored	Described Bruce Rivers cryptically indicating awareness that Guertin had told others (01:08:27–01:09:04).	CONTEXTUALLY PLAUSIBLE	Narrative is specific with named parties and timeline.	
A-08	Computer hacked	“My computer’s already doing weird shit. I got AI people on the screen now” (01:37:14–19). Described Bluetooth findings and WiFi adapter disconnection.	UNTESTED	Described specific technical observations. No forensic device analysis available.	
A-12	Discovery altered	“My evidence, someone in the court edited my shit” (01:06:09–14). Described finding 80 vs. 104 photos, metadata analysis.	VERIFIED	Cited specific discrepancies. Part 2 confirmed multiple discovery sets.	
A-14	Rivers is a YouTube star	“He’s like, you wouldn’t believe how much money this shit makes” (01:32:09–11). “Garbage man knows who I am” (01:32:04).	VERIFIED	Cited observable facts about Rivers’ public profile.	
A-16	Can prove Netflix fraud	“I’ve proven they’re fraud already” (01:40:02–04). Referenced ChatGPT analysis comparing patents.	VERIFIED	Cited specific analytical work product and patent comparison.	
A-18	Jury would believe — digitally verified	“It’s digitally verified. There’s PGP, the PGP headers are what you use to prove an email”	VERIFIED	Demonstrated understanding of DKIM/PGP authentication standards.	

		(01:51:43–48).			
--	--	----------------	--	--	--

Summary: Across all 19 claims, the transcript consistently shows Guertin citing specific verifiable facts, named entities, dates, and offering to provide documentation. He described his analytical methodology (parsing HTML, examining email headers, building graphs). He acknowledged uncertainty where appropriate (“that’s something I would have to ask them”). He offered Milz access to his evidence via the email sent that morning. The DSM-5-TR definition of delusion requires beliefs “sustained despite evidence to the contrary.” The transcript shows Guertin actively citing evidence in support of his claims, not dismissing contrary evidence.

Significance

The transcript reveals a consistent pattern: Guertin’s assertions were evidence-based, citeable, and in many cases independently verifiable. The Milz report characterizes these same statements as “delusional thinking” without engaging with the evidentiary basis Guertin presented. Part 2 of this series verified 12 of 19 claims from the forensic database alone. The transcript adds the dimension that Guertin was actively offering to provide his evidence during the meeting.

Connecting Context

Part 2 independently verified 12 of 19 claims (63.2%) as VERIFIED, 4 as PARTIALLY VERIFIED or CONTEXTUALLY PLAUSIBLE, 3 as UNTESTED, and 0 as NOT SUPPORTED. The transcript corroborates this pattern: Guertin did not present these claims as mystical revelations or paranoid fantasies; he presented them as the product of his investigation, citing specific evidence and methodology.

Finding 4: Competency Indicators Observable in Transcript

Background

Part 2 documented 7 competency indicators (B-01 through B-07) from the Milz report and forensic database. The transcript allows direct observation of Guertin's competency-related functioning during the meeting itself.

Findings

The transcript reveals at least 12 distinct competency indicators:

#	Indicator	Transcript Evidence	Assessment
1	Correct charge identification	"Reckless discharge of a firearm within a municipality and then three felony counts" (01:19:22–28)	Milz confirmed: "He correctly identified the present charges."
2	Correct maximum sentences	"The bullshit gun charges they're five years" / "Two" for reckless discharge (01:24:09–16)	Correctly identified 5-year and 2-year maximums.
3	Understanding of competency standard	"As defined by Minnesota statute 20.01... able to understand the nature of the charges against me and aid in my own defense" (00:00:20–41)	Demonstrated immediately, within first 41 seconds.
4	Bifurcated trial structure	"So then you have the two-part trial" (01:41:01–07). Described admitting to discharge in part 1, then contesting mental state in part 2.	Milz characterized as "based on delusional thinking."
5	Multiple defense strategies	Discussed "laboring under defective reason," duress, acute stress reaction. Acknowledged not having finalized defense (01:46:28–30).	Milz: "discussed potential trial strategies based on delusional thinking."
6	Understanding sentencing grid	After Milz explained it, Guertin demonstrated comprehension: "I don't have anything" re: criminal history points (01:25:49).	Shows ability to process new legal information.
7	Self-awareness re: limitations	"I haven't dug into the defense yet" (01:49:01). "I figure stuff out as it comes" (01:49:09).	Acknowledged limitations rather than claiming omniscience.
8	Technical articulation	Patent prosecution, PCT filings, 3D scanning, DKIM authentication, HTML source code analysis, Bluetooth networking, ChatGPT analysis	Described methodologies in detail.
9	Medication self-awareness	"Very aware of the addiction potential of benzos" (00:19:11). "It scares me. So I treat it with respect" (00:19:33–	Demonstrates health awareness and self-regulation.

		36).	
1 0	Cooperation with evaluation	Agreed to participate, engaged for ~2 hours, answered all questions asked, corrected pronunciation of name at end.	Milz confirmed: “alert and cooperative.”
1 1	Emotional regulation	Expressed frustration without hostility. Used humor. Never threatened, raised voice excessively, or lost composure during 2-hour meeting.	Milz: “appropriate eye-contact throughout.”
1 2	Coherent incident narrative	Described January 21, 2023 incident chronologically: discovered fraud, contacted agencies, became stressed, barricaded doors, shot through window, threw guns out, cooperated with police, ate for 30 minutes (01:36:01–01:44:15).	Internally consistent, responsive to Milz’s questions.

Significance

The transcript reveals 12 distinct competency indicators, compared to the 7 documented in Part 2. Notable additions include: understanding of the bifurcated trial structure, self-awareness about defense limitations, medication awareness, and a coherent chronological narrative of the incident. Milz acknowledged several of these indicators (correct charge identification, cooperative demeanor, appropriate eye contact) but characterized the legal strategy discussion as compromised by “delusional thinking” — a characterization that collapses the distinction between the legal strategy itself (which demonstrated competency) and the factual claims underlying it (which Milz classified as delusional).

Connecting Context

Milz wrote: “he was unable to outline potential defense strategies in a rational manner.” The transcript shows Guertin outlining the bifurcated trial structure, distinguishing between the duress defense and the “laboring under defective reason” defense, acknowledging the risk of commitment under a 20.02 defense, and expressing willingness to consider plea options (“There’s not something in me that says I have to take this to trial no matter what” at 01:46:16–21).

Finding 5: Milz's Attentiveness During the Evaluation

Background

Document 78 filed in CASE 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM (September 26, 2024) includes Guertin's documentation of Dr. Milz's behavior during the Zoom meeting, including screenshots and an "Incoming Text Edition" video analysis.

Findings

Transcript evidence of distraction: At approximately 00:02:00–01, Milz says: "Give me one second here. Mr. Weirton [sic], I have a little computer trouble myself here." He then paused for approximately 26 seconds before continuing. This is the only overt indication of technical difficulty in the transcript, though the transcript cannot capture visual cues such as eye direction.

Federal filing evidence: Exhibit AB (Doc. 78, pages 9–12) includes sequential still frames extracted from the video showing Milz looking away from the camera for sustained periods. The filing includes an AI analysis that examined these frames and concluded Milz appeared to be "preoccupied with something other than the person he is supposed to be assessing," with "sustained engagement with the material he is reading" for an estimated 20–25 minutes of the ~2-hour meeting.

Mispronunciation: At the beginning of the meeting, Milz addressed Guertin as "Mr. Weirton" (00:02:01). At the end of the meeting (~01:53:10), Milz asked: "I may have been mispronouncing your last name. Do you say it? Gurtin?" This suggests Milz did not review basic case information (the defendant's name pronunciation) before the meeting, or was reading it from a source that did not indicate pronunciation.

Significance

The evaluator conducting a ~2-hour competency assessment appears to have spent a material portion of that time focused on something other than the person being assessed. The evaluator subsequently characterized that person as exhibiting "significantly perseverative" thought processes and an inability to "rationally engage in the evaluation" — observations that depend on sustained, attentive observation of the subject's behavior throughout the meeting.

Connecting Context

The video evidence referenced here is publicly available at the URLs listed in the Source Provenance section. All URLs were originally embedded in the federal court filing itself (Doc. 78) and are publicly accessible.

Finding 6: The Rogstad Critique — Specific vs. Paranoid

Background

Milz characterized Guertin’s discussion of the prior Rogstad evaluation as “perseverative” — a clinical term suggesting pathological repetition. This finding examines whether the transcript supports that characterization.

Findings

The transcript contains the following specific complaints about the Rogstad evaluation:

Timestamp	Guertin’s Complaint	Part 1 Verification
00:05:29	“Dr. Rogstad didn’t seem very independent.”	Part 1 documented prosecution witness prep meeting before evaluation.
01:18:31–64	Rogstad focused on “two cars” and one mention of extra Adderall, then “turned that into making it seem like I’m snorting my Adderall.”	Part 1 documented disproportionate focus on these topics.
01:33:43–67	“Jill Rogstad says I have perceived achievements” despite patent on record. She “was unable to get a hold of my patent attorney and is unable to analyze it because she doesn’t have the specialized skills.”	Part 1 confirmed Rogstad did not verify the patent.
01:47:39–46	“Jill Rockstead’s report is bullshit. She was an egregious whatever. She flat out ignored evidence.”	Part 1 documented multiple procedural issues.

Notably, Guertin’s references to Rogstad were responsive to Milz’s questions or arose naturally in context (e.g., when discussing the evaluation process). They did not represent unprompted, repetitive returns to the same topic disconnected from the conversation flow.

Significance

Milz’s characterization of “perseverative” implies pathological repetition. The transcript shows Guertin making specific, factual complaints about the prior evaluation — complaints that Part 1 of this series independently documented with forensic evidence. The complaints were contextually responsive, not randomly interjected. Guertin also demonstrated self-awareness about his opinion (“That’s my opinion on that” at 01:34:31).

Finding 7: Database Cross-Reference and Contextual Bolstering

Background

The MCRO forensic database provides independent contextual verification for the transcript comparison. All figures below were queried from the live database on March 9, 2026 (see Appendix for SQL).

Findings

7a. Guertin Case Document Inventory

Metric	Value
Total documents in case file	200
Total pages	12,077
Date range	January 24, 2023 – July 2, 2025
Documents available at time of Milz evaluation (Jan 11, 2024)	14 (35 pages)
Pro se filings by Guertin	156 documents (11,947 pages)

At the time of Milz's evaluation, only 14 documents (35 pages) existed in the MCRO case file. Guertin has since filed 156 pro se documents totaling 11,947 pages.

7b. Docket Timeline Around Milz Evaluation

Date	Event	Days After Interview
2023-11-15	Order for R20.01 Evaluation (Judge Klein)	-49
2024-01-03	Milz interview conducted (Zoom)	0
2024-01-05	Guertin files Demand for Discovery (pro se)	+2
2024-01-11	Rule 20 Evaluation Report filed	+8
2024-01-11	Rule 20 Report Distributed	+8
2024-01-16	Found Incompetent (no hearing recorded)	+13
2024-01-17	Finding of Incompetency and Order filed (Judge Klein)	+14

The interval from interview to incompetency finding was 13 days. The Finding of Incompetency order's XMP metadata shows a creation date of January 16, 2024 at 14:26:48 UTC (the day before filing), created in Microsoft Word for Microsoft 365. No hearing is recorded in the docket between report distribution (Jan 11) and the incompetency finding (Jan 16).

7c. Rule 20 Event Count Comparison

Cohort	Cases	Avg R20 Events	Max R20 Events	Guertin's Position
R20 Cases (corpus)	1,602	9.74	67	
Non-R20 Cases	1,301	0	0	
Guertin (27-CR-23-1886)	1	29		Top 5.7% (92nd of 1,602)

Guertin's 29 Rule 20 events place him at approximately 3x the corpus average of 9.74 events per R20 case, in the top 5.7% of all cases with Rule 20 involvement.

7d. Finding of Incompetency Order Metadata

Property	Value
Evidence UID	evidence:27-cr-23-1886:d1c60e5543fb330a
Filing Date	January 17, 2024
XMP Create Date	January 16, 2024 14:26:48 UTC (day before filing)
Creator Tool	Microsoft® Word for Microsoft 365
Page Count	4
Filed By	Judge Julia Dayton Klein

KEY METRICS

The following metrics summarize the most significant comparative statistics from this transcript verification:

Metric	Value
Substances attributed without transcript support	4 of 7 (crack cocaine, meth, LSD, marijuana)
Substances mischaracterized in nature of use	1 (DMT: single experience → “problematic use”)
Self-harm history asserted despite explicit denial on record	Yes — 5 separate denials in transcript
Claims classified as “delusional” with verifiable factual predicates cited in transcript	12 of 19 VERIFIED in Part 2; transcript shows evidence cited for all 19
Competency indicators observable in transcript	12 (vs. 7 documented in Part 2)
Estimated evaluator off-screen attention during ~2-hour meeting	~20–25 minutes (per federal filing AI analysis)
Days from interview to report filing	8
Days from report filing to incompetency finding (no hearing)	5
Days from interview to incompetency order	14
Guertin R20 events vs. corpus average	29 vs. 9.74 (3.0x)
Guertin pro se documents filed since evaluation	156 documents (11,947 pages)

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

The following limitations and alternative explanations should be considered:

Transcript accuracy: The transcript was generated by AI speech-to-text and may contain minor transcription errors, particularly in proper nouns and technical terms. The substantive content and sequence are faithful to the video recording, which is publicly available for independent verification.

Clinical nuance: A text transcript cannot fully capture clinical indicators such as affect, prosody, body language, or micro-expressions. Forensic psychology assessments rely on both verbal and non-verbal cues. A complete assessment of Milz's clinical observations would require independent review of the video recording by a qualified forensic psychologist.

Evaluator note-taking: Milz's off-screen attention documented in the federal filing may represent note-taking on another screen rather than distraction. Standard evaluation practice includes real-time documentation. However, the AI analysis in the federal filing noted that the eye movement patterns were more consistent with reading than with note-taking.

Records-based claims: Milz's substance use attributions were sourced from "records," not solely from the interview. Clinical evaluators routinely incorporate collateral information. The issue identified here is not that Milz consulted records, but that the report does not clearly distinguish between what Guertin reported during the interview and what was sourced from records, and that the interview denials are not noted.

Clinical judgment: This report does not evaluate whether Guertin has a mental illness. Clinical assessment involves pattern recognition, integration of multiple data sources, and professional judgment that extends beyond factual accuracy. A clinician might reasonably classify certain belief patterns as delusional even when individual factual predicates are verifiable.

Self-harm record: The 2009 incident cited by Milz may be accurately documented in the medical records. The discrepancy identified is between Guertin's explicit denial of any history of self-harm during the meeting and the report's assertion of such history without noting the denial or discussing the specific 2009 incident with the subject.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

- 1. Video-transcript comparison:** An independent reviewer should compare the source video recording against this transcript to verify accuracy. The video is publicly available at the URLs listed in the Source Provenance section.
- 2. Independent clinical review:** An independent forensic psychologist not affiliated with the Fourth Judicial District should review the video recording and assess whether the clinical characterizations in the Milz report (perseverative, tangential, circumstantial, delusional) are supported by the observable behavior in the recording.
- 3. APA guidelines comparison:** The Milz report should be reviewed against the APA Specialty Guidelines for Forensic Psychology (2013) regarding accuracy of documentation and the obligation to note discrepancies between self-report and collateral information.
- 4. Substance history verification:** The specific records Milz cited for the substance use attributions (crack cocaine, methamphetamine, LSD) should be identified and examined. If these attributions derive from the Rogstad report, and the Rogstad report sourced them from records Guertin disputes, the provenance chain should be documented.
- 5. Self-harm record verification:** The 2009 admission record cited by Milz should be examined to determine its accuracy and context, and whether it was discussed with Guertin during the evaluation.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

All database queries used in this report are reproduced below. All queries are SELECT-only and were executed against the MCRO forensic database (Supabase project: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii, region: us-west-2) on March 9, 2026.

A1 — Guertin Case Verification

```
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 — Guertin Document Inventory

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_docs, SUM(pdf_page_count) AS total_pages, MIN(filing_date)
AS earliest, MAX(filing_date) AS latest FROM children WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-
1886';
```

A3 — Rule 20 Event Count

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS r20_events FROM parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-
23-1886' AND event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?
nav)';
```

A4 — Docket Timeline (Nov 2023 – Feb 2024)

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date AS event_date, event_name,
event_json__filing_party_name AS filing_party FROM parents_case_events WHERE case_uid
= 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND event_json__date >= '2023-11-01' AND event_json__date <=
'2024-02-28' ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A5 — Finding of Incompetency Order Metadata

```
SELECT evidence_uid, filename, filing_date, filing_type, metadata__xmp_create_date,
metadata__xmp_creator_tool, pdf_page_count FROM children WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-
23-1886' AND filing_date BETWEEN '2024-01-15' AND '2024-01-18';
```

A6 — R20 Corpus Baselines

```
WITH r20_counts AS ( SELECT pce.case_uid, COUNT(*) AS r20_event_count FROM
parents_case_events pce WHERE pce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|
found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)' GROUP BY pce.case_uid ) SELECT CASE WHEN
r20_event_count > 0 THEN 'R20 Cases' ELSE 'Non-R20 Cases' END AS cohort, COUNT(*) AS
case_count, ROUND(AVG(r20_event_count)::numeric, 2) AS avg_r20_events,
MAX(r20_event_count) AS max_r20_events FROM ( SELECT p.case_uid,
COALESCE(rc.r20_event_count, 0) AS r20_event_count FROM parents p LEFT JOIN
r20_counts rc ON p.case_uid = rc.case_uid ) sub GROUP BY (r20_event_count > 0);
```

A7 — Pro Se Filing Count

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS pro_se_docs, SUM(pdf_page_count) AS pro_se_pages FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND case_event__filing_party_name ILIKE
'%guertin%';
```

A8 — Cluster Context

```
SELECT cr.case_uid, cr.case_id, 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;
```

V1 — Substance Comparison Chart (matplotlib)

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import matplotlib.patches as mpatches
import numpy as np
substances = ['Alcohol', 'DMT', 'Crack\nCocaine', 'Meth', 'LSD', 'Marijuana', 'Adderall\n(Rx)']
transcript = [1, 0.5, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1] # 1=discussed, 0.5=single use, 0=not mentioned
report = [1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1] # all listed as problematic use
x = np.arange(len(substances))
width = 0.35
fig, ax = plt.subplots(figsize=(10, 5))
bars1 = ax.bar(x - width/2, report, width, label='Milz Report Attribution', color='#C44E52', alpha=0.8)
bars2 = ax.bar(x + width/2, transcript, width, label='Transcript Support', color='#4C72B0', alpha=0.8)
ax.set_ylabel('Attribution Level')
ax.set_title('Substance Use: Milz Report Attribution vs. Transcript Support')
ax.set_xticks(x)
ax.set_xticklabels(substances, fontsize=9)
ax.legend()
ax.set_ylim(0, 1.3)
ax.set_yticks([0, 0.5, 1])
ax.set_yticklabels(['Not Mentioned', 'Single Use', 'Discussed/Listed'])
plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('substance_comparison.png', dpi=150, bbox_inches='tight')
```

V2 — Competency Indicator Count (matplotlib)

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
categories = ['Milz Report\n(acknowledged)', 'Part 2\nn(documented)', 'Transcript\n(observable)']
counts = [2, 7, 12]
colors = ['#C44E52', '#E5AE38', '#4C72B0']
fig, ax = plt.subplots(figsize=(7, 4))
bars = ax.bar(categories, counts, color=colors, width=0.5)
for bar, count in zip(bars, counts):
    ax.text(bar.get_x() + bar.get_width()/2., bar.get_height() + 0.3, str(count), ha='center', va='bottom', fontweight='bold', fontsize=14)
ax.set_ylabel('Number of Competency Indicators')
ax.set_title('Competency Indicators by Source')
ax.set_ylim(0, 15)
plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('competency_indicators.png', dpi=150, bbox_inches='tight')
```

V3 — Timeline Bar (matplotlib)

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import matplotlib.dates as mdates
from datetime import datetime
events = [
    (datetime(2024,1,3), 'Interview (Zoom)', '#4C72B0'),
    (datetime(2024,1,11), 'Report Filed', '#E5AE38'),
    (datetime(2024,1,16), 'Found Incompetent\n(no hearing)', '#C44E52'),
    (datetime(2024,1,17), 'Order Filed', '#C44E52'),
]
fig, ax = plt.subplots(figsize=(10, 2.5))
for i, (date, label, color) in enumerate(events):
    ax.plot(date, 0, 'o', markersize=12, color=color, zorder=5)
    ax.annotate(label, (date, 0), textcoords="offset points", xytext=(0, 20 if i%2==0 else -30), ha='center', fontsize=9, fontweight='bold')
    ax.axhline(y=0, color='gray', linewidth=1, alpha=0.3)
ax.xaxis.set_major_formatter(mdates.DateFormatter('%b %d'))
ax.set_xlim(datetime(2024,1,1), datetime(2024,1,20))
ax.set_ylim(-0.5, 0.5)
ax.set_yticks([])
ax.set_title('Milz Evaluation Timeline: Interview to Incompetency Finding')
plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('timeline.png', dpi=150, bbox_inches='tight')
```