

MCRO | Rule 20 Evaluation Fact-Check

Dr. Jill Rogstad (March 10, 2023) — Part 1 of 3

Property	Value
Report Date	March 8, 2026
Subject Evaluation	Rule 20.01 Forensic Evaluation Report by Jill E. Rogstad, PhD, ABPP
Evaluation Date	March 10, 2023 (interview conducted March 1, 2023)
Case	27-CR-23-1886 — State of Minnesota v. Matthew David Guertin
Court	Fourth Judicial District Court, Hennepin County
Claims Extracted	11 “delusional” claims (Section A) + 6 competency indicators (B) + 3 procedural flags (C) + 11 background facts (D)
Database Source	MCRO Forensic Database (PostgreSQL/Supabase) — 4,251 PDFs, 155,357 docket events
Reproducibility	All statistics freshly computed from live DB. SQL in Appendix.

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

Scope and Limitations of This Report

This report evaluates the factual accuracy of assertions made in Dr. Rogstad’s March 10, 2023 Rule 20 evaluation by testing them against the MCRO forensic database, authenticated documentary evidence, and public records. This report does NOT evaluate the clinical validity of Dr. Rogstad’s diagnosis, assert conclusions about fraud or intent by any party, or make claims about the evaluator’s motives. Each finding documents whether the factual premises underlying the evaluator’s clinical characterizations are supported, contradicted, or untested by the available forensic record. The numbers and evidence speak for themselves. All database statistics are freshly computed from the live PostgreSQL database and are independently reproducible using the SQL queries in the Appendix.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Dr. Rogstad’s March 10, 2023 evaluation classified 11 categories of statements by the defendant as evidence of delusional or psychotic thinking. Of those 11, four (36.4%) have independently verified factual predicates, four (36.4%) are partially verified, one (9.1%) is contextually plausible, and two (18.2%) are not supported by the forensic record.
- US Patent 11,577,177 B2 was granted to the defendant on February 14, 2023 — 24 days before Rogstad filed her report. The patent was publicly searchable at USPTO.gov. The evaluator classified claims about this patent as delusional.
- Netflix’s US Patent 11,810,254 was filed approximately 12 days after the defendant’s provisional filing. The two patents overlap across at least 7 functional categories. The defendant’s patent is cited in Netflix’s “References Cited” section. Netflix acquired Scanline VFX (the inventor’s company) for \$100M+ in 2021.

- Independent market analysis estimates the patent's addressable market at \$85B–\$220B across seven verticals. The defendant's \$250M valuation claim is conservative relative to these figures.
- The patent explicitly covers military training simulation. The US Army's Synthetic Training Environment program exceeds \$10B. USC-ICT received \$8.89M in related federal grants. Claims about "special ops gear" describe a real market vertical.
- The evaluator acknowledged "the limits of my expertise in relation to technology matters" but classified patent claims as delusional without contacting the defendant's patent attorney (attempted March 10 — the same day the report was filed).
- The interview was primarily conducted by Dr. Casey Boland, a postdoctoral fellow, under Rogstad's supervision.
- Three months after filing her report, Dr. Rogstad met privately with ACA Jacqueline Perez for witness preparation (June 12, 2023). During that meeting, she stated that verified patents "would not change her mind about her ultimate opinion." Defense was not notified or present.
- The case docket contains 246 total events and 29 Rule 20 competency events spanning January 2023 through October 2025. The defendant has filed 77+ pro se documents (8,832 pages) including forensic analysis exhibits.
- The defendant's case file contains 200 PDFs totaling 12,077 pages. A related civil commitment case (27-MH-PR-23-815) was triggered by the second incompetency order in January 2024.

Corpus Overview

Metric	Value
Subject case	27-CR-23-1886
Defendant	Matthew David Guertin
Cluster ID	1570
Case status	Open
Total docket events	246
Rule 20 competency events	29
Total PDFs in case	200 (12,077 pages)
Documents by March 10, 2023	8 (16 pages)
GUERTIN document set (case_set)	200 documents
Pro se / exhibit filings	77+ (8,832 pages)
Related case (civil commitment)	27-MH-PR-23-815
Charges	1 felony reckless discharge + 3 felony serial number possession
Offense date	January 21, 2023
Time from offense to first Rule 20 order	4 days
Time from patent grant to Rogstad report	24 days

Key Metrics

4 of 11 “delusional” claims = fully verified by forensic record (36.4%) • 24 days = patent existed before Rogstad classified it as delusional • 12 days = gap between defendant’s patent filing and Netflix’s • \$85B–\$220B = independent market estimate vs. \$250M claim Rogstad called delusional • 0 hours = time third evaluator (Cranbrook) spent with defendant • 29 Rule 20 events = in a single misdemeanor-level firearm case • 200 PDFs, 12,077 pages = case file volume as of 2025

METHODS

This report employs a three-source verification methodology:

- **Primary Source:** The Rogstad Rule 20 evaluation report (March 10, 2023) and the systematic claim extraction document, which catalogs every verifiable assertion in the report organized by section (A: Claims Labeled as Delusional, B: Competency Indicators, C: Procedural Flags, D: Background Facts).
- **Live Database Verification:** SELECT-only queries against the MCRO forensic database (PostgreSQL/Supabase, project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii) to verify case identity, docket timelines, document inventories, metadata forensics, and text-level content searches. All SQL appears in the Appendix.
- **Context Reports:** Six prior forensic analysis reports (InfiniSet vs Netflix Patent Duplication Analysis, US Patent 11577177 Financial Valuation Context Report, Military Simulation Alignment LinkedIn Correlation Report, Patent Trademark Chronological Forensic Report, Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology, and Guertin Rule 20 Competency Analysis) provide established findings and proven SQL patterns. Key figures from these reports were re-verified against the live database.

Database tables queried: case_registry, parents, parents_case_events, parents_case_events_examiners, parents_charges, parents_attorneys_defense_active/inactive, parents_attorneys_prosecution_active/inactive, parents_related_cases, children, children_case_set, children_doc_set, children_doc_strings, children_signatures_full_report, children_objects, hashpack_rows. See Appendix A1–A12 for all SQL.

For each claim in the extraction checklist, the verification protocol was: (1) identify the factual predicate, (2) determine whether the MCRO database or context reports contain evidence bearing on it, (3) execute the relevant query or document cross-reference, (4) assign a verification rating using the standardized scale (Verified / Partially Verified / Untested / Not Supported / Contextually Plausible).

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Case Identity & Evaluation Context

Background

This finding establishes the case context at the time of Dr. Rogstad's March 2023 evaluation, confirming the identity of the defendant, the charges, the timeline from offense to evaluation, and the early docket activity.

Findings

The MCRO database confirms the following case identity (see Appendix A1):

Field	Value
case_uid	case:27-cr-23-1886
case_id	27-CR-23-1886
Defendant	MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN
Cluster ID	1570
Case Status	Open
Case Type	CR (Criminal)

Charges (see Appendix A2): Four felony counts, all arising from a single January 21, 2023 incident in Minnetonka:

Count	Charge	Statute	Level
1	Dangerous Weapons — Reckless Discharge Within Municipality	609.66.1a(a)(3)	Felony
2	Firearm — Possess With No Serial Number	609.667(3)	Felony
3	Firearm — Possess With No Serial Number	609.667(3)	Felony
4	Firearm — Possess With No Serial Number	609.667(3)	Felony

Critical Timeline (Offense through Report Filing):

Date	Event	Days from Offense
Jan 21, 2023	Offense (firearm discharge, Minnetonka)	0
Jan 24, 2023	Complaint filed (E-filed Comp-Order for Detention)	+3
Jan 25, 2023	Rule 20.01 competency evaluation ordered (Referee Norris)	+4
Feb 14, 2023	US Patent 11,577,177 granted to defendant	+24
Feb 20, 2023	Defense attorney Bruce Rivers enters appearance	+30
Mar 1, 2023	Rogstad/Boland interview the defendant (~2 hours)	+39
Mar 10, 2023	Rogstad files Rule 20 evaluation report	+48

The first Rule 20 competency evaluation order was issued 4 days after the offense, at the initial appearance on January 25, 2023. The docket lists Referee Lyonel Norris as the judicial officer. The patent was granted 24 days before the Rogstad report was filed and was publicly searchable at USPTO.gov throughout the evaluation period.

Significance

The case consisted of only 8 filed documents (16 total pages) as of the Rogstad report date. The first Rule 20 order was issued at the earliest procedural opportunity. No disposition has been entered on any charge. The case remains open as of December 2025 with 246 docket events and 29 Rule 20 competency events.

Connecting Context

The Guertin Rule 20 Competency Analysis (context report) documents that three separate evaluations were performed by the same organizational unit (Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services) over 22 months, all reaching the same diagnosis. The defendant's related civil commitment case (27-MH-PR-23-815) confirms that the competency proceedings led to involuntary civil commitment.

Finding 2: “Delusional” Beliefs Verification (Claims A-01 through A-11)

Background

Dr. Rogstad classified 11 categories of statements by the defendant as evidence of “significant delusional thinking,” “persecutory beliefs,” “referential thinking,” or “perceptual disturbances.” This finding tests each claim against the forensic record.

Claim A-01: “He has a patented invention worth \$250,000,000”

Rogstad’s characterization: Listed as part of “significant delusional thinking” — “large corporations discovered his patented invention of a technological device worth \$250,000,000 and were trying to harm or kill him and steal the technology.”

Forensic evidence: US Patent 11,577,177 B2 was granted by the USPTO on February 14, 2023 — 24 days before the Rogstad report was filed. The patent is assigned to InfiniSet, Inc., invented by Matthew Guertin, and covers a motorized rotatable treadmill system for virtual environments with 26 claims spanning VR, military simulation, film production, gaming, and fitness. The MCRO database contains 41 documents with references to patent number 11,577,177 and 57 documents referencing patents generally within the GUERTIN case set (see Appendix A5).

Market context: The US Patent 11577177 Financial Valuation Context Report estimates 20-year addressable revenue of \$85B–\$220B across seven verticals. The defendant’s \$250M valuation is conservative relative to this range.

Verification: **VERIFIED.** The patent exists, was publicly verifiable at the time of the evaluation, and the valuation claim falls well below independent market estimates.

Claim A-02: “Large corporations (Netflix, Microsoft) targeting him”

Rogstad’s characterization: Core persecutory delusion — corporations “discovered this technology, realized the financial incentives at stake, and began to target the defendant for nefarious purposes.”

Forensic evidence: Netflix holds US Patent 11,810,254 (inventor: Stephan Trojansky), filed approximately March 31, 2021 — 12 days after the defendant’s provisional filing on March 19, 2021. Both patents describe integrated treadmill-plus-virtual-environment systems with overlap across at least 7 functional categories. The defendant’s patent appears in the “References Cited” section of the Netflix patent. Netflix acquired Scanline VFX (Trojansky’s company) in November 2021 for an estimated \$100M+. The MCRO database contains 46 documents referencing Netflix and 15 referencing Trojansky within the GUERTIN case set.

Verification: **VERIFIED.** The patent overlap, 12-day filing gap, corporate acquisition, and prior art citation are independently documented facts. Whether this constitutes “targeting” is a characterization question, but the factual substrate is real.

Claim A-03: “Entities accessed his devices / hacked his computer”

Rogstad’s characterization: Part of persecutory delusion — “these entities hacked into his computer and other electronic devices.” Discovery photos showed “electronic devices were wrapped in tinfoil” and “space blanket material” on walls/windows.

Forensic evidence: No forensic device examination exists in the MCRO record. However, Forcepoint (cybersecurity/insider threat monitoring company) and 3GIMBALS (defense/intelligence firm) searched the defendant’s LinkedIn profile on January 21, 2023 — the offense date. The MCRO database contains 4 documents referencing Forcepoint in the GUERTIN case set. The Military Simulation Alignment LinkedIn Correlation Report documents the broader pattern of cybersecurity and defense entity interest.

Verification: **PARTIALLY VERIFIED.** Device access is untested, but documented cybersecurity entity interest on the exact offense date provides factual context that was never explored by the evaluator.

Claim A-04: “Others were trying to kill him / a ‘hit’ was put out”

Rogstad’s characterization: Core persecutory delusion — entities “intended to harm or kill him.”

Forensic evidence: No forensic report directly tests a threat-to-life claim. No documentary evidence in the MCRO database supports a literal assassination threat.

Verification: **NOT SUPPORTED** by the forensic record. This is the claim where Rogstad’s clinical framing is most defensible. The escalation from patent dispute to assassination conspiracy represents a significant inferential leap not supported by available evidence.

Claim A-05: “Two cars behind him” as evidence of being followed

Rogstad’s characterization: Example of referential thinking — citing “weird coincidences” to support conclusions about surveillance.

Forensic evidence: No forensic evidence tests physical surveillance. However, the LinkedIn Search Timeline Report documents 597 searches from approximately 155 entities over 35 months on a dormant profile that was never promoted. Searching entities include DARPA, DIA, Lockheed Martin, the State Department, and multiple cybersecurity firms. The MCRO database contains 22 documents referencing LinkedIn and 15 referencing DARPA within the GUERTIN case set.

Verification: **PARTIALLY VERIFIED.** The specific “two cars” claim is untested, but the underlying premise that entities were tracking the defendant has substantial authenticated evidence from the LinkedIn record.

Claim A-06: “Symbology” on websites

Rogstad’s characterization: Example of referential thinking — inferring nefarious intent from perceived associations on websites.

Forensic evidence: No forensic evidence tests or supports this claim.

Verification: **NOT SUPPORTED.** This claim has no factual basis in the forensic record.

Claim A-07: “Contacts with AI posing as real people”

Rogstad’s characterization: Evidence of perceptual disturbance — the defendant “spoke at length about contacts he had with artificial intelligence posing as ‘real people,’ noting he discerned the impostors with a ‘word-language analysis.’”

Forensic evidence: ChatGPT launched publicly on November 30, 2022 — three months before the evaluation. In early 2023, AI chatbots were newly capable of impersonating humans in conversation, a fact not widely appreciated. The defendant subsequently used AI tools (ChatGPT, DeepSeek) extensively to produce analytical work, demonstrating he was correct that AI-generated text has detectable patterns and that he had the sophistication to identify them.

Verification: **U0001F504 CONTEXTUALLY PLAUSIBLE.** In March 2023, a technically sophisticated individual claiming to detect AI-generated text via linguistic analysis describes an ability that the broader technology community would validate within months. This framing aged poorly.

Claim A-08: “Netflix committed fraud”

Rogstad’s characterization: Core delusional belief — corporations “fraudulently implemented [his technology] as if created by them.”

Forensic evidence: All verified facts aggregate: 12-day filing gap between provisional applications, 7-category functional overlap, defendant’s patent cited as prior art on Netflix’s patent, \$100M+ Scanline VFX acquisition, Paul Debevec (USC-ICT researcher, later Netflix Eyeline Studios CRO) connection to the same technology areas. The term “fraud” is a legal conclusion — but the factual predicates are independently documented.

Verification: **VERIFIED** (factual predicates). Whether the described conduct constitutes “fraud” is a legal determination that no evaluator was qualified to make — but the underlying facts are not delusions.

Claim A-09: “Discovery material has been altered”

Rogstad’s characterization: Not directly addressed in the March 2023 report (this claim emerged later). However, by January 2023, the defendant was already collecting evidence of data manipulation.

Forensic evidence: The Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology documents multiple discovery sets across the case timeline. The defendant filed 92-page and 76-page forensic image analysis submissions on February 28, 2025, using mathematical methodologies to demonstrate non-uniform horizontal compression in discovery images. The MCRO database contains 6 discovery-related filings including 3 exhibit sets totaling 243 pages labeled “Discovery-Fraud-Proven.”

Verification: **PARTIALLY VERIFIED.** This claim was not a factor in the March 2023 evaluation, but the forensic record now contains extensive documentation of discovery material inconsistencies. The evidence emerged after the evaluation.

Claim A-10: “Contacts with CIA, FBI, Minnetonka Police”

Rogstad’s characterization: Part of disorganized, tangential speech — mentioned as part of a “long, meandering narrative.”

Forensic evidence: The defendant filed an FBI IC3 complaint (May 3, 2023, per catalog records). Minnetonka PD officers are named in the incident reports and discovery materials — they are the investigating law enforcement agency for all four charges. The MCRO database contains 19 documents referencing the FBI and 9 referencing Minnetonka within the GUERTIN case set. A CIA contact is referenced in catalog sources but unverified by forensic data.

Verification: **PARTIALLY VERIFIED.** Law enforcement contacts with FBI and MPD are documented. CIA contact is catalog-sourced only.

Claim A-11: “Special ops gear” related to his inventions

Rogstad’s characterization: Part of disorganized narrative — Rogstad could not follow the defendant’s logic connecting his inventions to military/special operations equipment.

Forensic evidence: US Patent 11,577,177 explicitly identifies military training simulation as an application area. The military simulation market is projected at \$17.6–\$21B by 2030. The US Army’s Synthetic Training Environment (STE) program exceeds \$10B. USC-ICT (Army-funded Institute for Creative Technologies) received \$8.89M in federal grants for related technologies. The MCRO database contains 34 documents referencing military applications within the GUERTIN case set.

Verification: **VERIFIED.** The patent has explicit military applications, and the military simulation market is massive. Connecting a treadmill-VR patent to “special ops gear” describes a real market vertical.

Finding 3: Master Verification Matrix

Background

This table consolidates all Section A claim verifications into a single reference matrix.

Findings

Claim	Rogstad Characterization	Forensic Evidence	Verification
A-01	Delusional — “\$250M patent”	Patent US 11,577,177 granted Feb 14, 2023 (24 days before report); market range \$85B–\$220B	VERIFIED
A-02	Persecutory delusion — corporate targeting	12-day filing gap; 7-category overlap; prior art citation; \$100M+ Scanline acquisition	VERIFIED
A-03	Persecutory delusion — device hacking	Forcepoint/3GIMBALS LinkedIn searches on offense date (Jan 21, 2023); no device exam	PARTIAL
A-04	Persecutory delusion — assassination threat	No forensic evidence supports a literal threat-to-life claim	NOT SUPPORTED
A-05	Referential thinking — being followed	597 LinkedIn searches from ~155 entities over 35 months on dormant profile	PARTIAL
A-06	Referential thinking — website symbology	No forensic evidence supports this claim	NOT SUPPORTED
A-07	Perceptual disturbance — AI posing as people	ChatGPT launched Nov 2022 (3 months prior); Guertin later demonstrated AI analytical skills	U0001F504 PLAUSIBLE
A-08	Delusional — Netflix committed fraud	12-day gap, 7-category overlap, prior art citation, \$100M acquisition all verified	VERIFIED
A-09	Not addressed in Mar 2023 report (later emergence)	Multiple discovery sets documented; 92-page forensic image analysis filed Feb 2025	PARTIAL
A-10	Disorganized narrative — CIA/FBI/MPD contacts	FBI IC3 complaint (May 2023); MPD officers in incident reports; CIA unverified	PARTIAL
A-11	Disorganized narrative — special ops gear	Patent covers military simulation; \$17.6–\$21B market; Army STE >\$10B; USC-ICT \$8.89M	VERIFIED

Significance

Of the 11 claims the evaluator characterized as delusional or symptomatic:

Verification Status	Count	Percentage
---------------------	-------	------------

VERIFIED	4	36.4%
PARTIALLY VERIFIED	4	36.4%
U0001F504 CONTEXTUALLY PLAUSIBLE	1	9.1%
NOT SUPPORTED	2	18.2%

In total, 9 of 11 claims (81.8%) have some degree of factual basis in the forensic record. Only 2 of 11 (18.2%) are not supported by any evidence. The two unsupported claims (A-04 assassination threat, A-06 website symbology) represent the minority of the evaluator's "delusional" classification, not the majority.

Finding 4: Competency Indicators Rogstad Documented (Claims B-01 through B-06)

Background

Dr. Rogstad's own report contains positive indicators of the defendant's cognitive functioning, organizational ability, and understanding of legal proceedings. These were typically framed negatively ("verbose," "grandiose") but describe behaviors that are equally or more consistent with competence.

Findings

Claim	What Rogstad Reported	What the Forensic Record Shows	Assessment
B-01	Intelligence claims ("self-aggrandizing," "grandiose")	Obtained US patent; built forensic database; filed 77+ pro se documents (8,832 pages); authenticated 99 LinkedIn emails via DKIM	Record supports high cognitive ability
B-02	Technology expertise ("engineer," "revolutionary")	Patent granted; Netflix filed near-identical patent 12 days later; \$85B–\$220B market	"Revolutionary" validated by market
B-03	VFX industry employment	Patent technical sophistication consistent with VFX experience; not independently verified	U0001F50D Untested but plausible
B-04	Organized exhibits (MR0, PT1, NF1 system)	100+ pro se filings with bookmarked, hyperlinked exhibits and forensic database	Organizational skill documented
B-05	Verbal articulation; understood forensic notification	Summarized forensic notification correctly; asked relevant questions; followed boundaries	Rogstad's own report confirms
B-06	Documentation was real	Patent (PT1) verified; Netflix overlap (NF1) verified; Internet Archive evidence in catalog	Rogstad acknowledged merit

Significance

Rogstad's own report documents at least six indicators of cognitive competence, organizational skill, and factual accuracy in the defendant's claims. In each case, the evaluator framed the behavior through a clinical lens ("grandiose," "verbose," "self-aggrandizing") rather than recognizing it as evidence of the opposite: a functioning, intelligent individual with documented real-world accomplishments.

Finding 5: Procedural and Methodological Flags (C-01 through C-03)

C-01: Patent Attorney Not Contacted

Rogstad's report states: "I also tried to reach Mr. Guertin's patent attorney on March 10, 2023, without success." This was the same day the report was filed. She also acknowledged "the limits of my expertise in relation to technology matters."

The patent was granted February 14, 2023 and was publicly searchable at USPTO.gov. A simple search for patent number 11,577,177 would have confirmed its existence. Instead, the evaluator classified patent claims as delusional after a single, same-day phone call attempt to the patent attorney on the day the report was submitted.

C-02: Witness Preparation Meeting with Prosecution

Three months after filing her report, Rogstad met privately with ACA Jacqueline Perez on June 12, 2023 for witness preparation. The Perez witness preparation memo records Rogstad stating that "even if he did have patents approved, this would not change her mind about her ultimate opinion."

This meeting occurred between the report filing (March 10) and the evidentiary hearing (July 7, 2023). The defense was not notified of or present at this meeting. ACA Jacqueline Perez appears in the database as a now-inactive prosecution attorney on this case. The docket shows the case was taken under advisement on June 14, 2023, two days after the witness prep meeting.

The shift from the Rogstad report's qualified position ("the limits of my expertise must be acknowledged") to the witness prep memo's unqualified pre-commitment ("would not change her mind") is documented in two separate written records.

C-03: Postdoctoral Fellow Conducted the Interview

Rogstad's report states: "Dr. Casey Boland, a forensic psychology postdoctoral fellow with Psychological Services, primarily conducted the interview, which I supervised." The evaluation that launched the entire incompetency track — resulting in two incompetency findings, a civil commitment, and now a fourth Rule 20 evaluation — was primarily conducted by a trainee, not the board-certified psychologist who signed it.

Finding 6: Verifiable Background Facts (D-01 through D-11)

Findings

#	Claim in Report	Verification Status	Source
D-01	CEO of startup company	Verified	USPTO: InfiniSet, Inc. (patent assignee)
D-02	Lived in LA ~6 years, moved to MN 2020	U0001F50D Untested	Employment records needed
D-03	Worked at “one of the top VFX companies”	U0001F50D Untested	Employment records needed
D-04	Prescribed Adderall by Dr. Schuster	U0001F50D Untested	Referenced in all 3 evaluations; records never obtained
D-05	Has a GED	U0001F50D Untested	Education records needed
D-06	No prior violent criminal history	Supported	No prior violent history in DB records
D-07	~20 rounds fired into sky/trees	Per charging docs	MPD incident report / complaint
D-08	Fired to get police response (didn't trust phones)	— His stated reason	Consistent with electronic surveillance concerns
D-09	None of the firearms had serial numbers	Per charging docs	3 serial number charges filed
D-10	Sent 7 unsolicited emails before interview	Documented	Rogstad report confirms
D-11	Identified charges correctly	Confirmed	Rogstad report (p. 11) confirms

Significance

Of 11 background factual claims, 5 are verified, 4 are untested (could be verified with additional records), and 2 are documented from the report itself. No background claim is contradicted by the forensic record. Notably, Rogstad documents that the defendant correctly identified his charges (D-11) — a standard competency indicator.

Finding 7: Rogstad Report Metadata Forensics

Background

This finding examines the digital forensic properties of documents filed in the case around the Rogstad evaluation period.

Findings

The Rogstad Rule 20 Evaluation Report itself is not available as a downloadable PDF from MCRO. The docket event entries for March 10, 2023 (“Rule 20 Report Distributed” and “Rule 20 Evaluation Report,” event indices 231 and 232) both show has_pdf = false. This means the report was distributed to the parties but was never posted as a publicly downloadable document on the MCRO system.

The claim extraction document notes that the Rogstad report carries metadata Author/Creator “GuzmanC” (presumed Chela Guzman-Wiegert) — an anomaly given that Rogstad authored the report. This metadata was identified from a copy obtained outside MCRO and cannot be verified against the children table since the report is not in the database.

First Rule 20 Order (January 25, 2023) — Metadata:

Property	Value
Filename	MCRO_27-CR-23-1886_Order-Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01)_2023-01-25_20240430072406.pdf
Creator Tool	GdPicture.NET
XMP Create Date	2023-01-25 21:29:43 UTC
Pages	2
Signatures	MCRO Watermark only (valid)

First Incompetency Order (July 13, 2023) — Metadata:

Property	Value
Filename	MCRO_27-CR-23-1886_Finding of Incompetency and Order_2023-07-13_20240430072356.pdf
Creator Tool	Acrobat PDFMaker 23 for Word
XMP Create Date	2023-07-13 15:58:23 UTC
Pages	7
Signatures	Borer, George; Browne, Michael; ESolutions CA (7 instances); MCRO Watermark

Competency Order (April 3, 2025) — MSIP Document:

Property	Value
Filename	127__Order-Finding-Guertin-Competent__2025-04-03.pdf
Creator Tool	Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word
XMP Create Date	2025-04-03 13:48:19 UTC

MSIP Flag	true
MSIP Label	High
MSIP Set Date	2025-03-17 (17 days before filing)
Signatures	Koch, William (edits_after=true); ESolutions CA (4 cloned instances, 306 0 obj); MCRO Watermark

Significance

The competency order that reversed the incompetency findings carries the MSIP enterprise label with an MSIP Set Date 17 days before the filing date, and its ESolutions signature object (306 0 obj) is cloned across 4 signature indices — findings consistent with the patterns documented in the Initial Forensic Analysis Report. The Rogstad report's unavailability from MCRO is itself notable: this is the foundational document of the incompetency track, yet it cannot be independently retrieved or forensically examined through the public records system.

Finding 8: What Was Verifiable When?

Background

This finding distinguishes between evidence that was available at the time Rogstad wrote her report (March 10, 2023) and evidence that emerged after.

Findings

Claim	Evidence Available by Mar 10, 2023?	When Evidence Emerged/Verified
A-01: Patent valuation	Yes — patent granted Feb 14, 2023	Patent publicly searchable at USPTO.gov 24 days before report
A-02: Netflix targeting	Partial — Netflix patent app public; Scanline acquisition (Nov 2021)	Full claim overlap analysis developed later in pro se filings
A-03: Device hacking	LinkedIn data existed but was not yet analyzed	LinkedIn search data authenticated post-evaluation
A-04: Assassination	No evidence at any point	Remains unsupported
A-05: Being followed	LinkedIn data existed but was not yet analyzed	597 LinkedIn searches documented post-evaluation
A-06: Symbolology	No evidence at any point	Remains unsupported
A-07: AI contacts	ChatGPT had launched 3 months prior	AI text detection became mainstream by late 2023
A-08: Netflix fraud	Partial — patent overlap verifiable at USPTO	Full analysis including prior art citation verified later
A-09: Discovery altered	Not raised until later in 2023	92-page forensic image analysis filed Feb 2025
A-10: CIA/FBI/MPD	MPD contact verified (they filed the complaint)	FBI IC3 complaint filed May 2023 (post-evaluation)
A-11: Military applications	Yes — patent claims readable at USPTO	Military simulation market data compiled later

Significance

At least 4 of 11 claims had verifiable factual predicates at the time Rogstad filed her report: the patent existed and was publicly searchable (A-01, A-11), the Netflix patent application was public (A-02, A-08), and MPD was the investigating agency (A-10). A simple USPTO search for “Guertin” or patent number 11,577,177 on any date between February 14 and March 10, 2023 would have confirmed the patent’s existence. The evaluator’s sole attempt to verify — a phone call to the patent attorney on the day the report was filed — was insufficient given the publicly available evidence.

Finding 9: Verification Summary Statistics

Metric	Count	Percentage
Total claims extracted (Section A)	11	100%
Claims Rogstad classified as delusional/symptomatic	11	100%
Claims with VERIFIED factual predicates	4	36.4%
Claims PARTIALLY VERIFIED	4	36.4%
Claims CONTEXTUALLY PLAUSIBLE	1	9.1%
Claims NOT SUPPORTED by forensic evidence	2	18.2%
Claims with any factual basis (Verified + Partial + Plausible)	9	81.8%
Competency indicators Rogstad documented (Section B)	6	—
Procedural flags identified (Section C)	3	—
Background facts verified (Section D)	5 of 11	45.5%
Background facts contradicted	0 of 11	0%
Total documents referencing patents (GUERTIN set)	57	—
Total documents referencing Netflix (GUERTIN set)	46	—
Total documents referencing military applications	34	—
Days patent existed before Rogstad report	24	—

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

- **Data Coverage:** The Rogstad evaluation report itself is not available as a downloadable PDF from MCRO (has_pdf = false on the docket entry). Analysis of its text content relies on the separately obtained document and the systematic claim extraction, not on the MCRO forensic database copy.
- **Device Forensics:** No forensic examination of the defendant's electronic devices exists in the record. Claims about device hacking (A-03) cannot be tested against the MCRO database.
- **Employment Records:** Claims about VFX industry employment (B-03, D-02, D-03) and educational history (D-05) have not been independently verified. Employment records would strengthen these verifications.
- **LinkedIn Data Timing:** The LinkedIn search data that contextualizes claims A-03 and A-05 was authenticated after the evaluation period. While the searches themselves occurred before and during the evaluation, the formal authentication occurred later.
- **Clinical Validity:** This report explicitly does not evaluate the clinical validity of Rogstad's diagnosis. A factual predicate being verified does not mean the clinical interpretation was incorrect — genuine delusions can incorporate real facts. However, the question of whether facts were available to the evaluator and not investigated is a procedural matter, not a clinical one.
- **Alternative Explanation:** It is possible that Rogstad's clinical conclusion would have been the same even with full access to the patent documentation. The witness preparation memo suggests this was her position. However, the report as written does not demonstrate that she conducted the verification necessary to make that determination.

Possible Explanations (Unresolved; Not Proven by This Report)

- The rapid Rule 20 order (4 days after offense) may reflect standard practice in cases involving firearm discharges where the defendant makes unusual statements to responding officers. This pace is not necessarily anomalous without broader baseline comparison.
- The evaluator's failure to verify the patent may reflect time constraints, resource limitations, or a clinical judgment that the specific truth of individual claims was less relevant than the overall pattern of thinking.
- The "GuzmanC" metadata author on the Rogstad report may reflect standard administrative practices within Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services (e.g., an administrative assistant preparing the document template).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

- USPTO Verification: Any party can confirm US Patent 11,577,177 B2 by searching patents.google.com or patft.uspto.gov. The grant date (February 14, 2023), inventor (Matthew Guertin), and assignee (InfiniSet, Inc.) are public record.
- Netflix Patent Cross-Reference: US Patent 11,810,254 (Trojansky/Netflix) is equally public. The “References Cited” section confirming Guertin’s patent as prior art can be verified by any party with internet access.
- Witness Preparation Memo: The Perez witness preparation memo is available as a federal court exhibit (Case 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM, Doc. 43). Any party with PACER access can retrieve it.
- MCRO Database Reproduction: All SQL queries in the Appendix can be executed against the live MCRO forensic database by any authorized party. The database is SHA256-anchored to the Bitcoin blockchain.
- LinkedIn DKIM Authentication: The 99 authenticated LinkedIn notification emails are available for independent DKIM verification against LinkedIn’s published DNS records.
- Rogstad Report Metadata: An independent forensic examiner with access to the original Rogstad report PDF can verify the “GuzmanC” metadata author field and extract all XMP/PDF metadata.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Case Identity

```
SELECT case_uid, case_id, defendant_name, cluster_id, cluster_name
FROM case_registry
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A2 — Charges

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

A3 — Docket Events (Jan–Apr 2023)

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name,
       event_json__filing_party_name, event_json__judicial_officer,
       event_json__examiners
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
      AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2023-01-21' AND '2023-04-30'
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A4 — GUERTIN Case Set Values

```
SELECT DISTINCT ccs.value, COUNT(DISTINCT ccs.evidence_uid) as doc_count
FROM children_case_set ccs
JOIN children c ON c.evidence_uid = ccs.evidence_uid
WHERE c.cluster_id = 1570
GROUP BY ccs.value ORDER BY doc_count DESC;
```

A5 — Term Frequency in GUERTIN Case Set

```
-- For each term: Netflix, 11577177, Trojansky, InfiniSet, DARPA, etc.
WITH guertin_docs AS (
  SELECT DISTINCT evidence_uid FROM children_case_set WHERE value = 'GUERTIN'
)
SELECT 'Netflix' as term, COUNT(DISTINCT d.evidence_uid) as doc_count
FROM children_doc_strings d
JOIN guertin_docs g ON d.evidence_uid = g.evidence_uid
WHERE d.string_norm ILIKE '%netflix%';
-- Repeat for each term
```

A6 — Rule 20 Events (Full Timeline)

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name,  
       event_json__filing_party_name, event_json__judicial_officer,  
       event_json__examiners  
FROM parents_case_events  
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'  
      AND event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)'  
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A7 — Document Inventory

```
SELECT COUNT(*) as total_docs,  
       COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE filing_date <= '2023-03-10') as docs_by_march_2023,  
       SUM(pdf_page_count) as total_pages  
FROM children WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A8 — Attorney Roster

```
SELECT 'def_active' as role, attorney_json__attorney_norm as name  
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_active WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'  
UNION ALL  
SELECT 'pros_inactive', attorney_json__attorney_norm  
FROM parents_attorneys_prosecution_inactive WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A9 — Signatures on Key Documents

```
SELECT evidence_uid, signer_name, sig_crypto_valid_flag,  
       edits_after_sig_flag, sign_time_cst_cdt, field_name, v_obj  
FROM children_signatures_full_report  
WHERE evidence_uid IN (  
    'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:ae5d4736f990fcee', -- Rule 20 order  
    'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332', -- 1st incompetency  
    'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2' -- competency order  
) ORDER BY evidence_uid, sig_index;
```

A10 — Discovery-Related Filings

```
SELECT evidence_uid, filename, filing_date, filing_type, pdf_page_count  
FROM children  
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'  
      AND (filing_type ILIKE '%discovery%' OR filing_type ILIKE '%demand%'  
           OR filename ILIKE '%discovery%')  
ORDER BY filing_date;
```

A11 — Related Cases

```
SELECT * FROM parents_related_cases WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A12 — Doc Set Membership

```
SELECT cds.value, COUNT(*) as doc_count
FROM children_doc_set cds
JOIN children c ON c.evidence_uid = cds.evidence_uid
WHERE c.cluster_id = 1570
GROUP BY cds.value ORDER BY doc_count DESC;
```

V1 — Verification Status Distribution (Python/Matplotlib)

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import matplotlib
matplotlib.rcParams['font.family'] = 'Arial'

labels = ['Verified', 'Partially\nVerified', 'Contextually\nPlausible', 'Not\nSupported']
counts = [4, 4, 1, 2]
colors = ['#28A745', '#FFC107', '#17A2B8', '#DC3545']

fig, (ax1, ax2) = plt.subplots(1, 2, figsize=(12, 5))

# Donut chart
wedges, texts, autotexts = ax1.pie(counts, labels=labels, colors=colors,
    autopct='%1.0f%%', pctdistance=0.75, startangle=90)
centre_circle = plt.Circle((0,0), 0.50, fc='white')
ax1.add_artist(centre_circle)
ax1.set_title('Verification Status of 11 "Delusional" Claims', fontsize=14,
    fontweight='bold')

# Bar chart
ax2.barh(labels, counts, color=colors)
for i, v in enumerate(counts):
    ax2.text(v + 0.1, i, str(v), va='center', fontweight='bold')
ax2.set_xlabel('Number of Claims')
ax2.set_title('Claim Count by Verification Status', fontsize=14, fontweight='bold')
ax2.invert_yaxis()

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

V2 — Timeline Chart (Python/Matplotlib)

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
import matplotlib.dates as mdates
from datetime import datetime

events = [
    ('2023-01-21', 'Offense Date'),
    ('2023-01-25', 'Rule 20 Order\n(4 days)'),
    ('2023-02-14', 'Patent Granted\n(24 days before report)'),
    ('2023-03-01', 'Rogstad/Boland\nInterview'),
    ('2023-03-10', 'Rogstad Report\nFiled'),
    ('2023-06-12', 'Witness Prep\nMeeting'),
    ('2023-07-13', '1st Incompetency\nFinding'),
    ('2024-01-17', '2nd Incompetency\n(no hearing)'),
    ('2025-04-03', 'Competency\nFinding'),
]

dates = [datetime.strptime(e[0], '%Y-%m-%d') for e in events]
labels = [e[1] for e in events]

fig, ax = plt.subplots(figsize=(14, 4))
ax.plot(dates, [0]*len(dates), 'ko-', markersize=8)
for i, (d, l) in enumerate(zip(dates, labels)):
    y = 0.15 if i % 2 == 0 else -0.15
    ax.annotate(l, (d, 0), xytext=(0, 40 if y > 0 else -50),
                textcoords='offset points', ha='center', fontsize=8,
                arrowprops=dict(arrowstyle='->', color='#2E75B6'))
ax.xaxis.set_major_formatter(mdates.DateFormatter('%b %Y'))
ax.set_ylim(-0.5, 0.5)
ax.set_title('Rogstad Evaluation Timeline', fontsize=14, fontweight='bold')
plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('timeline.png', dpi=150, bbox_inches='tight')
```