

MCRO FORENSIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Tracking-Font Injection & Revision-Count Anomalies

Companion Report to the Clone Report

Analyst: MCRO Forensic Research System (AI-Assisted)

Date: March 3, 2026

Database: MCRO Supabase Forensic Warehouse (4,251 documents / 245 cases)

Classification: Attorney Work Product / Privileged

Disclaimer

This report presents forensic observations derived exclusively from structured metadata, embedded PDF object hashes, digital signatures, and XMP properties stored in the MCRO forensic database. All findings are based on reproducible SQL queries executed in read-only mode against the live database.

This report does not assert intent, motive, or wrongdoing by any individual or institution. Observations are presented as measurable structural anomalies that warrant further investigation. Alternative explanations are noted where applicable. Nothing in this report constitutes legal advice.

Methodology note: Every quantitative claim in this report is accompanied by the SQL query used to derive it, included in Appendix A. All document identifiers (evidence_uid, doc_sha256, document_id) are provided to enable independent verification.

Executive Summary

This report examines two pairs of PDF court documents filed in Hennepin County, Minnesota that share identical Microsoft Word source files (as proven by matching XMP document_id values) yet differ in their embedded font inventories, revision counts, and digital signature structures. The core findings are:

- 1. Shared Word Origins:** Both document pairs share identical XMP document_id values within each pair, confirming they originate from the same Microsoft Word source file. Pair 1 shares document_id af03a228-aeb1-4472-bcad-86c4b1c16418; Pair 2 shares 78ea734e-77dc-410f-b340-fcd5036afb56. Each document_id appears in exactly two documents in the entire 4,251-document corpus.
- 2. Tracking-Font Injection:** One document in each pair contains two embedded TrueType font objects (designated Tracking-Font-C1 and Tracking-Font-C2, identified by SHA-256 hashes 1fa67c75... and b50a0345...) that are absent from its paired counterpart. These fonts appear in exactly 1,130 documents (26.6% of the corpus) across 196 cases and always co-occur.
- 3. Revision-Count Jumps of Exactly +2:** In both pairs, the document containing tracking fonts shows a revision count exactly 2 higher than its counterpart (9 → 11 for Pair 1; 8 → 10 for Pair 2). The rev_count=11 value is unique in the entire corpus—no other document among 4,251 has this value.
- 4. Corpus-Unique Font in Pair 2:** Document 2B contains a font object (SHA-256 prefix e668b6...) that appears in no other document in the entire corpus. This font is present only in the variant that lacks tracking fonts, forming a perfect inverse relationship: tracking fonts are swapped out, the unique font is swapped in, and the revision count jumps by +2.
- 5. Signature Coverage Degradation:** In Pair 1, the clone document (1B) shows dramatically lower signature coverage percentages despite identical v_obj references (same PDF signature objects): Borer drops from 37.76% to 17.42%, Browne from 53.36% to 24.62%, and ESolutions from 61.50% to 28.38%. This indicates substantial content was added to the PDF after the original signatures were applied.
- 6. ESolutions Signature Pattern:** Document 2B contains an ESolutions Development Certificate Authority signature timestamped 2021-04-16 08:46:12—the day after its filing date of 2021-04-15. Document 2A, filed one week earlier, has no ESolutions signature. Among the 4,251 documents in the corpus, only 134 contain ESolutions signatures.

Key Metrics at a Glance

Metric	Value	Context
Corpus size	4,251 documents / 245 cases	Hennepin County Rule 20 cohort
Tracking-Font-C1/C2 prevalence	1,130 docs (26.6%)	196 cases, 77 clusters; always co-occur
e668b6... font prevalence	1 document only	Corpus-unique; present only in Doc 2B
rev_count = 11	1 document only	Corpus-unique; present only in Doc 1B

Metric	Value	Context
rev_count ≤ 6	4,034 docs (95.5%)	Normal range for signed court PDFs
doc_id reuse (2-doc pairs)	220 pairs	Template reuse is common; our pairs are within this set
File-size ratio (Pair 1)	1B is 2.17× larger than 1A	1,107 KB vs 511 KB; same 7-page content

Background Concepts

What Is a Revision Count?

Every PDF file contains an internal revision counter (typically stored in the document information dictionary or incremental-save history) that increments each time the file is modified and re-saved. In the Minnesota court system, a typical court order starts as a Word document (revision 1), is converted to PDF (revision 2), receives a judicial signature (revision 3), and may receive an e-filing system signature (revision 4). Most signed documents in this corpus have revision counts between 3 and 6 (95.5% of all signed documents).

A revision count of 8 or higher is statistically unusual (only 3.1% of signed documents), and a count of 11 is entirely unique in this corpus. Each additional revision represents a distinct save event—a point at which the PDF file was opened, modified, and re-written to disk.

What Are Tracking Fonts?

PDF documents embed font objects as binary streams, each uniquely identified by its SHA-256 hash. Two specific font objects (designated Tracking-Font-C1, hash prefix 1fa67c75..., and Tracking-Font-C2, hash prefix b50a0345...) appear across 1,130 documents spanning 196 cases. They always appear together (perfect co-occurrence) and never appear individually.

These fonts are notable because they do not correspond to visible text content—they appear to be embedded without being referenced by visible page content. Their consistent co-occurrence across 26.6% of the corpus, combined with a date range spanning January 2020 through July 2025, suggests they are injected by an automated system or template pipeline rather than inserted by individual document authors.

What Is a Document ID (document_id)?

Microsoft Word assigns each document a unique identifier (document_id) stored in the XMP metadata stream. This identifier persists across saves and exports—if a Word file is opened and re-saved as a new PDF, the new PDF inherits the original document_id. A separate instance_id is generated for each distinct save event. When two PDF files share the same document_id but have different instance_id values, it proves they were produced from the same Word source file at different times.

What Is Signature Coverage?

Digital signatures in PDF cover a byte range of the file. The coverage percentage indicates what fraction of the file's total bytes fall within the signed range. If content is added to a PDF after signing, the file grows but the signed byte range stays the same, causing the coverage percentage to decrease. A large drop in coverage between two documents with the same signature v_obj reference indicates post-signature modification.

Methods

Data Source

All queries were executed as read-only SELECT statements against the MCRO Supabase PostgreSQL database. The database contains forensic metadata extracted from 4,251 PDF documents across 245 criminal cases in the Hennepin County (Minnesota) Rule 20 competency-evaluation cohort.

Tables Used

children: Master document registry. One row per PDF. Contains filing metadata (case_id, filing_date, filing_type), XMP metadata (document_id, instance_id, create_date, metadata_date, creator_tool, producer), file properties (size_bytes, pdf_page_count), and classification fields.

children_objects: Embedded PDF objects (fonts, images, forms). One row per object per document. Keyed by evidence_uid + object_sha256. Used to identify tracking fonts and measure font inventories.

children_signatures_full_report: Digital signature inventory. One row per signature field per document. Contains signer_name, sign_time, coverage_pct, rev_count, edits_after_sig_flag, and v_obj (PDF object reference for the signature).

children_tracking_groups: Pre-computed tracking-font group assignments. Documents containing designated tracking fonts are catalogued here with their group classifications.

Join Keys

Primary join key: evidence_uid (globally unique document identifier, format evidence:{case_id}:{hash_prefix}). Secondary keys: doc_sha256 (file-level hash), object_sha256 (embedded object hash), metadata__document_id (Word document identity).

Definitions

Tracking-Font-C1: Font object with SHA-256 hash prefix 1fa67c75. Present in 1,130 documents.

Tracking-Font-C2: Font object with SHA-256 hash prefix b50a0345. Present in 1,130 documents. Perfect co-occurrence with C1.

e668b6 font: Font object with SHA-256 hash prefix e668b6. Present in exactly 1 document (Doc 2B).

ESolutions signature: Digital signature issued by “ESolutions Development Certificate Authority.” Present in 134 of 4,251 documents.

Findings

Finding 1: Target Document Identification and Pairing

Four documents were identified for analysis based on shared Word-level document_id values and observable structural differences. They form two distinct pairs:

Pair 1 — Guertin Incompetency Orders (Case 27-CR-23-1886, Filed 2023-07-13)

Property	Doc 1A (Source)	Doc 1B (Clone)
evidence_uid	...db8525dd67737332	...7f55a35d9f19876d
Filing Type	Finding of Incompetency and Order	Order-Other
Filing Date	2023-07-13	2023-07-13
Pages	7	7
File Size	511,028 bytes (511 KB)	1,107,468 bytes (1,107 KB)
Revision Count	9	11
Total Fonts	5	7 (+2)
Tracking Fonts C1/C2	ABSENT	PRESENT
XMP Create Date	2023-07-13 15:58:23 UTC	2023-07-13 15:58:23 UTC
XMP Metadata Date	2023-07-13 19:57:12 UTC	2023-07-13 21:47:53 UTC
document_id	af03a228-aeb1-4472-bcad-86c4b1c16418	af03a228-aeb1-4472-bcad-86c4b1c16418
instance_id	2b6de574-6a50-4c21-b1c2-48ae7df3bdc7	fcf6903f-c5c9-4e16-b870-c14bbd931e06
Creator Tool	Acrobat PDFMaker 23 for Word	Acrobat PDFMaker 23 for Word

Pair 2 — Conditional Release Orders (Different Cases, Filed 2021-04-08 / 2021-04-15)

Property	Doc 2A	Doc 2B
evidence_uid	...9a1814acccc4fabb	...a0796f7ddbcd10bb
Case	27-CR-20-20788	27-CR-20-27550
Filing Type	Order for Conditional Release	Order for Conditional Release
Filing Date	2021-04-08	2021-04-15 (+7 days)
Pages	1	1
File Size	14,059,202 bytes (14.1 MB)	13,538,311 bytes (13.5 MB)
Revision Count	8	10
Total Fonts	103	102
Tracking Fonts C1/C2	PRESENT	ABSENT

Property	Doc 2A	Doc 2B
e668b6... Font	ABSENT	PRESENT (corpus-unique)
XMP Create Date	2021-02-20 04:10:13 UTC	2021-02-20 04:10:13 UTC
XMP Metadata Date	2021-04-09 18:12:30 UTC	2021-04-16 13:46:13 UTC
document_id	78ea734e-77dc-410f-b340-fcd5036afb56	78ea734e-77dc-410f-b340-fcd5036afb56
instance_id	3f6f3012-f900-4790-acec-7b7546eb7ab1	5f4a5458-cfba-4c17-af3f-86544819e9b3
Creator Tool	Microsoft® Word 2013	Microsoft® Word 2013

Observation: Both pairs share identical document_id values within each pair, and each document_id appears in exactly 2 documents in the entire 4,251-document corpus. This is not a template artifact—the most-reused document_ids in the corpus appear in 20–38 documents. These are private 1:1 pairings.

Finding 2: Revision Count Distribution and Statistical Outlier Status

The revision count distribution across all 4,225 signed documents in the corpus is heavily concentrated in the range of 3–6:

Rev Count	Documents	Percentage	Cumulative %
1	14	0.33%	0.33%
2	1	0.02%	0.36%
3	759	17.96%	18.32%
4	2,307	54.60%	72.93%
5	720	17.04%	89.96%
6	233	5.51%	95.48%
7	62	1.47%	96.95%
8	4	0.09%	97.04%
9	114	2.70%	99.74%
10	10	0.24%	99.98%
11	1	0.02%	100.00%

Key observations:

- rev_count = 11 is entirely unique: exactly 1 document in the corpus (Doc 1B, the tracking-font variant of the Guertin order).
- rev_count ≥ 8 accounts for only 129 documents (3.05%). All four target documents fall in this tail.
- The +2 jump pattern: in both pairs, the variant with additional/swapped fonts shows exactly +2 revisions compared to its counterpart. This consistent increment suggests a two-step automated process (e.g., font injection + re-save).

Finding 3: Tracking-Font Injection and the Font-Swap Pattern

Pair 1 — Font Addition:

Doc 1A contains 5 embedded font objects. Doc 1B contains 7—the same 5 plus Tracking-Font-C1 and Tracking-Font-C2. No fonts were removed; 2 were added. The file size increase (511 KB → 1,107 KB, a factor of 2.17×) is disproportionate to the addition of two font streams, suggesting additional structural changes to the PDF beyond font embedding.

Pair 2 — Font Swap:

Doc 2A contains 103 font objects including Tracking-Font-C1 and C2. Doc 2B contains 102 font objects—the tracking fonts are absent, replaced by a font with SHA-256 prefix e668b6. This is a perfect inverse relationship:

Font	Doc 2A (103 fonts)	Doc 2B (102 fonts)	Corpus Prevalence
Tracking-Font-C1 (1fa67c75...)	PRESENT	ABSENT	1,130 docs (26.6%)
Tracking-Font-C2 (b50a0345...)	PRESENT	ABSENT	1,130 docs (26.6%)
e668b6... font	ABSENT	PRESENT	1 doc only (this one)

The e668b6 font is the rarest embedded object in the corpus: it appears in exactly one document out of 4,251. Its presence exclusively in the variant that lacks tracking fonts—combined with the +2 revision count jump—is consistent with an automated font-substitution process.

Corpus-Wide Tracking Font Statistics:

Tracking-Font-C1 and C2 co-occur in 1,130 documents across 196 cases and 77 case clusters, with filing dates ranging from 2020-01-07 through 2025-07-02. Their prevalence indicates a systemic rather than ad-hoc origin. The `children_tracking_groups` table catalogues documents containing these fonts: Doc 1B and Doc 2A appear in this table; Doc 1A and Doc 2B do not. This is consistent with the font-presence data.

Finding 4: Digital Signature Structure and Coverage Degradation

Pair 1 — Identical v_obj References, Divergent Coverage:

Both Doc 1A and Doc 1B reference the same PDF signature objects by v_obj identifier (140 0 obj for Borer, 148 0 obj for Browne, 158 0 obj for ESolutions). This means the actual signature byte streams are the same—yet the coverage percentages differ dramatically:

Signer	Doc 1A Coverage	Doc 1B Coverage	Delta
Borer, George (sig_index 1)	37.76%	17.42%	−20.34 pp
Browne, Michael (sig_index 2)	53.36%	24.62%	−28.74 pp
ESolutions (sig_index 3–9)	61.50%	28.38%	−33.12 pp
MCRO Watermark (sig_index 10)	96.79%	98.52%	+1.73 pp

Interpretation: Since the signature v_obj values are identical, the signed byte ranges are the same size. The coverage drop in 1B means the total file size grew substantially after signing. The MCRO Watermark (applied last, in April 2024) shows high coverage in both, confirming it was applied to the already-enlarged file.

All signatures in both documents carry `edits_after_sig_flag = true` except the MCRO Watermark, indicating that every judicial and system signature was followed by additional PDF modifications.

Pair 2 — Additional ESolutions Signature in 2B:

Signer	Doc 2A	Doc 2B
Lamas, Carolina (Judge)	sig_index 1, 2021-04-08 10:49:21, 95.29%	sig_index 1, 2021-04-15 15:07:26, 99.08%
ESolutions Dev Cert Auth	— (absent)	sig_index 2, 2021-04-16 08:46:12, 99.51%
MCRO Watermark	sig_index 2, 2024-04-30 09:02:42, 99.88%	sig_index 3, 2024-04-30 09:07:18, 99.88%

Notable: Doc 2B's ESolutions signature is timestamped 2021-04-16, the day after its filing date of 2021-04-15. Doc 2A (filed 2021-04-08) has no ESolutions signature at all. Only 134 of 4,251 corpus documents contain ESolutions signatures, making this an uncommon feature. The ESolutions signature in 2B carries `edits_after_sig_flag = true`, indicating further modification after this signing event.

Finding 5: XMP Timestamp Alignment and Divergence

Pair 1:

Both documents share identical xmp_create_date (2023-07-13 15:58:23 UTC), confirming a single Word-to-PDF conversion event. The xmp_metadata_date diverges: 1A was last modified at 19:57:12 UTC; 1B at 21:47:53 UTC—approximately 1 hour 51 minutes later. The additional time window is consistent with the +2 revision increments observed in 1B.

Pair 2:

Both documents share identical xmp_create_date (2021-02-20 04:10:13 UTC)—a date approximately 47 days before the first filing (2021-04-08) and 54 days before the second (2021-04-15). This means the Word source document was created in February 2021, then used to generate two different filed PDFs in April 2021 across two different criminal cases.

The xmp_metadata_date values track the filing + signature timeline: 2A's last metadata touch is 2021-04-09 18:12:30 (day after filing); 2B's is 2021-04-16 13:46:13 (day after filing, matching the ESolutions signature timestamp pattern).

Implication: The shared February 2021 creation date for documents filed in two separate criminal cases, combined with the +2 revision count jump and font swap, suggests a template-based workflow where a single Word document was adapted and processed through different automated pipelines for each case.

Finding 6: Document-ID Reuse in Corpus Context

Document_id sharing is a common pattern in this corpus, reflecting template-based document generation in the Minnesota court system:

Pattern	Count	Notes
Unique document_ids (1 doc each)	2,385	56.1% of all docs
Shared document_ids (exactly 2 docs)	220 pairs (440 docs)	10.4% of docs; includes our target pairs
Multi-reuse (3+ docs per document_id)	204 groups (1,660 docs)	39.0% of docs; highest = 38 docs sharing one ID

The most-reused document_ids correspond to common filing types: Order for Conditional Release (38 docs), Order-Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (27 docs), Finding of Incompetency and Order (27 docs). These represent standardized court form templates reused across many cases.

Our target pairs fall in the 2-doc category, meaning their document_ids are not part of large template families. They represent private 1:1 pairings—a single Word file producing exactly two distinct PDF outputs and no more.

Limitations & Alternative Explanations

1. Template Workflow Artifacts: The Minnesota court system uses template-based document generation extensively. The presence of shared document_ids and common font libraries may reflect standard IT workflow rather than targeted manipulation. However, the +2 revision jump pattern, the corpus-unique rev_count=11 and e668b6 font, and the consistent font-swap correlation exceed what typical template reuse would produce.

2. Automated E-Filing Processing: The ESolutions signatures and iText processing stamps indicate automated e-filing infrastructure. Some font additions may be artifacts of the Tyler Technologies / ESolutions filing pipeline. This could explain some revision count increases, though it does not explain why paired documents from the same source file receive different pipeline treatments.

3. Signature Coverage Mechanics: PDF signature coverage percentages depend on the total file size at time of signing and at time of measurement. If the MCRO watermark or extraction process modifies file size differently for different documents, coverage comparisons may be affected. However, the v_obj identity between Pair 1 documents confirms the signature byte ranges themselves are identical.

4. Font Library Variation: The 100+ font counts in Pair 2 documents suggest the Word source file or conversion tool embedded a broad font library. Individual font differences could reflect conversion-time system state (e.g., which fonts were available on the machine at conversion time). The e668b6 font's corpus-uniqueness makes this less likely as an explanation for its presence.

5. Data Completeness: This analysis covers the MCRO forensic database as currently constituted. Documents outside this corpus (other counties, other case types, sealed documents) are not represented. Font hash comparisons are limited to objects extracted and catalogued by the ingestion pipeline.

Recommendations for Follow-Up

- 1. Corpus-Wide Font-Swap Scan:** Search for additional document pairs sharing document_id values where one contains tracking fonts and the other does not. This would determine whether the font-swap pattern observed in Pair 2 is isolated or systemic.
- 2. Revision-Count Correlation with Font Delta:** For all document_id pairs/groups in the corpus, compute the difference in font counts and revision counts between members. Test whether font additions consistently correlate with +2 (or other fixed) revision increments.
- 3. ESolutions Signature Timeline Analysis:** Map all 134 ESolutions-signed documents against their filing dates to determine whether post-filing ESolutions signatures (as seen in Doc 2B) are common or exceptional.
- 4. Tracking Font Content Analysis:** Extract and examine the actual binary content of Tracking-Font-C1 and C2 to determine whether they contain valid glyph data or are placeholder/marker objects. This would clarify whether they serve a functional typographic purpose or a tracking/tagging purpose.
- 5. Cross-Case Template Pipeline Audit:** Investigate the workflow that produced Pair 2's shared Word file (created 2021-02-20) across two separate criminal cases. Determine whether the court system has documented procedures for template-based order generation and whether those procedures account for the observed font and revision variations.
- 6. Byte-Level Diff of Paired Documents:** Perform binary comparison of the actual PDF files for each pair to identify exactly what content was added between revisions. This would definitively determine whether the additional revisions contain only font objects or include other modifications.

Appendix A: Reproducible SQL Queries

All queries below are SELECT-only and can be executed against the MCRO Supabase database for independent verification.

Query 1: Target Document Identification and Metadata

```
SELECT c.evidence_uid, c.case_id, c.filing_type, c.filing_date, c.metadata__xmp_create_date,
c.metadata__xmp_metadata_date, c.metadata__xmp_creator_tool, c.metadata__xmp_producer,
c.metadata__document_id, c.metadata__instance_id, c.size_bytes, c.pdf_page_count, s.rev_count FROM children c LEFT
JOIN (SELECT DISTINCT evidence_uid, rev_count FROM children_signatures_full_report) s ON c.evidence_uid =
s.evidence_uid WHERE c.evidence_uid IN ('evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332','evidence:27-cr-23-
1886:7f55a35d9f19876d','evidence:27-cr-20-20788:9a1814acccc4fabb','evidence:27-cr-20-27550:a0796f7ddbcd10bb')
ORDER BY c.case_id, c.filing_date;
```

Query 2: Revision Count Distribution (All Signed Documents)

```
SELECT rev_count, COUNT(DISTINCT evidence_uid) as doc_count FROM children_signatures_full_report WHERE
rev_count IS NOT NULL GROUP BY rev_count ORDER BY rev_count;
```

Query 3: Tracking Font Corpus Prevalence

```
SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT o.evidence_uid) as docs_with_c1, COUNT(DISTINCT c.case_id) as cases_with_c1,
COUNT(DISTINCT c.cluster_id) as clusters_with_c1, MIN(c.filing_date) as earliest_filing, MAX(c.filing_date) as latest_filing
FROM children_objects o JOIN children c ON o.evidence_uid = c.evidence_uid WHERE o.object_sha256 LIKE '1fa67c75%';
```

Query 4: e668b6 Font Uniqueness Check

```
SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT evidence_uid) as docs_with_e668b6 FROM children_objects WHERE object_sha256 LIKE
'e668b6%';
```

Query 5: Document-ID Collision Analysis

```
WITH collision_stats AS (SELECT metadata__document_id, COUNT(*) as cnt FROM children WHERE
metadata__document_id IS NOT NULL GROUP BY metadata__document_id) SELECT (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM
children) as total_docs, (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM collision_stats WHERE cnt = 1) as unique_doc_ids, (SELECT
COUNT(*) FROM collision_stats WHERE cnt = 2) as pairs, (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM collision_stats WHERE cnt > 2) as
multi_reuse, (SELECT SUM(cnt) FROM collision_stats WHERE cnt > 1) as total_reused_docs;
```

Query 6: Signature Details for Target Documents

```
SELECT evidence_uid, sig_index, signer_name, sign_time_cst_cdt, coverage_pct, rev_count, edits_after_sig_flag, v_obj,
field_name FROM children_signatures_full_report WHERE evidence_uid IN ('evidence:27-cr-23-
1886:db8525dd67737332','evidence:27-cr-23-1886:7f55a35d9f19876d','evidence:27-cr-20-
20788:9a1814acccc4fabb','evidence:27-cr-20-27550:a0796f7ddbcd10bb') ORDER BY evidence_uid, sig_index;
```

Query 7: Target Document-ID Pair Verification

```
SELECT metadata__document_id, COUNT(*) as doc_count, array_agg(evidence_uid ORDER BY filing_date) as  
evidence_uids, array_agg(DISTINCT case_id) as cases FROM children WHERE metadata__document_id IN ('af03a228-  
aeb1-4472-bcad-86c4b1c16418','78ea734e-77dc-410f-b340-fcd5036afb56') GROUP BY metadata__document_id;
```

Query 8: doc_sha256 Values for Provenance

```
SELECT evidence_uid, doc_sha256 FROM children WHERE evidence_uid IN ('evidence:27-cr-23-  
1886:db8525dd67737332','evidence:27-cr-23-1886:7f55a35d9f19876d','evidence:27-cr-20-  
20788:9a1814acccc4fabb','evidence:27-cr-20-27550:a0796f7ddbcd10bb');
```

Appendix B: Document Provenance Identifiers

The following identifiers enable independent verification of every document referenced in this report:

Label	evidence_uid	doc_sha256
Doc 1A	evidence:27-cr-23-1886:db8525dd67737332	db8525dd67737332d2e76891d56eed7c16c8d590ae83a78125c1960ab2163b22
Doc 1B	evidence:27-cr-23-1886:7f55a35d9f19876d	7f55a35d9f19876d7b081395bf8911471b7aa385da1c5dc294892ba945f9e419
Doc 2A	evidence:27-cr-20-20788:9a1814acccc4fabb	9a1814acccc4fabb0a9dc27e7e224cfef82bcaa9fca3126cf3cde40f9076b26
Doc 2B	evidence:27-cr-20-27550:a0796f7ddbcd10bb	a0796f7ddbcd10bbd047aba3a1ed1985deda491778eabad5c679195c12ee4700

— End of Report —