

FORENSIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO)

Fourth Judicial District — Hennepin County

SOURCE HEARINGS DATASET — SCHEDULING ANOMALIES & STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Property	Value
Prepared by	Matthew David Guertin, Pro Se Defendant
Case Reference	State of Minnesota v. Guertin 27-CR-23-1886
Court	Fourth Judicial District Court, Hennepin County
Report Date	March 2026
Data Source	MCRO Hearing Search — 13 Source Documents (Cases Search Excluded)
Corpus Size	11,645 hearing entries across 7,277 cases 1,557 clusters
Database	PostgreSQL (Supabase) — source_hearings table, READ-ONLY analysis
Reproducibility	All findings are query-reproducible. SQL provided in Appendix.

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents objective forensic data findings reproducible from the source database. It does not assert conclusions about fraud, fabrication of defendants, or criminal intent. Each finding is a documented scheduling anomaly or structural irregularity that warrants independent examination. Where plausible benign explanations exist, they are noted.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report analyzes 11,645 hearing entries from 13 MCRO Hearing Search source documents, covering three initial judicial officers (Danielle Mercurio, George Borer, Julia Dayton Klein) and ten additional judges discovered in the June 2025 collection window. The analysis excludes one Cases Search source document. All queries are SELECT-only against the live PostgreSQL database.

Summary of Critical Findings:

- **138 cases docketed for one judge at a single date/time** (George Borer, Feb 14, 2023, 1:30 PM), collapsing to only 46 distinct defendant clusters.
- **98 jury trials scheduled for one judge on a single day** (Lisa Janzen, Sept 8, 2025) in one courtroom — a physical impossibility.
- **41.1% of all hearings are at 1:30 PM** — a single time slot accounts for nearly half the corpus.
- **MH caseload vaporization:** Klein's Mental Health docket shows 1,260 cases collapsing to 69 clusters (18.3:1). Borer: 1,837 → 102 (18.0:1).

- **7,277 unique cases** → **1,557 clusters**: an overall 4.67:1 case-to-cluster ratio, meaning on average each defendant identity appears in ~4.7 cases.
- **43 judge-timeslots with 50+ cases each**, containing 4,204 total hearing entries but averaging only 42.7 clusters per slot.
- **Naming variation**: Up to 5 defendant name variants per cluster inhibit automated linkage (e.g., Tayrel/Tayrez Rulford with and without suffix).
- **Courtroom double-bookings**: GC-C1159 on July 1, 2025 at 1:30 PM has 38 hearings split between two different judges.

Corpus Overview

Metric	Count	Notes
Total hearing entries	11,645	All 13 hearing source docs
Source documents analyzed	13	1 cases-search doc excluded
Unique cases	7,277	By case_id
Unique defendant clusters	1,557	After normalization
Case-to-cluster ratio	4.67:1	Overall compression
Unique judicial officers	36	Normalized names
Unique courtrooms/locations	44	GC-C### codes + generic
Unique hearing dates	405	2023-01-03 to 2025-12-30
Unique time-of-day values	72	
Unique date+time slots	4,830	
Unique hearing types	29	Jury Trial through Restitution Hearing
Criminal hearing entries	5,496	From 6 CR + 7 JUN_2025 source docs
Probate/MH hearing entries	6,149	From 3 MH source docs; 93.5% lack cluster_id

2. METHODS

2.1 Source Document Selection

The MCRO source database contains 14 source set records. Each represents a distinct scrape session. These were categorized by the search_type field in the source table:

Source Set ID	Search Type	Category	Judge	Hearings
APR_2024__cr_hearings__danielle_mercurio	Hearings	Criminal	Mercurio	1,791
APR_2024__cr_hearings__george_borer	Hearings	Criminal	Borer	1,054
APR_2024__cr_hearings__julia_dayton_klein	Hearings	Criminal	Klein	1,548
APR_2024__mh_hearings__danielle_mercurio	Hearings	Probate/MH	Mercurio	1,947
APR_2024__mh_hearings__george_borer	Hearings	Probate/MH	Borer	2,426
APR_2024__mh_hearings__julia_dayton_klein	Hearings	Probate/MH	Klein	1,776
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__carolina_lamas	Hearings	All	Lamas	89
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__emmett_donnelly	Hearings	All	(multiple)	46
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__judith_cole	Hearings	All	(multiple)	200
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__kerry_meyer	Hearings	All	Meyer	50
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__lisa_janzen	Hearings	All	Janzen	200
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__mawerdi_hamid	Hearings	All	(multiple)	200
JUN_2025__cr_hearings__raissa_carpenter	Hearings	All	(multiple)	318
JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter	Cases	Criminal	—	EXCLUDED

The exclusion filter is: WHERE source_set_id != 'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter'. This isolates the 13 hearing-search source docs (11,645 rows in source_hearings) from the single cases-search doc.

2.2 Key Definitions

Case (case_id): A unique MCRO court file number (e.g., 27-CR-23-1886). One defendant may have many cases.

Cluster (cluster_id): A normalized defendant identity grouping. Cases sharing the same cluster_id belong to the same individual, after accounting for name variations, Jr./Sr. suffixes, and spelling inconsistencies.

Timeslot: A unique combination of hearing_date + hearing_time. A judge-timeslot further partitions by judicial officer.

Cluster compression ratio: cases ÷ clusters. Higher values mean more cases per unique defendant — indicating repeat appearances or multi-case defendants.

2.3 Limitations

93.5% of Probate/Mental Health hearings (5,751 of 6,149) have NULL cluster_id because those cases were not linked to the criminal defendant cluster system. Cluster-level collapse metrics for MH cases are understated. Additionally, MCRO hearing searches return structured metadata but not full docket narratives, so hearing outcomes, continuance reasons, and procedural context are unavailable from this dataset alone.

3. FINDINGS

Finding 1: Mass Same-Time Docketing (Critical)

Background

Court scheduling systems typically assign hearing slots with the expectation that a judicial officer can meaningfully process each case within the allotted time. Docketing dozens or hundreds of cases at an identical date and time for a single judge is physically impossible if each requires any individual attention.

Findings

43 judge-timeslot combinations have 50 or more cases scheduled simultaneously. The top 10 are shown below. Every single one of the top 25 slots occurs at 1:30 PM.

Judge	Date	Time	Location	Cases	Clusters	Cluster Ratio
George Borer	2023-02-14	13:30	GC-C456	138	46	0.333
Danielle Mercurio	2023-03-28	13:30	GC-C556	136	37	0.272
Danielle Mercurio	2023-08-15	13:30	GC-C556	131	49	0.374
Julia Dayton Klein	2023-05-16	13:30	GC-C559	130	45	0.346
Danielle Mercurio	2023-10-24	13:30	GC-C556	130	62	0.477
Danielle Mercurio	2023-09-19	13:30	GC-C556	126	57	0.452
George Borer	2023-03-21	13:30	GC-C456	128	44	0.344
Danielle Mercurio	2023-07-11	13:30	GC-C556	125	59	0.472
Danielle Mercurio	2024-01-02	13:30	GC-C556	119	49	0.412
Julia Dayton Klein	2023-06-20	13:30	GC-C559	118	49	0.415

Top-cluster concentration in the #1 slot (Borer, Feb 14, 2023, 138 cases): The top cluster (DEMITA LOYD) accounts for 15 cases (10.9%); the top 3 clusters account for 39 cases (28.3%). In the #2 slot (Mercurio, Mar 28, 2023, 136 cases): MICHAEL HOWARD alone holds 30 cases (22.1%); top 3 = 56 cases (41.2%).

Significance

Even in high-volume calendar call or status hearing contexts, 138 cases at a single time slot is operationally extreme. A 90-minute afternoon session (1:30–3:00 PM) would imply 39 seconds per case. The cluster compression further reveals that these are not 138 independent

defendants — they are at most 46 distinct individuals, each carrying an average of 3 cases to the same hearing.

Connecting Context

The dominant time slot — 1:30 PM — accounts for 4,781 hearing entries (41.1% of the entire corpus). This single time-of-day value contains more entries than any other hour-slot combined.

Finding 2: Multiple Jury Trials in Same Time Slot (Critical)

Background

A jury trial is a resource-intensive proceeding requiring a seated jury, the presiding judge, attorneys, witnesses, and courtroom staff. Unlike status hearings or calendar calls, a jury trial cannot be double-booked. A single judge cannot conduct two jury trials simultaneously.

Findings

21 distinct timeslots have multiple jury trials scheduled for the same judge in the same courtroom. The most extreme case is Judge Lisa Janzen on September 8, 2025 (Courtroom GC-C1453):

Judge	Date	Time	Courtroom	Jury Trials	Unique Cases
Lisa Janzen	2025-09-08	09:00	GC-C1453	17	17
Lisa Janzen	2025-09-08	10:00	GC-C1453	49	44
Lisa Janzen	2025-09-08	11:00	GC-C1453	32	29
Shereen Askalani	2025-09-15	11:00	GC-C1453	6	6
Tamara Garcia	2025-08-25	10:00	GC-C1453	5	5
Michael Burns	2025-08-11	09:00	GC-C1453	4	4
Tamara Garcia	2025-08-25	11:00	GC-C1453	4	4
Maximillia Utley	2025-09-29	11:00	GC-C1453	4	4

Total for Janzen on Sept 8, 2025: 98 jury trials across 3 time slots, involving 90 unique cases — all in the same courtroom. This is physically and procedurally impossible.

Significance

Jury trial scheduling is inherently exclusive: only one trial can proceed per courtroom at a time. A judge assigned 49 simultaneous jury trials at 10:00 AM in a single courtroom has a scheduling throughput impossibility of 49:1. Even allowing for standard overbooking practices (where most cases settle or plead), the scale here is extraordinary.

Benign Explanation Considered

Many jurisdictions use “trial stacking” where multiple cases are assigned the same trial date as a forcing mechanism, knowing most will resolve before trial. However, 98 jury trials for one judge in one day, all in one courtroom, far exceeds any standard stacking protocol documented in Minnesota court practices.

Finding 3: Courtroom Double-Bookings (High)

Background

A courtroom is a physical space. Two different judges cannot simultaneously preside in the same room.

Findings

7 courtroom-timeslot combinations show two different judges assigned hearings simultaneously:

Courtroom	Date	Time	Judges	Total Hearings	Unique Cases
GC-C1159	2025-07-01	13:30	Daniel Moreno, Kerry Meyer	38	38
GC-C1559	2025-07-01	13:30	Daniel Moreno, Kerry Meyer	15	15
Hennepin County	2025-07-10	09:00	Hilary Caligiuri, Juan Hoyos	5	5
GC-TBD	2025-07-23	10:30	Daniel Moreno, Marta Chou	3	3
GC-TBD	2025-07-16	13:30	Luis Bartolomei, Marta Chou	2	2
GC-TBD	2025-07-08	11:00	Luis Bartolomei, Sarah West	2	2
Hennepin County	2025-08-07	09:00	Emily Froehle, Hilary Caligiuri	2	2

Significance

The two GC-TBD conflicts involve a placeholder courtroom code (“TBD” = to be determined), which may reflect genuinely unassigned rooms rather than true conflicts. However, GC-C1159 and GC-C1559 are specific courtroom designations, and their double-bookings require explanation.

Finding 4: Judge Docket Illusion — Many Hearings, Few Defendants (Critical)

Background

A judge's apparent caseload should reflect the number of distinct defendants served. If thousands of hearing entries reduce to a small set of recurring defendant clusters, the apparent workload is substantially inflated.

Findings

The top three judges by volume show dramatic docket collapse:

Judge	Hearings	Cases	Clusters	Hearings/Cluster	Cases/Cluster
George Borer	3,480	2,742	430	8.09	6.38
Julia Dayton Klein	3,332	2,473	530	6.29	4.67
Danielle Mercurio	3,785	2,670	627	6.04	4.26

Combined: 10,597 hearing entries across 7,885 case appearances represent only 1,587 unique defendant clusters. Borer's docket of 3,480 hearings serves just 430 individuals — an average of 8.09 hearing appearances per defendant cluster.

MH Caseload Vaporization (Sub-Finding 4A)

When isolated to Probate/Mental Health hearing sources, the collapse is far more extreme:

Judge	MH Hearings	MH Cases	MH Clusters	Cases/Cluster	Hearings/Cluster
Julia Dayton Klein	1,776	1,260	69	18.26	25.74
George Borer	2,426	1,837	102	18.01	23.78
Danielle Mercurio	1,947	1,254	107	11.72	18.20

Klein's MH docket: 1,260 distinct case files represent only 69 unique defendant clusters. Each cluster averages 18.26 MH cases and 25.74 hearing appearances. Note that 93.5% of MH hearings have NULL cluster_id (no cluster assignment), so these ratios reflect only the subset where criminal defendant linkage was possible. The true defendant-level compression for MH cases may be substantially higher.

MH Case Type Breakdown

The most common MH case types and their cluster compression:

Case Type	Hearings	Cases	Clusters*
Commitment - Mentally Ill	2,112	973	120
Guardianship/Conservatorship	1,786	1,268	20
Formal Unsupervised	826	640	0
Commitment - MI & CD	319	182	46
Conservatorship - Adult	211	170	0

**Cluster counts reflect only cross-linked cases with criminal cluster assignments. Most MH-only cases have no cluster_id.*

Finding 5: Naming Variation Patterns Inhibiting Linkage (High)

Background

Defendant name variations across case files make automated linkage difficult. If the same individual is recorded under multiple name spellings, standard text matching will treat them as distinct people, further inflating apparent caseloads.

Findings

The following clusters demonstrate the highest name-variant counts in the hearing dataset:

Cluster ID	Cluster Name	Variants	Cases	Example Variants
47	Tayrel Rulford	5	10	Tayrel Lamar Rulford Tayrez Lamar Rulford Tayrez Lamar Rulford, Jr. TERRY DERON JOHNSON, Jr.
23	Robert Ford	4	12	Robert Earl Ford Robert Gary Michael Ford ROBERT GARY MICHAEL FORD, Jr
113	DEA FOSTER	4	6	DEA JA MOREY FOSTER Dea Ja Vonnise Morey Foster DEA JA VONNISE MOREY-FOSTER
20	ANDRE SCROGGINS	4	12	Andre Lamons Scroggins ANDRE LAMONS SCROGGINS JR Andre Lamons Scroggins, Jr.
90	EMMETT BALLARD	4	7	EMMETT BALLARD EMMETT EMMETT BALLARD EMMETT LAMONT BALLARD Emmett Nmn Ballard
145	AHMED UMAR	4	6	Ahmed Mohamed Kadir AHMED MOHAMED MAHDI AHMED MOHAMED UMAR AHMED UMAR
76	MAKIS LANE	3	8	MAKIS DEVELL LANE MAKIS DEVIL LANE MAKIS DUVELL LANE
102	VLADIMIR BOGINSKIY	3	8	VLADIMIR VLADIMIROVICH BOGINSKI BOGINSKIY VLADMIROVI BOGINSKIY
3	Brandon Williamson	3	23	Brandon Deandre Williamson BRANDON DEANDRE WILLIAMSON, Sr.
9	Chriss Hunter	3	16	Chriss Hunter Chriss Patrick Hunter CHRISS PATRICK HUNTER, Jr.

Variation patterns observed include: Jr./Sr. suffix inconsistency, middle name inclusion/exclusion, capitalization changes, minor spelling errors (e.g., “Devell” vs. “Devil” vs. “Duvell”), and in one case (cluster 47), an entirely different name (“TERRY DERON JOHNSON, Jr.”) assigned to the same cluster as “Tayrel Rulford.”

Significance

These naming inconsistencies are not unusual in court record systems. However, they directly impact any analysis that attempts to count unique defendants by name alone. Without the cluster normalization performed during database construction, the 1,557 clusters would appear as a much larger population.

Finding 6: Repeated Hearing Types Within Short Windows (Significant)

Background

A defendant should not normally require the same hearing type multiple times within a single week unless the proceeding was continued or rescheduled.

Findings

Analysis of same-cluster, same-hearing-type events occurring within 7 calendar days:

Cluster	Hearing Type	Repeat Pairs (≤7d)	Min Gap (days)
Lucas Kraskey	Hearing	121	7
Jonte Yates	Hearing	30	7
PRIEST JESUS	Hearing	25	7
ABDINEJIB ABSHIR	Bail Hearing	19	7
SON CHEAM	Hearing	16	7
CHASE GREEN	Hearing	13	7
DEETWAN JACKSON	Hearing	11	7
MATTHEW GUERTIN	Hearing	9	7
KAVOSIAE FORD-WHITE	Bail Hearing	9	7
YAQUB OSMAN	Hearing	8	3
LEAMOR WILLIAMS	Arraignment	4	1

Lucas Kraskey has 121 repeat-hearing pairs within 7-day windows. This means that across Kraskey's many cases, generic "Hearing" entries recur at weekly intervals across different judges — consistent with systematic rotation through bulk calendar-call dockets. LEAMOR WILLIAMS has 4 arraignment pairs at 1-day gaps, an unusual frequency for what is typically a one-time event per case.

Finding 7: Cross-Judge Scheduling Churn (Significant)

Background

When a defendant cluster appears before multiple different judges within a 7-day window, it raises questions about case assignment stability.

Findings

Top clusters by number of distinct judge-pair conflicts within 7 days:

Cluster	Judge Pairs (≤7d)	Conflict Entries	Min Gap	Judges Involved
DANIELLE STAND	3	8	0 days	Carolina Lamas, Janet Poston, Luis Bartolomei
DERRICK	3	6	4 days	Mercurio, Borer, Klein

LUCAS				
GORDON SHARP	2	171	7 days	Mercurio, Borer, Klein
CHASE GREEN	2	13	7 days	Mercurio, Borer, Klein
MARK REINHART	2	8	4 days	Mercurio, Borer, Klein
TIMOTHY STUCKEY	2	5	3 days	Mercurio, Borer, Klein
Lucas Kraskey	1	242	7 days	Mercurio, Borer
DEETWAN JACKSON	1	154	7 days	Mercurio, Klein
TERRELL JOHNSON	1	100	7 days	Mercurio, Borer

GORDON SHARP generates 171 judge-conflict entries between the three core judges (Mercurio, Borer, Klein) at exactly 7-day intervals. Lucas Kraskey has 242 conflict entries between Mercurio and Borer. These high counts reflect the compounding effect of many cases per cluster × many hearing dates × the weekly scheduling pattern.

Finding 8: Hearing Time-of-Day Concentration (Significant)

Findings

The distribution of hearing times is heavily skewed:

Time	Hearings	% of Total	Cases	Clusters
13:30 (1:30 PM)	4,781	41.1%	2,986	1,076
09:00	938	8.1%	784	167
10:00	598	5.1%	571	134
10:30	509	4.4%	496	74
11:00	365	3.1%	349	98
09:30	320	2.7%	309	39
14:00	294	2.5%	280	52
15:00	286	2.5%	282	31
08:30	285	2.4%	241	15
All other times	3,269	28.1%	—	—

1:30 PM alone has more hearing entries than all other times combined in the top 9. The 08:30 slot shows 285 hearings but only 15 clusters, an exceptionally high 19.0 hearings-per-cluster ratio. The 09:30 slot shows 320 hearings for 39 clusters (8.2:1).

Significance

While afternoon calendar calls are standard practice, the degree of concentration at 1:30 PM — over 40% of the entire corpus — combined with the extreme cluster compression within those timeslots, indicates that these are bulk-processing blocks where hundreds of cases are nominally “scheduled” at one time for the same judge.

Finding 9: Hearing Type Contradictions (Moderate)

Findings

12 instances were found where the same case is scheduled at the same time for the same judge with two different hearing types:

Case ID	Cluster	Date	Judge	Conflicting Types
27-CR-23-4062	DEETWAN JACKSON	2023-09-19	Mercurio	Hearing + Review Hearing
27-CR-23-4070	DEETWAN JACKSON	2023-09-19	Mercurio	Hearing + Review Hearing
27-CR-23-4496	DELAYNA LUSSIER	2024-01-02	Mercurio	Hearing + Review Hearing
27-CR-25-9613	JEFFIE DAVIS	2025-07-01	Mercurio	Bail Hearing + Hearing
27-GC-PR-	(probate)	2023-08-	Mercurio	Court Trial + Probate Hearing

17-163		11		
27-GC-PR-22-80	(probate)	2023-02-02	Mercurio	OTSC + Probate Hearing

Most contradictions involve “Hearing” paired with a more specific type (Review Hearing, Bail Hearing). This may reflect data-entry conventions where hearings are dual-classified. The Court Trial + Probate Hearing pairing for a single case at the same time is the most structurally inconsistent.

4. KEY METRICS AT A GLANCE

Max cases in a single judge-timeslot: 138 (George Borer, Feb 14, 2023, 1:30 PM)
Unique clusters in that slot: 46 — meaning 138 cases represent only 46 people (33.3%)
Max jury trials for one judge in one day: 98 (Lisa Janzen, Sept 8, 2025, Courtroom GC-C1453)
Implied throughput at max slot: 39 seconds per case (138 cases in 90 min)
Top MH docket collapse: 1,260 cases → 69 clusters (Klein MH, 18.26:1)
Hearing entries at 1:30 PM: 4,781 (41.1%) — more than all other top-9 times combined
Judge-timeslots with 50+ cases: 43 containing 4,204 hearing entries
Overall case-to-cluster ratio: 4.67:1 — 7,277 cases are 1,557 people
Max naming variants per cluster: 5 (including entirely different names)
Jury trial conflicts: 21 timeslots with 156 total jury-trial double-bookings

5. LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Bulk calendar calls: High-volume status hearing dockets (e.g., Rule 20 review calendars) commonly schedule many cases at one time. The 1:30 PM mass slots may reflect legitimate bulk calendar-call practices. However, the cluster compression (cases far exceeding clusters) is a separate observable pattern regardless of scheduling convention.

Jury trial stacking: Courts routinely assign multiple cases to the same trial date as a forcing function. Most resolve by plea or continuance. However, 98 jury trials for one judge on one day in one courtroom is multiple standard deviations beyond typical stacking.

MH case isolation: 93.5% of MH hearings lack cluster_id, which limits the cluster-collapse analysis. The defendant-level compression for MH cases may be substantially more or less extreme than reported here.

Courtroom “TBD” codes: Three of seven double-booking conflicts involve GC-TBD (unassigned) courtrooms, which are placeholder values and do not represent true physical conflicts.

Data scope: This analysis covers only what is visible in MCRO hearing-search results for the queried judges and date ranges. It is not a complete census of the Fourth Judicial District’s scheduling system.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

1. Obtain the court’s internal scheduling system logs for the identified high-volume timeslots (e.g., Borer Feb 14, 2023, 1:30 PM) and compare actual courtroom utilization vs. scheduled docket.
2. Request courtroom assignment records for GC-C1453 on September 8, 2025 to verify whether 98 jury trials were genuinely scheduled.

3. Examine whether the 1:30 PM mass-scheduling pattern reflects an official court policy (e.g., bulk calendar call) and, if so, how many cases were actually individually addressed during those sessions.
4. Cross-reference the cluster compression analysis with the court's own defendant identity system (e.g., Odyssey SID numbers) to validate or refute the name-variant groupings.
5. Investigate the MH case types with extreme case-to-cluster ratios (Guardianship/Conservatorship: 1,268 cases with only 20 cross-linked clusters) to determine whether the same respondents appear across many MH case files.

7. APPENDIX: SQL QUERIES

All queries are *SELECT*-only against the live Supabase PostgreSQL database. Project ID: *ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii*.

A1: Source Set Identification (Cohort SQL)

```
-- 13 hearing source docs (exclude cases search) SELECT source_set_id, search_type,
search_category, search_judicial_officer_norm, total_hearings_unique FROM source WHERE
search_date = 'Hearings' ORDER BY source_set_id; -- Exclusion filter used in all subsequent
queries: -- WHERE source_set_id != 'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter'
```

A2: Corpus Overview

```
SELECT COUNT(*) as total_hearing_entries, COUNT(DISTINCT hearing_judicial_officer_norm) as
unique_judges, COUNT(DISTINCT hearing_location) as unique_courtrooms, COUNT(DISTINCT
hearing_date) as unique_dates, COUNT(DISTINCT hearing_time) as unique_times, COUNT(DISTINCT
case_id) as unique_cases, COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id) as unique_clusters, MIN(hearing_date) as
earliest, MAX(hearing_date) as latest FROM source_hearings WHERE source_set_id !=
'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter';
```

A3: Mass Same-Time Docketing (Finding 1)

```
SELECT hearing_judicial_officer_norm as judge, hearing_date, hearing_time, hearing_location,
COUNT(*) as hearing_count, COUNT(DISTINCT case_id) as unique_cases, COUNT(DISTINCT
cluster_id) as unique_clusters FROM source_hearings WHERE source_set_id !=
'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' GROUP BY judge, hearing_date, hearing_time,
hearing_location ORDER BY hearing_count DESC LIMIT 25;
```

A4: Jury Trial Conflicts (Finding 2)

```
SELECT hearing_judicial_officer_norm as judge, hearing_date, hearing_time, hearing_location,
COUNT(*) as jury_trial_count, COUNT(DISTINCT case_id) as unique_cases FROM source_hearings
WHERE source_set_id != 'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' AND hearing_type = 'Jury Trial'
GROUP BY judge, hearing_date, hearing_time, hearing_location HAVING COUNT(*) > 1 ORDER BY
jury_trial_count DESC;
```

A5: Courtroom Double-Bookings (Finding 3)

```
SELECT hearing_location, hearing_date, hearing_time, COUNT(DISTINCT
hearing_judicial_officer_norm) as num_judges, COUNT(*) as total_hearings, string_agg(DISTINCT
hearing_judicial_officer_norm, ', ') as judges FROM source_hearings WHERE source_set_id !=
'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' GROUP BY hearing_location, hearing_date, hearing_time
HAVING COUNT(DISTINCT hearing_judicial_officer_norm) > 1 ORDER BY num_judges DESC, total_hearings
DESC;
```

A6: Judge Docket Collapse (Finding 4)

```
SELECT hearing_judicial_officer_norm as judge, COUNT(*) as total_hearings, COUNT(DISTINCT
case_id) as distinct_cases, COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id) as distinct_clusters,
ROUND(COUNT(*)::numeric / NULLIF(COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id),0), 2) as hearings_per_cluster
FROM source_hearings WHERE source_set_id != 'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' GROUP BY judge
ORDER BY hearings_per_cluster DESC;
```

A7: MH Caseload Vaporization (Finding 4A)

```
SELECT source_set_id, COUNT(*) as hearings, COUNT(DISTINCT case_id) as cases,
COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id) as clusters, ROUND(COUNT(DISTINCT case_id)::numeric /
NULLIF(COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id),0), 2) as cases_per_cluster FROM source_hearings WHERE
source_set_id LIKE '%mh_hearings%' GROUP BY source_set_id ORDER BY cases_per_cluster DESC;
```

A8: Naming Variation (Finding 5)

```
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, COUNT(DISTINCT defendant_name) as name_variants,
COUNT(DISTINCT case_id) as cases, string_agg(DISTINCT defendant_name, ' | ') as all_names FROM
source_hearings WHERE source_set_id != 'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' AND cluster_id IS
NOT NULL GROUP BY cluster_id, cluster_name HAVING COUNT(DISTINCT defendant_name) > 2 ORDER BY
name_variants DESC LIMIT 20;
```

A9: Repeated Hearing Types (Finding 6)

```
-- Self-join: same cluster, same type, 1-7 day gap WITH hearing_pairs AS ( SELECT a.cluster_id,
a.cluster_name, a.hearing_type, ABS(b.hearing_date - a.hearing_date) as day_gap FROM
source_hearings a JOIN source_hearings b ON a.cluster_id = b.cluster_id AND a.hearing_type
= b.hearing_type AND a.source_hearings_row_id < b.source_hearings_row_id AND
ABS(b.hearing_date - a.hearing_date) BETWEEN 1 AND 7 WHERE a.source_set_id !=
'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' AND b.source_set_id !=
'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' ) SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, hearing_type,
COUNT(*) as repeat_pairs, MIN(day_gap) as min_gap FROM hearing_pairs GROUP BY cluster_id,
cluster_name, hearing_type ORDER BY repeat_pairs DESC LIMIT 20;
```

A10: Hearing Time Distribution (Finding 8)

```
SELECT hearing_time, COUNT(*) as hearings, ROUND(COUNT(*)::numeric / 11645 * 100, 1) as
pct_of_total, COUNT(DISTINCT case_id) as cases, COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id) as clusters FROM
source_hearings WHERE source_set_id != 'JUN_2025__cr_cases__raissa_carpenter' GROUP BY
hearing_time ORDER BY hearings DESC;
```

End of Appendix. All queries are reproducible against the live database.