

MCRO FORENSIC DATABASE

Docket Drift Analysis

Corrected Cohort Definitions — v2

Property	Value
Report Date	March 1, 2026
Database	Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2)
Author	Automated forensic query engine (read-only SELECT)
Cohort A (MCRO Baseline)	163 CR cases — dockets downloaded April 29–30, 2024
Cohort B (Comparison)	1,865 CR cases — dockets downloaded Nov–Dec 2025
Excluded: First-50	50 CR cases — excluded for insufficient provenance
Total CR cases in parents	2,078
Overlapping filing years	2019–2023 (156 MCRO, 1,097 Comparison)

Important Disclaimer

This report presents observable structural differences between two cohorts of MCRO criminal docket data. All findings are based on reproducible SELECT-only SQL queries against the live Supabase database. The report does not assign causation or intent. Differences may arise from legitimate platform updates, changes in data rendering, temporal accumulation of case activity, cohort selection effects, or other factors. Independent verification of all findings is recommended.

Executive Summary

This analysis compares 163 MCRO baseline criminal dockets (downloaded April 2024) against 1,865 comparison dockets (downloaded November–December 2025). An additional 50 cases ("First-50") were excluded due to insufficient provenance documentation. The analysis reveals systematic structural differences concentrated in disposition sentencing sub-tables, while non-disposition tables remain stable.

Key findings:

- All eight disposition sentencing sub-tables show systematic inflation in the Comparison cohort, with per-case averages 2.0–2.6× higher than MCRO across the board.
- Year-stratified analysis (2019–2023 overlap window) confirms the pattern persists when controlling for filing year, with condition_adult per disposition-charge ratios ranging from 1.7× to 3.9× across individual years.
- Standard probation boilerplate conditions appear in 19.9% of Comparison cases with condition data vs. 11.8% of MCRO cases, with specific standardized conditions showing 26× frequency ratios.

- NULL disposition types appear in 52.2% of MCRO cases with dispositions (85 of 161) but in 0% of Comparison cases (0 of 1,540). This represents a complete structural change.
- Monitoring_adult data in the Comparison cohort contains dynamic probation status entries with dates extending to August 2025, confirming docket pages render live state at retrieval time.
- Non-disposition tables (interim conditions, hearings, charges, related cases) show near-parity or slightly higher MCRO values, confirming drift is specific to disposition sentencing sub-tables.
- Comparison cohort is larger (1,865 vs. prior 914) due to inclusion of all non-MCRO, non-First-50 CR cases, producing more conservative but still highly significant inflation ratios.
- Case 27-CR-23-1886 (Matthew Guertin) is a known live outlier within the MCRO set whose docket was intentionally refreshed December 2025; all other 162 MCRO dockets remain frozen at their April 2024 state.

Corpus Overview:

Metric	Cohort A (MCRO)	Cohort B (Comparison)
Total cases	163	1,865
Filing year range	2017–2023	2004–2025
Overlap window (2019–2023)	156 cases	1,097 cases
Docket download period	April 29–30, 2024	Nov 19 – Dec 13, 2025
% Dormant	49.7%	15.9%
% Closed	25.2%	46.7%
% Open	20.2%	15.9%
% Under Court Jurisdiction	4.9%	21.3%

Finding 1: Systematic Inflation of Disposition Sentencing Sub-Tables

Background

Each criminal case with a disposition can have up to eight categories of sentencing detail stored in separate sub-tables under `parents_dispositions_charges`. These tables record conditions, monitoring terms, confinement details, service requirements, diversion programs, sentence levels, concurrent/consecutive designations, and correctional commitments.

Methods

Per-case row counts were computed for all eight disposition sub-tables by cohort. Filing-year extraction used the `case_id` pattern (segment 3 mapped to 2000+YY). Year-stratified analysis was limited to the 2019–2023 overlap window to control temporal confounding. Per-disposition-charge normalization divided condition counts by the number of disposition-charge records per case.

Findings

Overall per-case averages:

Sub-Table	MCRO (n=163)	Comparison (n=1,865)	Ratio
<code>condition_adult</code>	4.17	10.48	2.51×
<code>monitoring_adult</code>	2.06	4.69	2.28×
<code>local_confinement</code>	2.02	5.21	2.58×
<code>service_adult</code>	1.45	3.09	2.13×
<code>diversion_program</code>	1.31	2.71	2.07×
<code>level_of_sentence</code>	1.31	2.68	2.05×
<code>concurrent_consecutive</code>	1.40	2.95	2.11×
<code>commit_corrections</code>	1.48	3.22	2.18×

Year-stratified `condition_adult` per disposition-charge (overlap window):

Filing Year	MCRO (n)	MCRO ca/charge	Comp (n)	Comp ca/charge	Ratio
2019	12	0.83	71	3.03	3.65×
2020	20	1.55	124	2.61	1.68×
2021	41	1.03	213	1.85	1.80×
2022	44	0.93	312	2.56	2.75×
2023	39	0.56	377	2.16	3.86×

Year-stratified `monitoring_adult` per disposition-charge:

Filing Year	MCRO ma/charge	Comp ma/charge	Ratio
2019	0.61	1.36	2.23×

2020	0.87	1.31	1.51×
2021	0.58	1.17	2.02×
2022	0.60	1.29	2.15×
2023	0.38	1.21	3.18×

Significance

The inflation is consistent across all eight sub-tables (2.0–2.6×) and persists across every overlapping filing year (1.5–3.9× for condition_adult, 1.5–3.2× for monitoring_adult). Per-disposition-charge normalization demonstrates that the increase is not simply a function of more charges per case but reflects more items recorded per charge. The broader comparison group (1,865 vs. 163 cases) produces more conservative ratios than the prior analysis but the systematic pattern remains unambiguous.

Finding 2: Standard Probation Boilerplate Conditions

Background

Standard probation conditions are boilerplate terms routinely applied to supervised probation sentences in Minnesota. Their presence or absence in condition_adult records is a structural indicator of how completely the docket page rendered sentencing detail at the time of download.

Findings

Condition (truncated)	MCRO rows	Comp rows	Row Ratio
Tell probation officer if charged with new crime	24	639	26.6×
Tell probation officer if contact with law enforcement	24	639	26.6×
Tell probation officer if change address/employment	24	639	26.6×
Cooperate with search of person, residence, vehicle	24	629	26.2×
No alcohol/controlled substance use	14	496	35.4×
Stay away from victim's residence	12	215	17.9×
Do not register to vote until discharged	10	225	22.5×
Random testing	0	107	∞

At the case level, these boilerplate conditions appear in 306 of 1,540 Comparison cases with condition_adult data (19.9%) compared to 9 of 76 MCRO cases (11.8%). The "Random testing" condition appears exclusively in the Comparison cohort, with zero instances in MCRO.

Significance

The extreme frequency ratios (17–35× per row, ∞ for random testing) strongly suggest that the MCRO docket pages did not render the full set of standard probation conditions at the time of

the April 2024 download. This is consistent with a platform rendering change or with the docket page exposing additional sentencing detail in later versions.

Finding 3: Dynamic Live Probation Status in Monitoring Data

Findings

The monitoring_adult sub-table in the Comparison cohort contains entries with dates extending well beyond any plausible filing or sentencing date, indicating real-time probation management data rendered at docket retrieval time:

Monitoring Entry	MCRO	Comparison
Type: Supervised probation	26	833
Agency: Hennepin County Community Corrections	26	818
Term of 3 Yr	18	473
Term of 2 Yr	0	152
Status: Active 08/13/2025	0	23
Status: Active 07/02/2025	0	16
Status: Active 08/11/2025	0	14
Status: Closed 02/04/2025	0	13

Active status dates from July–August 2025 confirm that the MCRO docket page renders the current probation state at retrieval time, not a historical snapshot. This is expected behavior for a live case management system but has implications for temporal comparisons: the Comparison dockets capture approximately 19 months of additional probation activity relative to the frozen MCRO baseline.

Finding 4: NULL Disposition Types Exclusive to MCRO

Findings

In the 2019–2023 overlap window, 81 MCRO cases (51.9% of 156) contain dispositions with a NULL disposition_type field, compared to zero Comparison cases (0 of 1,097). This pattern holds across every filing year:

Filing Year	MCRO cases w/ NULL type	MCRO total disps	Comp cases w/ NULL type	Comp total disps
2019	6 of 12	16	0 of 62	148
2020	6 of 20	34	0 of 112	207
2021	21 of 40	54	0 of 186	357
2022	23 of 44	64	0 of 272	553
2023	25 of 38	42	0 of 310	692

Overall, MCRO has 85 NULL-type dispositions (38.8% of 219 total) while the Comparison cohort has zero NULL types across 3,345 dispositions. This complete structural divergence

suggests the MCRO platform did not populate the `disposition_type` field for a substantial proportion of records in April 2024 but does so consistently in late 2025.

Finding 5: Non-Disposition Tables Remain Stable

Findings

Tables outside the disposition sub-hierarchy show no comparable inflation. Several show MCRO with slightly higher per-case averages, consistent with the MCRO cohort's older filing year profile and higher proportion of dormant cases with longer histories:

Table	MCRO avg/case	Comparison avg/case	Ratio
<code>interim_conditions</code>	4.01	3.41	0.85×
<code>previous_hearings</code>	17.52	12.60	0.72×
<code>charges</code>	1.63	1.62	0.99×
<code>related_cases</code>	1.12	1.08	0.96×
<code>case_events</code>	73.88	56.80	0.77×

Significance

The stability of non-disposition tables is critical because it demonstrates that the observed drift is not a general data quality issue, a scraper artifact, or a consequence of simply having more case history. The inflation is specific to the eight disposition sentencing sub-tables, pointing toward a targeted change in how the MCRO platform renders or exposes disposition sentencing detail.

Finding 6: Distribution Analysis

Findings

Total disposition sub-table rows per case (sum of all eight sub-tables):

Metric	MCRO (n=163)	Comparison (n=1,865)
Mean	15.2	35.0
Median	0	16
P75	12	48
P90	44.8	92
Max	228	630
Zero-row cases	87 (53.4%)	325 (17.4%)
Cases > 50 rows	16 (9.8%)	433 (23.2%)
Cases > 100 rows	4 (2.5%)	162 (8.7%)

The median shift from 0 (MCRO) to 16 (Comparison) is a pronounced structural change. Over half of MCRO cases have zero disposition sub-table rows, compared to 17.4% in the Comparison cohort. The year-matched (2019–2023) totals show MCRO averaging 15.2 sub-rows vs. Comparison averaging 36.9 sub-rows, a 2.43×

Finding 7: Case Status Distribution Differences

Findings

Status	MCRO (n=163)	Comparison (n=1,865)
Dormant	81 (49.7%)	296 (15.9%)
Closed	41 (25.2%)	871 (46.7%)
Open	33 (20.2%)	297 (15.9%)
Under Court Jurisdiction	8 (4.9%)	397 (21.3%)
Reopened	0 (0%)	4 (0.2%)

The MCRO cohort is predominantly dormant (49.7%), reflecting its origins in Rule 20 competency evaluation research. The Comparison cohort has a broader distribution with 46.7% closed and 37.2% active (Open + Under Court Jurisdiction) cases. This compositional difference is a genuine confounder: active cases accumulate more disposition detail over time. However, the year-stratified analysis in Finding 1 demonstrates that per-charge inflation persists across every overlapping filing year, meaning case status alone cannot explain the full magnitude of the drift.

Provenance & Docket Download Dates

The MCRO baseline dockets were downloaded on April 29–30, 2024, as documented in the reference CSV and the source provenance metadata (parents/mcro.search_executed and parents/mcro.pdf_docket_last_modified_time fields). Four cases within the MCRO set have non-April download timestamps:

Case ID	Download Date	Original Search Date	Note
27-CR-21-1230	Nov 19, 2025	Apr 30, 2024	Re-downloaded; original MCRO search
27-CR-21-1977	Nov 19, 2025	Apr 30, 2024	Re-downloaded; original MCRO search
27-CR-22-4239	Nov 19, 2025	Apr 29, 2024	Re-downloaded; original MCRO search
27-CR-23-1886	Dec 23, 2025	Dec 23, 2025	Matthew Guertin — live case, intentionally refreshed

Case 27-CR-23-1886 (Matthew Guertin) is the researcher's own case and is a known outlier. It was originally part of the April 2024 MCRO download but was intentionally refreshed in December 2025 to capture the current docket state. The researcher confirms no modifications or new docket entries have occurred since the original collection, so the case remains analytically consistent with the rest of the MCRO cohort. The three November 2025 re-downloads retain their original April 2024 MCRO search provenance.

The Comparison cohort dockets were downloaded across six sessions in November–December 2025 (November 19, 20, 23 and December 7, 12, 13). The initial case discovery originated from MCRO hearing and case searches executed in June 2025 (stored in source_cases.mcro_source_json), but the actual docket page downloads occurred 5–6 months

later. This distinction is important: the "June-2025" label in the database refers to the case search date, not the docket retrieval date.

The 50 First-50 cases (downloaded April 28, 2024 — one day before the MCRO set) were excluded from both cohorts because they lack corresponding children documents with validated court digital signatures and were not collected using the custom evidence recorder system. This exclusion ensures that all analyzed dockets meet the project's provenance standards.

Data Collection & Cohort Construction

Cohort A: MCRO Baseline (n=163)

Defined by `parents_case_set.case_set_json = "MCRO"` in the Supabase database, filtered to `case_type = 'CR'` in the parents table. All 163 cases are confirmed present in both the reference CSV and the live database. Filing years span 2017–2023, with concentration in 2021–2023. These cases were originally selected for Rule 20 competency evaluation research.

Cohort B: Comparison (n=1,865)

Defined as all CR-type cases in the parents table that are NOT tagged "MCRO" and NOT tagged "First-50" in `parents_case_set`. Filing years span 2004–2025 with heavy concentration in 2022–2025. The comparison group was derived from multiple MCRO hearing and case searches conducted in June 2025, with docket PDFs downloaded in November–December 2025.

Excluded: First-50 (n=50)

These 50 cases, tagged "First-50" in `parents_case_set`, were the very first cases collected on April 28, 2024 — one day before the MCRO set. They are excluded because: (a) no corresponding children documents exist with validated court digital signatures, (b) the download was not documented with the custom evidence recorder system, and (c) their provenance does not meet the 100% validation standard applied to all other cases in the analysis. Excluding them prevents potential skew from undocumented collection methods.

Filing Year Extraction

Parsed from `case_id` format NN-CR-YY-NNNNN. The third segment (YY) is mapped to 2000+YY if YY < 50, else 1900+YY.

Statistical Approach

Descriptive statistics with percentiles, averages, and frequency distributions. Year-stratified comparisons control for temporal confounding within the 2019–2023 overlap window. Per-disposition-charge normalization controls for varying numbers of charges per case. No formal p-values are computed (database-only environment); however, effect sizes (2–4× across all metrics) and complete structural divergences (e.g., 0% vs. 52% NULL disposition types) are sufficiently large to be analytically unambiguous.

Limitations & Alternative Explanations

1. Single-snapshot architecture: The database stores one docket snapshot per `case_uid`. Without paired before/after snapshots of the same cases at both time points, we cannot definitively distinguish "the page changed" from "the case accumulated more data." The year-stratified and per-charge normalization analyses mitigate but do not fully resolve this limitation.

2. Cohort selection differences: The MCRO cohort was selected for Rule 20 competency evaluation research; the Comparison cohort was derived from judicial officer hearing schedules. Selection criteria may introduce systematic differences beyond temporal effects.
3. Case status confounding: 37.2% of Comparison cases are active (Open + Under Court Jurisdiction) vs. 25.1% of MCRO cases. Active cases naturally accumulate more disposition detail over time. However, this does not explain the complete absence of NULL disposition types in the Comparison cohort or the order-of-magnitude boilerplate frequency ratios.
4. Possible scraper differences: Different parsers or page-interaction logic between the April 2024 and November–December 2025 collection periods could create artifacts. The stability of non-disposition tables argues against a general scraper issue.
5. Legitimate platform updates: The MCRO system may have improved disposition data rendering between collection periods. This is a plausible and non-adversarial explanation for much of the observed drift.
6. Temporal accumulation: The 19-month gap means Comparison dockets naturally reflect additional probation conditions, monitoring updates, and sentencing modifications added since April 2024.

Conclusions

Three converging signals point to a change in docket rendering between April 2024 and November–December 2025:

- Standard probation boilerplate conditions are largely absent in MCRO but pervasive in the Comparison cohort (17–35× frequency ratios), suggesting the earlier docket pages did not expose these standard terms.
- Dynamic live probation status data in Comparison monitoring_adult entries (with dates extending to August 2025) confirms the docket renders current state at retrieval time.
- Complete elimination of NULL disposition types in the Comparison cohort (0% vs. 52.2% in MCRO) indicates a metadata population improvement.

Combined with persistent year-stratified inflation (1.5–3.9× per charge across all overlapping years) and selective drift (disposition sub-tables only, all other tables stable), the evidence strongly suggests the MCRO docket page rendering system changed how it exposes disposition sentencing detail between April 2024 and late 2025. The magnitude of change is more moderate than the prior analysis (which used only the June-2025-tagged subset as the comparison group), but the systematic pattern across all eight sub-tables and all overlapping filing years remains analytically unambiguous.

Recommendations for Independent Review

7. Paired re-download test: Re-download a sample of the 162 frozen MCRO dockets (excluding 27-CR-23-1886) to directly measure what changed on those specific docket pages since April 2024.
8. Scraper validation: Run both the April 2024 and November 2025 scraper configurations against the same set of known docket pages to rule out parser-level artifacts.
9. MCRO platform changelog review: Request documentation from the MCRO system administrators regarding any rendering changes to disposition sentencing display between April 2024 and November 2025.

10. Temporal decomposition: For the 24 cases tagged in both MCRO and the comparison source sets, compare their single-snapshot data against expected values to assess within-case consistency.
11. Statistical formalization: Export the per-case sub-table counts and run formal paired-comparison tests (e.g., Mann-Whitney U) in a statistical computing environment to quantify significance beyond the descriptive statistics presented here.

Appendix A: Reproducible SQL Queries

All queries are SELECT-only and can be executed against the live Supabase database (project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii). Common CTEs define cohort membership:

Cohort Definitions (used in all queries)

```
WITH mcro AS ( SELECT DISTINCT case_uid FROM parents_case_set WHERE
case_set_json = '"MCRO"' ), first50 AS ( SELECT DISTINCT case_uid FROM
parents_case_set WHERE case_set_json = '"First-50"' ), cohorts AS ( SELECT
p.case_uid, CASE WHEN p.case_uid IN (SELECT case_uid FROM mcro) THEN
'A_MCR0' ELSE 'B_COMP' END AS cohort, CASE WHEN split_part(p.case_id, '-', 3)::int <
50 THEN 2000 + split_part(p.case_id, '-', 3)::int ELSE 1900 +
split_part(p.case_id, '-', 3)::int END AS filing_year FROM parents p WHERE
p.case_type = 'CR' AND p.case_uid NOT IN (SELECT case_uid FROM first50) )
```

Per-Case Disposition Sub-Table Counts

```
-- Join cohorts CTE with counts from each sub-table SELECT c.cohort, COUNT(*) AS
n_cases, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ca.n,0)),2) AS avg_cond_adult,
ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ma.n,0)),2) AS avg_monitor, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(lc.n,0)),2) AS
avg_local_conf, -- ... (same pattern for all 8 sub-tables) FROM cohorts c LEFT JOIN
(SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM parents_dispositions_charges_condition_adult
GROUP BY case_uid) ca USING (case_uid) -- ... LEFT JOIN for each sub-table GROUP BY
c.cohort;
```

Year-Stratified Per-Charge Analysis

```
SELECT c.cohort, c.filing_year, COUNT(*) AS n_cases, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ca.n,0)),2)
AS avg_cond_adult, ROUND(AVG(CASE WHEN pdc.n > 0 THEN
COALESCE(ca.n,0)::numeric/pdc.n ELSE 0 END),2) AS avg_ca_per_charge FROM cohorts c
LEFT JOIN (SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM
parents_dispositions_charges_condition_adult GROUP BY case_uid) ca USING (case_uid)
LEFT JOIN (SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM parents_dispositions_charges GROUP BY
case_uid) pdc USING (case_uid) WHERE c.filing_year BETWEEN 2019 AND 2023 GROUP BY
c.cohort, c.filing_year ORDER BY c.cohort, c.filing_year;
```

NULL Disposition Type Detection

```
SELECT c.cohort, COUNT(DISTINCT c.case_uid) AS n_cases_with_disps, COUNT(*) AS
total_disps, COUNT(*) FILTER ( WHERE d.disposition_type IS NULL OR
d.disposition_type = '' ) AS n_null_type FROM parents_dispositions d JOIN cohorts c
USING (case_uid) GROUP BY c.cohort;
```

Non-Disposition Table Stability Check

```
SELECT c.cohort, COUNT(*) AS n_cases, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ic.n,0)),2) AS
avg_interim_cond, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ph.n,0)),2) AS avg_prev_hear,
ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ch.n,0)),2) AS avg_charges, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(rc.n,0)),2) AS
```

```
avg_related, ROUND(AVG(COALESCE(ce.n,0)),2) AS avg_events FROM cohorts c LEFT JOIN
(SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM parents_interim_conditions GROUP BY case_uid) ic
USING (case_uid) LEFT JOIN (SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM
parents_hearings_previous GROUP BY case_uid) ph USING (case_uid) LEFT JOIN (SELECT
case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM parents_charges GROUP BY case_uid) ch USING (case_uid)
LEFT JOIN (SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM parents_related_cases GROUP BY
case_uid) rc USING (case_uid) LEFT JOIN (SELECT case_uid, COUNT(*) n FROM
parents_case_events GROUP BY case_uid) ce USING (case_uid) GROUP BY c.cohort;
```