

FORENSIC STATISTICAL REPORT

Mental Health / Incompetency Over-Representation Analysis

Case Sets A, B, C — MCRO Forensic Database

Report Date: March 2, 2026 | Database Queried: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2)

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents objective statistical findings derived exclusively from structured query results against a live forensic PostgreSQL database. All metrics are reproducible via the SQL provided. This report does not allege fraud, assign intent, or draw legal conclusions. Observations are statements directly supported by database output. Inferences are clearly labeled and supported by statistical reasoning. All claims are subject to the limitations documented in Section 7.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Three disjoint cohorts of Hennepin County criminal (CR) cases were analyzed: Set A (163 cases, the original MCRO seed set), Set B (162 cases, time-aligned comparison sample), and Set C (163 cases, drawn from the April 2024 judicial-officer hearing-search pool).
- Rule 20 / incompetency events appear in 98.8% of Set A cases and 99.4% of Set C cases, versus 30.2% of Set B cases. This is a 3.3× over-representation relative to Set B.
- Formal “Found Incompetent” determinations appear in 86.5% of Set A, 73.6% of Set C, versus 22.8% of Set B. National published baselines for incompetency findings range from approximately 0.4–2.4% of all criminal defendants.
- Set A cases average 12.7 Rule 20 events each (median 10); Set C averages 14.0 (median 11). Set B’s affected cases average 17.1, but the median is 0 (most cases have none).
- 54.6% of Set A’s CR cases link to a Mental Health (MH) case via shared defendant cluster, versus 14.8% for Set B and 32.5% for Set C. Linked MH cases contain 802 (Set A) and 818 (Set C) severe-treatment events including neuroleptic medication orders, ECT/NTP authorizations, and commitment proceedings.
- Judicial officer concentration is pronounced: the top 5 officers handle 34.8% (A), 31.7% (B), and 33.7% (C) of all Rule 20 events. Lisa Janzen, Julia Dayton Klein, Michael Browne, and Danielle Mercurio dominate across all cohorts.
- In MH severe-treatment events corpus-wide, Lori Skibbie (4.8%), Danielle Mercurio (4.2%), George Borer (2.9%), Julia Dayton Klein (2.2%), and Michael Browne (2.1%) are the top 5 officers.
- 49.7% of Set A cases are “Dormant” (the status typically assigned upon incompetency suspension), compared to 16.0% for Set B.
- From 2016–2018, Minnesota statewide recorded approximately 3,214 total incompetency findings across all charge levels (~1,071/year). Sets A and C, comprising 326 cases in a single county, contain 261 cases with formal incompetency findings—an extraordinary density by any published benchmark.

1.1 Corpus Overview

Metric	Set A	Set B	Set C	A+B+C	DB Total
Cases (CR)	163	162	163	488	2,078 CR
Total docket events	12,043	13,941	12,527	38,511	155,357
Cases w/ R20 event	161 (98.8%)	49 (30.2%)	162 (99.4%)	372	1,303 (62.7%)
Found Incompetent	141 (86.5%)	37 (22.8%)	120 (73.6%)	298	—
Avg R20 events/case	12.55	5.17	13.87	—	—
Median R20/case	10	0	11	—	—
Max R20/case	43	48	63	—	—
Linked MH cases	125 (54.6%)	62 (14.8%)	123 (32.5%)	—	787 MH
MH severe events	802	388	818	2,008	—
Status: Dormant	81 (49.7%)	26 (16.0%)	43 (26.4%)	—	—

2. METHODS

2.1 Cohort Definitions

Cohorts are defined via the `parents_case_set` table, where each row assigns a `case_uid` to a named set via the `case_set_json` column. The three primary cohorts are mutually exclusive (verified: zero overlap).

Set A ("MCRO" / "A"): 163 cases. The original MCRO seed set of criminal cases identified during the April–May 2024 forensic data collection. All 163 cases carry both the "A" and "MCRO" labels (confirmed identical).

Set B ("B"): 162 cases. A comparison sample drawn from newer parents dockets, intentionally time-aligned to Set A (earliest event range: 2013–2023, median filing years 2021–2023).

Set C ("C"): 163 cases. Drawn from the April 2024 hearing-search pool for three judicial officers. Confirmed overlap: 80 cases from SRC_H_Danielle-Mercurio, 72 from SRC_H_Julia-Dayton-Klein, 51 from SRC_H_George-Borer.

```
-- Cohort definition SQL SELECT DISTINCT case_uid, TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) AS cohort FROM
parents_case_set WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C');
```

2.2 Event Taxonomy: Rule 20 / Incompetency (CR)

The Rule 20 / incompetency event taxonomy was built empirically by pattern-matching `event_name` values in `parents_case_events` against the following regex (case-insensitive):

```
event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|finding.?of.?incomp|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)'
```

This captures the following validated event types (top 10 by case frequency): Order–Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01) [364 cases], Rule 20 Evaluation Report [338], Rule 20 Report Distributed [330], Found Incompetent [298], Rule 20 Progress Report [239], Finding of Incompetency and Order [221], Order Appointing Forensic Navigator [83], Notice of Forensic Navigator Assignment [54], Order–Eval for Mental Illness or Cognitive Impairment 20.02 [37], Order Regarding Request for Rule 20 Extension [28].

2.3 Event Taxonomy: MH Severe Treatment

The severe-treatment taxonomy was built from all `parents_case_events` where `case_type` = 'MH', matching:

```
event_name ~* '(neuroleptic|imposed.?treat|ECT|NTP|authoriz.*treat|petition.*treat|commitment|
recommit|indeterminate|physician.*statement)'
```

Key validated event types: Petition for Judicial Commitment [532 cases], Petition for Auth to Impose Treatment Neuroleptic Meds [487], Examiner's Report in Support of Petition for Commitment [467], Order Authorizing Use of Neuroleptic Medications [386], 60–90 Day Commitment Report [337], Order for Commitment [335], Physician's Statement [311], Petition for Recommitment [252], Order for Recommitment [245], Order for Continued Commitment [232], Affidavit in Support of Imposed Treatment by ECT or NTP [88].

2.4 MH Branch Linkage

CR → MH linkage was established via `cluster_id` in the `parents` table. If a CR case in cohort X shares a `cluster_id` with any MH-type case in `parents`, that MH case is considered a "branch" of that CR case. This assumes `cluster_id` represents the same defendant across case types.

2.5 Judicial Officer Attribution

Officer attribution uses the `parents_case_events_judicial_officers` table, joined to events via `(case_uid, event_index)`. The normalized name field (`judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm`) is used for grouping.

3. FINDINGS

Finding 1: Extreme Incompetency Over-Representation in Sets A and C

Claim: Sets A and C exhibit Rule 20/incompetency event rates (98.8% and 99.4%) that are 3.3× the rate observed in Set B (30.2%).

Evidence: Set A: 161/163 cases (98.8%) contain at least one Rule 20/incompetency event. Set C: 162/163 (99.4%). Set B: 49/162 (30.2%). The database-wide CR baseline is 1,303/2,078 (62.7%), meaning even the overall DB is enriched. Sets A and C are 1.6× the DB average and 3.3× Set B.

Statistical significance: A chi-square test comparing Set A (161/163) vs Set B (49/162) yields $\chi^2 > 160$, $p < 10^{-36}$. The effect is not subtle. Risk ratio: A vs B = $98.8\%/30.2\% = 3.27$ (95% CI approximately 2.6–4.1).

```
-- Reproducible SQL WITH cohort AS ( SELECT DISTINCT case_uid, TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) AS
cohort FROM parents_case_set WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C') ), per_case AS
( SELECT c.cohort, c.case_uid, COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE ce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|
competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)') AS r20_count FROM cohort c JOIN parents_case_events ce ON
ce.case_uid = c.case_uid GROUP BY c.cohort, c.case_uid ) SELECT cohort, COUNT(*) AS n, COUNT(*)
FILTER (WHERE r20_count>0) AS with_r20, ROUND(100.0*COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE r20_count>0)/COUNT(*),1)
AS pct FROM per_case GROUP BY cohort ORDER BY cohort;
```

Verification examples: Set A: case:27-cr-18-18391 (43 R20 events, Dormant); case:27-cr-19-12466 (42 events, Dormant). Set C: case:27-cr-17-9080 (61 events, Dormant). Set B (no R20): the median case has 0 R20 events.

Finding 2: Formal "Found Incompetent" Rates Far Exceed Published Baselines

Claim: 86.5% of Set A cases and 73.6% of Set C cases have a formal "Found Incompetent" or "Finding of Incompetency and Order" event. National baselines indicate approximately 0.4–2.4% of all criminal defendants are found incompetent.

Evidence: Set A: 141/163; Set B: 37/162; Set C: 120/163. Published literature: 2–8% of felony defendants are referred for competency evaluation (Nicholson & Kugler, 1991), and approximately 20–30% of those evaluated are found incompetent (multiple meta-analyses). Combined: roughly 0.4–2.4% of all criminal defendants. Set A's 86.5% is 36× to 216× the upper/lower national bounds.

Minnesota context: From 2016–2018, Minnesota recorded 3,214 total incompetency findings statewide across all charge levels (MN DHS Legislative Report, 2020). Sets A+C alone contain 261 "Found Incompetent" cases in a single county.

Finding 3: Intensity — Multiple Cycles of Incompetency Per Case

Claim: Cases with R20 events average 12.7 (A) and 14.0 (C) such events per case, indicating repeated evaluation-finding-restoration cycles.

Evidence: Set A: avg 12.7, median 10, max 43. Set C: avg 14.0, median 11, max 63. Set B (affected cases only): avg 17.1 but median 0 overall. The high per-case counts reflect the Rule 20 procedural pipeline: evaluation order → evaluation report → report distributed → finding → progress reports → potential re-evaluation.

Finding 4: MH Branch Linkage — Over Half of Set A CR Cases Connect to MH Cases

Claim: 54.6% of Set A CR cases share a defendant cluster with at least one MH case, compared to 14.8% in Set B.

Evidence: Via cluster_id join: Set A → 89/163 CR cases link to 125 MH cases (54.6%). Set B → 24/162 link to 62 MH cases (14.8%). Set C → 53/163 link to 123 MH cases (32.5%). The CR → MH

pipeline is structurally expected (incompetent defendants are referred for civil commitment), but the volume is remarkable.

Finding 5: Severe Treatment in Linked MH Cases

Claim: MH cases linked to Sets A and C contain substantial volumes of severe-treatment events including neuroleptic medication orders, ECT/NTP authorizations, and commitment proceedings.

Category	Set A	Set B	Set C	DB-wide MH	
MH cases w/ severe	124	62	122	—	
Total severe events	802	388	818	5,313+	
Neuroleptic events	133	64	139	967	
ECT/NTP events	47	19	46	133	
Commitment events	563	274	563	3,729	
Physician stmts	60	31	70	476	

Finding 6: Judicial Officer Concentration on R20 Events

Claim: A small group of judicial officers handles a disproportionate share of Rule 20/incompetency events across all cohorts.

Cohort	Officer	Events	Cases	% Evts	Rank
A	Lisa Janzen	213	74	10.4%	1
A	Michael Browne	152	87	7.4%	2
A	Julia Dayton Klein	147	82	7.2%	3
A	Danielle Mercurio	114	53	5.6%	4
A	George Borer	86	51	4.2%	5
B	Julia Dayton Klein	75	29	8.9%	1
B	Lisa Janzen	73	20	8.7%	2
B	Michael Browne	40	23	4.8%	3
C	Lisa Janzen	261	74	11.5%	1
C	Julia Dayton Klein	216	76	9.6%	2
C	William Koch	100	50	4.4%	3

Concentration metrics: Top-5 officers handle 34.8% (A), 31.7% (B), and 33.7% (C) of all R20 events. Total unique officers: 58 (A), 43 (B), 67 (C). This means approximately 8–12% of officers handle one-third of all R20 activity.

Finding 7: Judicial Officer Concentration on MH Severe Treatment

Claim: A small number of officers are disproportionately present on MH severe-treatment events (neuroleptic orders, commitment, ECT/NTP).

Top 5 officers on MH severe-treatment events (entire MH corpus): Lori Skibbie (253 events, 165 cases, 4.8%), Danielle Mercurio (225, 151, 4.2%), George Borer (156, 115, 2.9%), Julia Dayton Klein (114, 82, 2.2%), Michael Browne (110, 83, 2.1%). Overlap with the CR R20 top officers is notable: Mercurio, Borer, Dayton Klein, and Browne appear in both top lists.

Finding 8: Case Status Distribution Reflects Incompetency Pipeline

Claim: Set A's case status distribution is dominated by "Dormant" (49.7%), consistent with suspended-for-incompetency cases. Set B's distribution is dominated by "Under Court Jurisdiction" (42.0%) and "Closed" (32.7%).

Set A: Dormant 81 (49.7%), Closed 41 (25.2%), Open 33 (20.2%), Under Court Jurisdiction 8 (4.9%).

Set B: Under Court Jurisdiction 68 (42.0%), Closed 53 (32.7%), Dormant 26 (16.0%), Open 14

(8.6%). Set C: Closed 87 (53.4%), Dormant 43 (26.4%), Under Court Jurisdiction 29 (17.8%), Open 4 (2.5%).

Finding 9: Time to First R20 Event

Claim: The average time from first docket event to first Rule 20 event is 253 days (A), 302 days (B), and 212 days (C).

Set C's shorter time-to-first-R20 (212 days) may reflect its origin in hearing-search data from specific officers active in competency proceedings. Set B's longer latency (302 days) is consistent with a broader population where R20 referrals are a smaller proportion of activity.

4. EXTERNAL BASELINE / SCALE-UP ANALYSIS

4.1 Published National Baselines

The following external reference points provide context for the observed rates:

Competency referral rate: 2–8% of felony defendants (Nicholson & Kugler, 1991; Skeem et al., 1997). More recent estimates suggest 8–15% of felony prosecutions raise competency concerns (Psychiatric Times, 2026).

Incompetency finding rate: Approximately 20–30% of evaluated defendants are found incompetent (multiple meta-analyses; Wikipedia synthesis of published studies).

Combined baseline: Approximately 0.4–2.4% of all felony defendants are found incompetent nationally. Using the higher 8% referral × 30% IST rate = 2.4% upper bound.

Annual US evaluations: Estimated 60,000–90,000 CST evaluations per year nationally (JAAPL, 2021).

Minnesota statewide (2016–2018): 3,214 incompetency findings over 3 years (~1,071/year) across all charge levels and all 87 counties (MN DHS Community Competency Restoration Task Force Report, 2020).

4.2 Scale-Up Comparison

Observed: Sets A+C contain 261 cases with formal "Found Incompetent" events. These represent cases from a single county (Hennepin, County 27) over roughly 2017–2023.

If the national upper-bound incompetency rate (2.4%) applied to this sample of 326 CR cases, the expected number of cases with incompetency findings would be approximately 7–8 cases. The observed count of 261 is approximately 33× the expected upper bound.

Even compared to the database-wide average of 62.7% (which itself represents an enriched forensic dataset), Sets A and C at ~99% R20 involvement and ~80% Found Incompetent rates are far beyond random variation.

Conservative framing: These cohorts were not random samples of all Hennepin County criminal filings. Set A was assembled by identifying a cluster of related cases during forensic review; Set C was drawn from hearing searches for specific officers active in competency proceedings. This selection methodology explains much of the enrichment relative to population baselines, but does not explain the near-total saturation (98.8–99.4%) relative to Set B (30.2%), which was sampled from the same system.

5. LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Selection bias: Set A was identified through forensic review of related cases; Set C was drawn from hearing searches filtered by specific judicial officers. Both selection mechanisms enrich for incompetency-related cases. The comparison to Set B is more informative than comparison to population baselines.

Cohort design: Set B was designed as a time-aligned comparison but its exact sampling criteria (beyond "newer parents dockets") should be independently documented. If B was sampled with any negative selection against R20 cases, the contrast would be artificially inflated.

Event-name completeness: The regex-based taxonomy may miss variant spellings or rare event types. Sensitivity testing with broader/narrower patterns is recommended.

Cluster-based MH linkage: cluster_id groups cases by defendant identity. Some MH cases may be linked to a CR case via cluster but not represent a direct civil commitment referral from that CR case.

Temporal confounders: Year-filed distributions are similar across cohorts (concentrated 2019–2023) but not identical. B includes one case from 2013.

Missing case types: The report request mentioned PR (Probate) cases, but the parents table contains only CR (2,078), MH (787), and GC (38) case types. No PR cases were found.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT REVIEW

1. Replicate all findings independently using the SQL provided in the Appendix against the same Supabase database (project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii).
2. Conduct sensitivity analysis: vary the R20/incompetency regex to test whether the core finding (A and C >> B) holds under stricter or broader definitions.
3. Obtain Set B's exact sampling methodology documentation and verify it was not negatively selected against R20 cases.
4. Cross-reference Found Incompetent counts against Minnesota Judicial Branch public data dashboards (mncourts.gov) for Hennepin County.
5. Analyze whether the judicial officer concentration metrics differ significantly from the overall officer caseload distribution (i.e., control for "some officers simply handle more cases").
6. Investigate whether the high MH-branch linkage rates reflect direct civil commitment referrals from Rule 20 proceedings or coincidental clustering.

APPENDIX A: REPRODUCIBLE SQL

A.1 Cohort Definition & Overlap Verification

```
WITH cohort AS (
  SELECT case_uid,
    TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) AS label
  FROM parents_case_set
  WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C')
),
tags AS (
  SELECT case_uid,
    BOOL_OR(label = 'A') AS in_a,
    BOOL_OR(label = 'B') AS in_b,
    BOOL_OR(label = 'C') AS in_c
  FROM cohort GROUP BY case_uid
)
SELECT in_a, in_b, in_c, COUNT(*) AS n_cases
FROM tags GROUP BY in_a, in_b, in_c;
```

A.2 R20 Event Rates by Cohort

```
WITH cohort AS (
  SELECT DISTINCT case_uid,
    TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) AS cohort
  FROM parents_case_set
  WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C')
),
per_case AS (
  SELECT c.cohort, c.case_uid,
    COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE ce.event_name ~*
      '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)')
    AS r20_count
  FROM cohort c
  JOIN parents_case_events ce ON ce.case_uid = c.case_uid
  GROUP BY c.cohort, c.case_uid
)
SELECT cohort, COUNT(*) AS n_cases,
  COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE r20_count > 0) AS with_r20,
  ROUND(100.0 * COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE r20_count > 0)
    / COUNT(*), 1) AS pct_with_r20,
  ROUND(AVG(r20_count)::numeric, 2) AS avg_r20,
  PERCENTILE_CONT(0.5) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY r20_count)
    AS median_r20
FROM per_case GROUP BY cohort ORDER BY cohort;
```

A.3 Found Incompetent Rates

```
WITH cohort AS (
  SELECT DISTINCT case_uid,
    TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) AS cohort
  FROM parents_case_set
  WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C')
),
fi AS (
  SELECT c.cohort, ce.case_uid
  FROM cohort c
  JOIN parents_case_events ce ON ce.case_uid = c.case_uid
  WHERE ce.event_name ~* '(found.?incomp|finding.?of.?incomp)'
  GROUP BY c.cohort, ce.case_uid
)
SELECT cohort,
  COUNT(DISTINCT case_uid) AS cases_found_incompetent
FROM fi GROUP BY cohort ORDER BY cohort;
```

A.4 MH Branch Linkage

```
WITH cohort_cr AS (
  SELECT DISTINCT cs.case_uid,
    TRIM(BOTH '' FROM cs.case_set_json) AS cohort,
    p.cluster_id
  FROM parents_case_set cs
  JOIN parents p ON p.case_uid = cs.case_uid
  WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM cs.case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C')
),
mh_cases AS (
  SELECT case_uid, cluster_id FROM parents
  WHERE case_type = 'MH'
)
SELECT cr.cohort,
  COUNT(DISTINCT cr.case_uid) AS cr_cases,
  COUNT(DISTINCT cr.case_uid) FILTER
    (WHERE mh.case_uid IS NOT NULL) AS cr_with_mh,
  COUNT(DISTINCT mh.case_uid) AS linked_mh_cases
FROM cohort_cr cr
LEFT JOIN mh_cases mh ON mh.cluster_id = cr.cluster_id
GROUP BY cr.cohort ORDER BY cr.cohort;
```

A.5 Judicial Officer Concentration

```
WITH cohort AS (
  SELECT DISTINCT case_uid,
    TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) AS cohort
  FROM parents_case_set
  WHERE TRIM(BOTH '' FROM case_set_json) IN ('A','B','C')
),
r20 AS (
  SELECT c.cohort, ce.case_uid, ce.event_index
  FROM parents_case_events ce
  JOIN cohort c ON c.case_uid = ce.case_uid
  WHERE ce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc
    |found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)'
),
oc AS (
  SELECT r.cohort,
    jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm AS officer,
    COUNT(*) AS n_events,
    COUNT(DISTINCT r.case_uid) AS n_cases
  FROM r20 r
  JOIN parents_case_events_judicial_officers jo
    ON jo.case_uid = r.case_uid
    AND jo.event_index = r.event_index
  GROUP BY r.cohort, officer
)
SELECT * FROM oc ORDER BY cohort, n_events DESC;
```

APPENDIX B: EXTERNAL REFERENCES

1. Nicholson, R.A. & Kugler, K.E. (1991). Competent and incompetent criminal defendants: A quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109(3), 355–370. [Referral base rate: 2–8% of felony arrests]
2. Minnesota DHS Community Competency Restoration Task Force (2020). Interim Legislative Report. [2016–2018: 3,214 incompetency findings statewide]
3. JAAPL (2021). Estimating Annual Numbers of Competency to Stand Trial Evaluations. [National: 19,000–94,000 evaluations/year]
4. *Psychiatric Times* (2026). Assessing Competency To Stand Trial. [8–15% of felony prosecutions; 20–30% found IST]

5. Wikipedia, Competency Evaluation (Law). [60,000–90,000 annual CST evaluations; 2–5% of felony defendants; 11–30% IST rate]
6. Hennepin County (2022). Youth Competency — Rule 20. [120 children found incompetent in 2021]
7. Ramsey County Rule 20 Assessment (2023). [Documents increasing Rule 20 referrals in metro MN]