

FORENSIC ANALYSIS REPORT — 4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (MCRO)

MCRO | Discovery Fraud Chronology & The Competency Paradox

Case 27-CR-23-1886 — State of Minnesota v. Matthew David Guertin

Property	Value
Subject Case	27-CR-23-1886 — State of Minnesota v. Matthew David Guertin
Related Cases	27-MH-PR-23-815 (Civil Commitment, Closed); 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM (Federal, Dismissed)
Court	Fourth Judicial District Court, Hennepin County, Minnesota
Report Date	March 2026
Data Sources	MCRO Forensic Database (PostgreSQL/Supabase) + Master Filing Catalog (28 filings)
Corpus Context	4,251 PDFs across 245 cases 200 PDFs in subject case (12,077 pages)
Reproducibility	All DB-verified findings are query-reproducible. SQL in Appendix.

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents a chronological reconstruction of documented events in case 27-CR-23-1886, synthesized from two independent sources: (1) a defendant-authored Master Filing Catalog documenting 28 discovery-fraud-related filings spanning January 2024 through May 2025, and (2) live queries against the MCRO forensic database containing court-filed PDFs, docket events, digital signatures, and document metadata.

This report does not assert conclusions about guilt, fabrication, fraud, criminal intent, or motive. Where data is sourced from the Master Catalog, it is attributed as such and reflects the defendant's characterizations. Where data is drawn from the database, it is independently verified by SQL query. The distinction between "documented in filings" and "verified in DB" is maintained throughout.

Competency evaluations are clinical judgments; this report does not evaluate their clinical validity. The discovery photograph analysis (aspect ratios, EXIF metadata, color curves) is documented in the filed materials but is not reproducible from the MCRO database, which contains court-filed PDFs rather than the underlying discovery photographs.

Each finding represents a measurable pattern requiring independent verification by qualified experts.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report reconstructs the documented chronology of discovery material disputes, competency proceedings, and their intersection in case 27-CR-23-1886, spanning January 2023 through May 2025. The narrative is anchored by 246 docket events, 200 court-filed PDFs totaling 12,077 pages, and 28 discovery-fraud-related filings documented in the Master Catalog. The following are the key observations:

Corpus & Case Overview

Metric	Value
Total docket events (27-CR-23-1886)	246
Docket span	January 24, 2023 – December 2, 2025
Rule 20 competency events	29 (92.9th percentile)
PDFs in database for this case	200
Total pages across all PDFs	12,077
Unique judicial officers	7
Defense attorneys (DB-confirmed)	3 (Rivers [inactive], Carpenter [active], Donnelly [active])
Finding of Incompetency orders	2 (July 13, 2023; January 17, 2024)
MSIP-labeled documents (this case)	4 of 34 corpus-wide
Courts involved	3 (4th District, MN Court of Appeals, USDC-MN)
Discovery demands filed (DB)	3 (Feb 2023, Jan 2024, Jan 2025)
Master Catalog filings	28 (Jan 2024 – May 2025)
Federal case status	Dismissed under Younger abstention (Sept 30, 2024)
Civil commitment status	Closed (completed Nov 2024)

KEY METRICS

Discovery first formally requested: January 5, 2024. Court orders ruling on discovery motions as of last scrape: 0.

Rule 20 evaluations ordered: 4 (Jan 2023, Nov 2023, Oct 2024, Apr 2025). Evaluator who interviewed Guertin in person: 1 of 3 evaluators (Rogstad).

Competency finding in favor of defendant (Koch, April 3, 2025). Days before override by different judge: 26.

MSIP-labeled documents in 4,251-document corpus: 34. First appearance: April 3, 2025 — the defendant's competency order.

MSIP set date on May 30, 2025 order: January 9, 2025 — 141 days before filing, ~4 months before the hearing it responds to.

Pages of forensic evidence filed by defendant documenting discovery manipulation: ~600+ (per catalog). Pages of court response addressing that evidence on the merits: 0.

Cloned ESolutions signature objects (same v_obj 306 0 obj) on April 3 competency order: 4 (sig indices 2–5).

Total pages filed by this defendant in this case: 12,077 across 200 PDFs.

METHODS

Dual-Source Methodology

This report employs a dual-source methodology combining narrative context from the defendant-authored Master Filing Catalog with independent verification against the MCRO forensic database.

Source 1: Master Filing Catalog

A 2,970-line consolidated chronological catalog of 28 discovery-fraud-related filings in case 27-CR-23-1886, spanning January 5, 2024 through May 3, 2025. The catalog includes detailed summaries, exhibit inventories, forensic flags, and a key entities tracker. It was authored by the defendant and reflects his characterizations of events. Catalog-sourced claims are attributed as such throughout this report.

Source 2: MCRO Forensic Database

A PostgreSQL database (Supabase, us-west-2) containing 4,251 PDFs across 245 cases with SHA256-hashed internal objects, XMP/PDF metadata, cryptographic signature records, docket event timelines, and content hash rows. All DB-verified claims are reproducible from the SQL queries in the Appendix. Tables used include: case_registry, children, children_signatures_full_report, parents, parents_case_events, parents_case_events_judicial_officers, parents_attorneys_defense_active, parents_attorneys_defense_inactive, hashpack, and hashpack_rows.

Analytical Approach

The analysis proceeded in five phases: (1) case identity verification and cluster linkage; (2) full docket reconstruction with Rule 20 event extraction; (3) PDF inventory with metadata, signature, and MSIP analysis; (4) corpus-wide comparison for Rule 20 intensity percentile ranking; and (5) cross-catalog verification, matching documented events against DB-confirmed data points. Where the catalog documents events that cannot be verified from the database (federal filings, discovery photographs, email communications), this is explicitly noted.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Case Identity & Docket Reconstruction

Background

Case 27-CR-23-1886 is a criminal case in Minnesota's Fourth Judicial District (Hennepin County). The defendant, Matthew David Guertin, is charged with reckless discharge of a firearm and three counts related to firearm serial numbers. The case is linked via cluster_id 1570 to civil commitment case 27-MH-PR-23-815 (status: Closed) and, per the Master Catalog, to federal civil rights action 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM (not in the MCRO database).

Findings

The database confirms 246 docket events for this case spanning January 24, 2023 through December 2, 2025. Of these, 29 events match Rule 20/competency-related patterns. Seven unique judicial officers are recorded. The case status is "Open."

The following table presents all 29 Rule 20 events confirmed in the database:

Date	Event	Docket #	Judicial Officer
2023-01-25	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Rule 20.01)	4	Norris, Lyonel
2023-03-10	Rule 20 Report Distributed	—	—
2023-03-10	Rule 20 Evaluation Report	12	—
2023-07-13	Finding of Incompetency and Order	19	Borer, George
2023-07-13	Found Incompetent	—	Borer, George
2023-11-15	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Rule 20.01)	21	Dayton Klein, Julia
2024-01-11	Rule 20 Evaluation Report	23	—
2024-01-11	Rule 20 Report Distributed	—	—
2024-01-16	Found Incompetent	—	Mercurio, Danielle
2024-01-17	Finding of Incompetency and Order	25	Mercurio, Danielle
2024-05-09	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Rule 20.01)	40	Dayton Klein, Julia
2024-07-16	Rule 20 Progress Report	96	—
2024-09-11	Rule 20 Progress Report	99	—
2024-10-15	Order Appointing Forensic Navigator	109	Askalani, Shereen
2024-10-15	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Rule 20.01)	108	Askalani, Shereen
2024-12-08	Notice of Forensic Navigator Assignment	111	—
2024-12-20	Rule 20 Evaluation Report	112	—
2024-12-20	Rule 20 Report Distributed	—	—
2025-04-29	Order Appointing Forensic Navigator	188	Hudleston, Sarah
2025-04-29	Order-Evaluation for Competency (Rule 20.01)	187	Hudleston, Sarah
2025-06-23	Rule 20 Progress Report	212	—
2025-07-03	Order Re: Rule 20 Extension	215	Dayton Klein, Julia
2025-07-10	Notice of Forensic Navigator Assignment	216	—
2025-07-23	Rule 20 Progress Report	217	—

2025-08-04	Order Re: Rule 20 Extension	220	Koch, William H.
2025-09-29	Rule 20 Progress Report	221	—
2025-10-06	Forensic Navigator Progress Report	223	—
2025-10-06	Order Re: Rule 20 Extension	222	Dayton Klein, Julia
2025-10-17	Forensic Navigator Progress Report	225	—

See Appendix A1 for the full query.

Significance

The 29 Rule 20 events confirm four distinct cycles of competency evaluation orders: January 25, 2023 (Norris); November 15, 2023 (Dayton Klein); October 15, 2024 (Askalani); and April 29, 2025 (Hudleston). Each cycle includes an evaluation order, a report, a distribution event, and in some cases a finding. The fourth cycle (April 29, 2025) was ordered 26 days after Judge Koch's contested hearing resulted in a competency finding. Post-April 2025, the Rule 20 pipeline continues generating progress reports and extension orders through at least October 2025.

Connecting Context

The 29-event count places this case at the 92.9th percentile in the corpus (see Finding 5). The persistence of Rule 20 activity through October 2025 — more than two years after the initial competency order — is consistent with the pattern identified in the Initial Forensic Analysis Report's Finding 5 regarding dormant cases with anomalously high Rule 20 event counts.

Finding 2: Judicial Officer Rotation & Attorney Turnover

Background

The Master Catalog documents a complex chain of judicial officers and defense attorneys cycling through this case. This finding verifies that chain against the database.

Findings

Seven judicial officers are confirmed in the docket:

Judicial Officer	First Event	Last Event	Events	Key Actions
Norris, Lyonel	2023-01-25	2023-01-25	1	Initial Rule 20.01 order
Dayton Klein, Julia	2023-06-14	2025-10-06	10	Continuances, Rule 20 orders, extensions, recused Jul 2024
Borer, George	2023-07-07	2023-07-13	4	First incompetency finding
Mercurio, Danielle	2024-01-16	2024-01-17	2	Second incompetency finding
Koch, William H.	2024-10-01	2025-08-04	7	PD appointment, competency finding (Apr 3, 2025), R20 extensions
Askalani, Shereen	2024-10-15	2024-10-15	3	Third Rule 20 order + forensic navigator
Hudleston, Sarah	2025-01-31	2025-05-30	4	Case reassignment, fourth Rule 20 order, pro se denial

Three defense attorneys are confirmed:

Attorney	Status	Notes
Bruce Rivers	Inactive	Predecessor counsel; discharged Oct 2024 per catalog
Raissa Carpenter	Active	Hennepin County Public Defender; assigned to 131 cases (39 Dormant)
Emmett Donnelly	Active	Hennepin County Public Defender; co-counsel with Carpenter

Note: Michael Biglow, documented in the Master Catalog as the initial defense counsel who transmitted discovery materials, does not appear in the defense attorney tables for the criminal case (27-CR-23-1886). He may have been counsel of record on the civil commitment case (27-MH-PR-23-815) rather than the criminal case, or his assignment predates the scraped data.

Significance

Seven judicial officers on a single criminal case over 2.5 years represents high turnover. The database confirms that Judge Dayton Klein recused on July 15, 2024 (per the filed recusal order in children), yet her name continues appearing on Rule 20 extension orders through October 2025 — consistent with the catalog's documentation that competency matters operate on a separate judicial track.

Connecting Context

Three of the seven judicial officers (Dayton Klein, Borer, Mercurio) are among the most frequent judicial officers in the corpus per the Initial Forensic Analysis Report's Finding 5. All three were named as defendants in the federal civil rights action (0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) per the Master Catalog.

Finding 3: The Discovery Request Chain

Background

The Master Catalog documents a 16-month discovery dispute chain beginning January 5, 2024 and extending through multiple courts. This finding verifies which elements of that chain are confirmed in the database.

Findings

The database contains three “Demand or Request for Discovery” filings for this case:

Filing Date	Filename	Pages	Creator Tool
2023-02-20	MCRO_27-CR-23-1886_Demand or Request for Discovery_2023-02-20_...pdf	1	PrintServer210
2024-01-05	MCRO_27-CR-23-1886_Demand or Request for Discovery_2024-01-05_...pdf	1	(none)
2025-01-14	118__Demand-or-Request-for-Discovery_2025-01-14.pdf	8	Acrobat PDFMaker 24 for Word

The February 20, 2023 demand (1 page, creator: PrintServer210) is consistent with a standard attorney-filed template demand — likely filed by Bruce Rivers or the initial defense counsel. The January 5, 2024 demand (1 page, no creator tool) corresponds to Filing #1 in the Master Catalog, which documents it as Guertin's own handwritten discovery request. The January 14, 2025 demand (8 pages, Acrobat PDFMaker) corresponds to the new public defenders' formal discovery demand (Index 118).

The Master Catalog additionally documents: a 40-page Motion to Compel Discovery filed April 4, 2024 (verified in children as filing_type “Motion,” 40 pages); a 3-page follow-up correspondence filed May 3, 2024 (verified); and a Renewed Motion to Compel filed June 3, 2024 (verified as “Notice of Motion and Motion,” 5 pages).

Critical observation: A search of parents_case_events for any event containing “order” within 90 days following the April 4, 2024 Motion to Compel or the June 3, 2024 Renewed Motion returns no court order acknowledging, ruling on, or denying either motion. The April 12, 2024 “Order Denying Motion” in the children table addresses the Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel, not the discovery motion (see Appendix A3).

Significance

The database confirms the existence of multiple discovery-related filings and the absence of responsive court orders. The pattern documented in the Master Catalog — discovery requested, motions filed, no judicial response — is consistent with the docket record.

Connecting Context

The Cloned Discovery Template Forensic Report identified case 27-CR-23-1886 as “Outlier A” — the case whose original discovery demand (July 13, 2023 filing) had 78% unique text rows, making it the most distinctive document in the template analysis. The January 5, 2024 filing (Guertin's own demand) is a separate, subsequent filing that further distinguishes this case's discovery chain from the corpus template pattern.

Finding 4: Finding of Incompetency Orders — Signatures & Clone Analysis

Background

Two “Finding of Incompetency and Order” documents exist in the database for this case. The Finding of Incompetency Clones Forensic Report documented a corpus-wide pattern of template reuse in these orders. This finding examines the specific orders in this case.

Findings

Order 1: July 13, 2023 (Docket Index 19) — 7 pages

Signed by Borer, George (judicial) and Browne, Michael (approving judge), with seven ESolutions/Tyler signatures referencing the same field name, plus the MCRO watermark. All signatures show `edits_after_sig_flag = true` except the terminal MCRO watermark. The Borer signature timestamp is 11:00:00 AM exactly, consistent with the hearing time rather than a live signing event.

Order 2: January 17, 2024 (Docket Index 25) — 4 pages

Signed by Mercurio, Danielle (referee) on January 16 at 8:27 AM, countersigned by Dayton Klein, Julia at 9:22 AM the same day. Both signatures return `sig_crypto_valid_flag = true`. The filing date of January 17 is one day after both signatures. Creator tool: Microsoft® Word for Microsoft 365.

The Master Catalog documents that the “Found Incompetent” docket entry for the second order is dated January 16, 2024 (Mercurio), while the formal “Finding of Incompetency and Order” is filed January 17, 2024 — indicating the finding was entered one day before the order document was filed. This is confirmed by the database: the docket shows “Found Incompetent” on 2024-01-16 and the order on 2024-01-17.

Significance

Both orders follow the structural pattern identified in the Finding of Incompetency Clones Report: programmatic document assembly with Tyler Technologies digital signatures and stored judicial signature images. The July 13 order has seven ESolutions signatures referencing the same field, while the January 17 order has cryptographically valid judicial signatures — a structural difference that may reflect different document production pathways.

Finding 5: Rule 20 Event Intensity — This Case vs. Corpus

Background

Minnesota Rule 20 governs competency proceedings. The Initial Forensic Analysis Report documented that dormant cases average 12.73 Rule 20 events — more than double the closed-case average. This finding contextualizes case 27-CR-23-1886 within that distribution.

Findings

Corpus-wide Rule 20 event count distribution (CR cases with at least one Rule 20 event, n = 1,303):

Percentile	Rule 20 Events
25th (P25)	5
50th (P50 / Median)	8
75th (P75)	17
90th (P90)	26
95th (P95)	31
99th (P99)	50
Maximum	67
27-CR-23-1886 (Guertin)	29 → 92.9th percentile

With 29 Rule 20 events, case 27-CR-23-1886 exceeds the 90th percentile (26 events) and falls between P90 and P95 (31 events). The first Rule 20 event occurred January 25, 2023; the most recent in the database is October 17, 2025 — a span of 996 days (2.7 years).

The Master Catalog documents at least four distinct competency evaluation cycles: Dr. Rogstad (March 2023, in-person), Dr. Milz (January 2024, via Zoom), Dr. Cranbrook (December 2024, without interview), and a fourth evaluator ordered April 29, 2025 (pending). The database confirms all four evaluation order dates.

Significance

At the 92.9th percentile, this case's Rule 20 event count exceeds the vast majority of cases in the corpus. The case status is "Open" (not "Dormant"), which distinguishes it from the most extreme Rule 20 cases in the corpus (which are typically classified as Dormant). However, the continued accumulation of Rule 20 events without trial resolution mirrors the pattern the Initial Forensic Analysis Report identified in dormant cases.

Finding 6: The April 3, 2025 Competency Order — MSIP & Signature Analysis

Background

On April 3, 2025, Judge Koch entered an order finding Guertin competent to proceed, following a contested hearing on March 5, 2025 at which Guertin testified under oath. This order carries MSIP (Microsoft Information Protection) metadata — and is the first document in the entire 4,251-document corpus to bear this label.

Findings

MSIP Metadata (Index 127):

Property	Value
MSIP Label	High
MSIP Site ID	8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f
MSIP Label Token	14543c82-bfb1-4059-96af-7a0a0f468681
MSIP Set Date	March 17, 2025, 19:18 UTC (17 days before filing)
MSIP Method	Standard
Creator Tool	Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word

Verification: The query `SELECT COUNT(*) FROM children WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true AND filing_date < '2025-04-03'` returns **0**. This confirms the April 3, 2025 order is the first MSIP document in the corpus.

Digital Signatures (Index 127):

Sig #	Signer	Time (CST)	Field	v_obj	Edits After?
1	Koch, William	2025-04-03 08:48:36	Signature2	13 0 obj	TRUE
2	ESolutions Dev CA	2025-04-03 13:27:13	tyler_sig_fa94cb09...	306 0 obj	TRUE
3	ESolutions Dev CA	2025-04-03 13:27:13	tyler_sig_fa94cb09...	306 0 obj	TRUE
4	ESolutions Dev CA	2025-04-03 13:27:13	tyler_sig_fa94cb09...	306 0 obj	TRUE
5	ESolutions Dev CA	2025-04-03 13:27:13	tyler_sig_fa94cb09...	306 0 obj	TRUE
6	MCRO Watermark	2025-04-03 17:45:44	Signature_cc1585d1...	338 0 obj	FALSE

Signatures 2–5 reference the identical PDF object (306 0 obj) with the identical timestamp, field name, and signer. This means a single binary object is presented as four independent page-level signatures. The ESolutions Development Certificate Authority is a Tyler Technologies component. Per the Initial Forensic Analysis Report, this certificate uses a deprecated RSA-1024-bit key issued March 19, 2014.

All four MSIP documents in this case:

Filing Date	Document	MSIP Set Date	Pre-staging Interval
2025-04-03	127__Order-Finding-Guertin-Competent	2025-03-17	17 days
2025-04-23	134__Transcript_April-17-2025_Hearing	2025-04-23	Same day
2025-05-03	189__Transcript_April-29-2025	2025-05-03	Same day
2025-05-30	205__Order-Other (re: Pro Se Motions)	2025-01-09	141 days

Significance

The MSIP set date of March 17, 2025 on the April 3 order indicates the document or its template was created within the Microsoft 365 enterprise environment 17 days before it was filed — which is 12 days after the March 5, 2025 contested hearing. For the May 30 order (Index 205), the MSIP set date of January 9, 2025 precedes both the April 29 hearing it responds to and even the January 31, 2025 case reassignment to Judge Hudleston. The two transcripts have same-day MSIP set dates, consistent with standard document production.

All four documents share the identical MSIP Site ID (8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f), confirming they originated from the same Microsoft 365 organizational tenant — the same tenant identified in the Initial Forensic Analysis Report as spanning the 4th District Court, MN Court of Appeals, and MN Supreme Court.

Connecting Context

The Initial Forensic Analysis Report's Finding 4 identified 34 MSIP documents across three judicial branches, all sharing this tenant ID. This case contributes 4 of those 34 documents, including the chronologically first. The concentration of a corpus-rare metadata artifact in a single defendant's filings was identified as a forensic anomaly requiring explanation in the initial report.

Finding 7: The Chronological Narrative Arc

Background

This finding weaves together the Master Catalog's documented timeline with database-verified anchors across five phases, from the initial discovery requests through the April 2025 crisis.

Phase 1: The Discovery Request Chain (January – June 2024)

According to the Master Catalog, the documented discovery dispute begins with Filing #1 on January 5, 2024: a formal written request from Guertin to prosecutor Jacqueline Perez for all Brady material, squad video, audio tapes, and the 104 police photographs referenced in Dr. Rogstad's forensic evaluation report. The database confirms this filing exists (1 page, no creator tool metadata).

The catalog documents that the next major event is Filing #2, a 40-page Motion to Compel Discovery filed April 4, 2024, accompanied by 13 exhibits including a complete 80-image aspect ratio analysis. The database confirms this filing (filing_type: Motion, 40 pages). The catalog states this motion presented evidence that the discovery PDF contained only 80 of 104 documented photographs, with 65% of interior photos showing non-uniform aspect ratios indicating manual cropping.

Filings #3, #7, #8, and #9 (May–June 2024) are documented as follow-up correspondence, a substitute counsel motion, and a renewed motion to compel. All are confirmed in the database by filing date and type. The catalog documents that no court order acknowledged or ruled on any of these filings during this period. The database's docket record is consistent with this characterization — no responsive order appears between the April 4 motion and the July 2 appellate court order.

Phase 2: Escalation to Federal Court (July – September 2024)

The Master Catalog documents that Guertin filed a federal civil rights action (0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) on July 8, 2024, naming 11 defendants including three judicial officers, two attorneys, two forensic evaluators, and the county. The federal case was dismissed without prejudice under *Younger v. Harris* on September 30, 2024.

This federal case is not in the MCRO database and cannot be independently verified here. However, the database does confirm: (a) Judge Dayton Klein's recusal order filed July 15, 2024 (immediately following the federal lawsuit naming her as a defendant); and (b) a gap in docket activity between July and September 2024, consistent with the catalog's documentation that the case was stayed pending federal proceedings.

Phase 3: The Second Discovery Production & New Forensic Evidence (February – March 2025)

The catalog documents that new public defenders Carpenter and Donnelly filed a formal discovery demand (confirmed in DB: Index 118, January 14, 2025, 8 pages) and that Guertin received a third set of discovery materials via Hennepin County OneDrive on February 13, 2025. The catalog states Guertin's forensic comparison revealed that 20 images previously identified as having non-standard aspect ratios had been resized to a uniform 16:9 ratio in the new set.

The database confirms three exhibit packages filed February 28, 2025: Index 122 (75 pages), Index 123 (92 pages), and Index 124 (76 pages) — totaling 243 pages of forensic exhibit material. A fourth package, Index 125 (23 pages), addresses patent-related claims.

The March 5, 2025 contested competency hearing is confirmed by the transcript in the children table: “Guertin, Matthew - March 5, 2024.pdf” (filed April 5, 2025, 61 pages). The catalog provides extensive detail on the hearing, including Guertin’s sworn testimony describing the discovery manipulation and Judge Koch’s direct examination of Guertin on competency elements.

Phase 4: The April 2025 Crisis

The database confirms the following sequence of events in April 2025:

Date	Docket / Index	Event	DB-Verified?
Apr 3	Index 127	Order Finding Guertin Competent (Koch) — first MSIP doc in corpus	Yes
Apr 10	Index 128	Netflix Whistleblower exhibit (153 pages)	Yes
Apr 14	Index 129–130	Patent fraud exhibits (82 pages combined)	Yes
Apr 16	Index 131	Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice (50 pages)	Yes
Apr 21	Index 133	Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel (110 pages)	Yes
Apr 23	Index 134	Transcript: April 17 hearing (15 pages, MSIP)	Yes
Apr 28	Index 135–184	~50 exhibit filings (MCRO data analysis, forensic reports)	Yes
Apr 29	Index 187–188	New Rule 20.01 order + Forensic Navigator (Hudleston)	Yes
May 3	Index 189	Transcript: April 29 hearing (20 pages, MSIP)	Yes

The April 28, 2025 filing burst is remarkable: approximately 50 documents were filed on a single day, totaling thousands of pages of MCRO forensic analysis, incompetency order compilations, register-of-actions data, and ancillary exhibits. This represents the defendant’s attempt to enter the MCRO forensic analysis into the state court record ahead of the April 29 hearing.

Phase 5: The Paradox

The Master Catalog documents the following exchange from the April 29, 2025 hearing transcript (Filing #28):

The court acknowledged Guertin’s technological capability, with the transcript recording that the court credited his intelligence and abilities as likely exceeding the vast majority of the population. The court simultaneously ordered a fourth competency evaluation, finding that the content of Guertin’s filings — specifically his claims about institutional conspiracy and patent fraud — raised concerns about his mental state.

The Master Catalog documents that Guertin articulated his position on the record regarding the discovery evidence: that once photographs were cropped and then resized to a uniform aspect ratio, the original non-uniform dimensions could not be recovered — creating, in his characterization, an irrefutable logical proof of manipulation.

The prosecution’s position, as documented in the transcript, was that the state was not aware of any manipulation of the evidence. The docket contains no motion, order, or hearing specifically addressing the forensic evidence of discovery manipulation on its merits.

The structural result is documented in the record: discovery fraud evidence was filed and entered as sworn testimony; three successive forensic evaluators characterized the defendant’s fraud claims as symptomatic of mental illness; a fourth evaluation was ordered after the defendant was found competent through a contested hearing. The act of documenting the alleged fraud became, in the evaluators’ reports, evidence supporting the diagnosis that justified the competency proceedings.

CROSS-REFERENCE TO EXISTING MCRO FORENSIC REPORTS

Report	Connection to This Case
Initial Digital Forensic Analysis Report	Finding 4: The April 3, 2025 competency order is the first MSIP document in the corpus. Finding 5: This case's Rule 20 event count (29) is at the 92.9th percentile. Finding 2: Koch signature image on the April 3 order follows the stored-image pattern.
Cloned Discovery Template Report	Case 27-CR-23-1886 is identified as "Outlier A" — the case with the most distinctive (78% unique) discovery demand text. The January 5, 2024 demand was defendant-authored, explaining the deviation from the template pattern.
Finding of Incompetency Clones Report	Both incompetency orders in this case (July 13, 2023 and January 17, 2024) follow the template pattern identified corpus-wide: programmatic document assembly with Tyler Technologies signatures and stored judicial signature images.
Digital Signature Authentication Report	The April 3, 2025 order's ESolutions signature uses the deprecated RSA-1024 key identified in the authentication report. The four cloned signature objects (same v_obj 306 0 obj) on this order exemplify the pattern documented corpus-wide.

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Data Coverage Gaps

The Master Catalog is a defendant-authored document and reflects his characterizations of events. While the database confirms filing dates, page counts, and metadata, it cannot independently verify the defendant's interpretations of the evidence content. Federal case filings (0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) are not in the MCRO database and cannot be verified here.

Discovery photograph analysis (aspect ratios, EXIF metadata, color curves, homography comparisons) is documented in the filed court materials but is not reproducible from the MCRO database, which contains court-filed PDFs rather than the underlying discovery photographs. The forensic claims about image manipulation can only be evaluated by examining the photographs themselves.

Methodological Constraints

The MCRO database reflects the state of documents at their download time, not necessarily their state at the time of original filing. Attorney assignments in the database may be incomplete — Michael Biglow's absence from the criminal case attorney tables suggests his representation was recorded on a different case or predates the scraped data.

The Rule 20 event count comparison uses pattern-matching on event names, which may over- or under-count depending on naming conventions across different judicial officers and clerks. The 92.9th percentile ranking is within a dataset already skewed toward Rule 20-heavy cases due to collection methodology.

Plausible Benign Explanations

The MSIP label appearance beginning April 3, 2025 may reflect a system-wide Microsoft 365 policy deployment rather than case-specific document handling. The 17-day and 141-day MSIP pre-staging intervals could reflect template reuse or draft creation workflows standard in judicial document production. The absence of court orders on discovery motions could reflect procedural handling that does not generate docket entries (e.g., informal denial, scheduling deferrals). Competency evaluations are clinical judgments; this report does not evaluate their clinical validity.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

1. Obtain original discovery photographs from the Minnetonka Police Department evidence system and the Hennepin County OneDrive discovery platform. Compare aspect ratios and EXIF metadata across all three documented production sets (August 3, 2023; July 16, 2024; February 13, 2025).
2. Verify the MSIP Site ID (8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f) against the Minnesota Judicial Branch's Microsoft 365 tenant registry to determine whether it represents a system-wide or localized deployment.
3. Request the ESolutions Development Certificate Authority's certificate chain from Tyler Technologies to determine whether the RSA-1024 key is still in active use across the court system.
4. Compare Dr. Cranbrook's December 20, 2024 evaluation (conducted without interview) against the video recording of the January 3, 2024 Milz evaluation (entered into the federal record as Exhibit AB) to assess consistency of characterizations.
5. Reproduce the Rule 20 event count distribution from the MCRO database using the SQL in Appendix A5 to confirm the 92.9th percentile ranking.
6. Engage a credentialed digital forensics examiner (CFCE, EnCE, or equivalent) to independently verify the aspect ratio analysis documented in the defendant's February 28, 2025 exhibit filings.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Case Identity & Cluster Linkage

```
SELECT cr.case_id, cr.case_uid, cr.defendant_name, p.case_type, p.case_status
FROM case_registry cr LEFT JOIN parents p ON p.case_uid = cr.case_uid WHERE
cr.cluster_id = 1570 ORDER BY cr.case_id;
```

A2 — Rule 20 Events for 27-CR-23-1886

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

A3 — Discovery-Related Filings in Children

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type, pdf_page_count,
metadata__xmp_creator_tool FROM children WHERE case_id = '27-CR-23-1886' AND
(filing_type ILIKE '%demand%' OR filing_type ILIKE '%discovery%') ORDER BY
filing_date;
```

A4 — MSIP Documents — This Case

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type,
metadata__msip__msip_label_name_primary, metadata__msip__msip_site_id_primary,
metadata__msip__msip_set_date_primary FROM children WHERE case_id = '27-CR-23-1886'
AND metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true ORDER BY filing_date;
```

A5 — Corpus-Wide Rule 20 Distribution & Guertin Percentile

```
WITH r20_counts AS ( SELECT pce.case_uid, COUNT(*) as r20_count FROM
parents_case_events pce JOIN parents p ON p.case_uid = pce.case_uid WHERE
p.case_type = 'CR' AND pce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|finding.?
of.?incomp|found.?incomp|forensic.?nav)' GROUP BY pce.case_uid ) SELECT
PERCENTILE_CONT(0.50) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY r20_count) AS p50,
PERCENTILE_CONT(0.75) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY r20_count) AS p75,
PERCENTILE_CONT(0.90) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY r20_count) AS p90,
PERCENTILE_CONT(0.95) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY r20_count) AS p95,
PERCENTILE_CONT(0.99) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY r20_count) AS p99, MAX(r20_count) AS
max_r20, COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE r20_count < 29) as below_guertin, COUNT(*) as
total_cases FROM r20_counts;
```

A6 — April 3, 2025 Order Signatures

```
SELECT sig_index, field_name, signer_name, sign_time_cst_cdt,
edits_after_sig_flag, v_obj, coverage_pct FROM children_signatures_full_report
WHERE evidence_uid = 'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2' ORDER BY sig_index;
```

A7 — MSIP Documents Before April 3, 2025 (Corpus-Wide)

```
SELECT COUNT(*) as msip_before_apr3 FROM children WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag
= true AND filing_date < '2025-04-03'; -- Returns: 0
```

A8 — Judicial Officers on This Case

```
SELECT DISTINCT event_json__judicial_officer as judge, MIN(event_json__date) as
first_date, MAX(event_json__date) as last_date, COUNT(*) as event_count FROM
parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND
event_json__judicial_officer IS NOT NULL GROUP BY event_json__judicial_officer ORDER
BY first_date;
```

A9 — Defense Attorney Assignments

```
SELECT 'active' as status, attorney_json__attorney_norm, attorney_index FROM
parents_attorneys_defense_active WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' UNION ALL
SELECT 'inactive', attorney_json__attorney_norm, attorney_index FROM
parents_attorneys_defense_inactive WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' ORDER BY
attorney_index;
```

A10 — Raissa Carpenter Case Assignments by Status

```
SELECT p.case_status, COUNT(*) as case_count FROM parents_attorneys_defense_active a
JOIN parents p ON p.case_uid = a.case_uid WHERE a.attorney_json__attorney_norm =
'Raissa Carpenter' GROUP BY p.case_status ORDER BY case_count DESC;
```

A11 — Incompetency Order Signatures

```
SELECT c.filename, c.filing_date, s.signer_name, s.sign_time_cst_cdt,
s.sig_crypto_valid_flag, s.edits_after_sig_flag FROM children_signatures_full_report s
JOIN children c ON c.evidence_uid = s.evidence_uid WHERE c.case_id = '27-CR-23-1886'
AND c.filing_type = 'Finding of Incompetency and Order' ORDER BY c.filing_date,
s.sig_index;
```

A12 — Case Summary Statistics

```
SELECT COUNT(*) as total_pdfs, SUM(pdf_page_count) as total_pages,
MIN(filing_date) as first_filing, MAX(filing_date) as last_filing, COUNT(*) FILTER
(WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true) as msip_count FROM children WHERE case_id
= '27-CR-23-1886';
```

Source: Matthew Guertin v. State of Minnesota | 27-CR-23-1886 | MCRO Forensic Database | MattGuertin.com