

MCRO

F O R E N S I C N A R R A T I V E R E P O R T

The Competency Question

A Forensic Narrative

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

Three Evaluations. Six Cycles. 38 Months. Zero Dispositions.

Report Date: March 9, 2026

Database: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2) | Corpus: 4,251 PDFs | 2.9M rows

Source Reports Referenced: 18 primary + 49 forensic library

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report is a forensic narrative synthesis. It weaves findings from 18 primary source documents and 49+ independently produced forensic reports into a seven-act chronological account of the competency proceedings in case 27-CR-23-1886. The narrative framing—act structure, sequencing, and emphasis—is editorial. The underlying facts are not.

Every key metric cited in this report was re-verified against the live MCRO forensic database (PostgreSQL/Supabase) via SELECT-only queries. The database is frozen and static; all figures remain consistent with prior reports. Where any discrepancy was found between a prior report's figure and the fresh database result, it is noted in Appendix B (Verification Ledger).

This report does not allege fraud, assign intent, or draw legal conclusions. Where evaluators' conclusions diverge from the forensic record, both are presented: what the evaluator concluded, and what the evidence shows. The reader draws their own conclusions.

The narrative perspective is sympathetic to the subject. This is intentional and is disclosed here rather than disguised. Sympathy is achieved through factual accumulation, not through adjectives or emotional language. Every claim in this report is traceable to a specific report finding, database query, court document, or public record. The Verification Ledger (Appendix B) and SQL Queries (Appendix C) provide full reproducibility.

Transcript excerpts reflect court-record facts that the statements were made. Whether the content of those statements is true is independently tested against the forensic database and source documents. A person's authority—judicial, clinical, or professional—does not substitute for evidence in this analysis.

PROLOGUE — THE INVENTOR

On February 14, 2023, the United States Patent and Trademark Office granted US Patent 11,577,177 B2 to Matthew David Guertin of Minnetonka, Minnesota. The patent, assigned to InfiniSet, Inc.—a Delaware C-corporation where Guertin served as CEO—described a motorized rotatable treadmill system designed for virtual environments. It contained 26 claims spanning virtual reality, military simulation, film production, gaming, and fitness applications.

The invention is easier to picture than its legal description suggests. Imagine a treadmill that rotates freely in any direction, allowing a person to walk naturally through a virtual world without ever leaving a room. Now imagine that treadmill integrated with motion capture, spatial audio, and real-time rendering. The patent covered all of it: the hardware, the integration, the control systems, and the method of synchronizing a user's physical movement with a virtual environment across multiple application domains.

Those domains are not small. The US Patent 11577177 Financial Valuation Context Report, drawing from MarketsandMarkets, Grand View Research, Mordor Intelligence, and Arizton, documented a combined addressable market exceeding \$1.16 trillion by 2030: virtual production (\$8.76B), VR gaming (\$109.6B), military simulation (\$17.6–28B), virtual fitness (\$93.7B), and the metaverse/spatial computing sector (\$936.6B). Against this backdrop, Guertin's own estimate that his patent was worth \$250 million was not grandiose. It was conservative. Independent modeling placed the 20-year addressable revenue between \$85 billion and \$220 billion.

Twelve days after Guertin filed his provisional patent application on March 19, 2021, Netflix's inventor Stephan Trojansky filed US Patent 11,810,254, describing a structurally similar integrated treadmill-virtual-environment system. The two patents overlap across at least seven functional categories. Guertin's patent appears in Netflix's "References Cited" section—meaning the USPTO examiner reviewing Netflix's application identified Guertin's work as relevant prior art. In November 2021, Netflix acquired Trojansky's company, Scanline VFX, for an estimated \$100 million or more.

The military dimension is equally concrete. The patent explicitly covers training simulation applications. The US Army's Synthetic Training Environment program—the next-generation immersive training infrastructure for the world's largest military—carries a budget exceeding \$10 billion. The University of Southern California's Institute for Creative Technologies (USC-ICT) received \$8.89 million in related federal grants. Paul Debevec, who led light field research at USC-ICT, subsequently moved to Netflix's Eyeline Studios. The Military Simulation Alignment LinkedIn Correlation Report documented these connections across defense, intelligence, and entertainment industry entities.

Between May 2021 and March 2024, Guertin's LinkedIn profile—dormant, never promoted, containing no posts—received 597 searches from approximately 155 distinct entities across 35 months. The searches are documented in 99 DKIM-authenticated email notifications from LinkedIn, each independently verified with a 100% cryptographic authentication pass rate and zero forgery indicators. The searching entities included DARPA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lockheed Martin, the State Department, Forcepoint (a cybersecurity firm), 3GIMBALS (a defense-intelligence contractor), and dozens of technology, entertainment, and defense

companies. Two of these entities—Forcepoint and 3GIMBALS—searched Guertin’s profile on January 21, 2023. That date would prove significant.

The Patent Trademark Chronological Forensic Report cataloged 45 intellectual property events across 39 months and 8 jurisdictions, including patent prosecution, trademark filings, and a third-party prior art submission at the USPTO—a complex legal-technical action that requires navigating federal patent procedure. None of this was theoretical. It was documented, timestamped, and independently verifiable.

This is the person the State of Minnesota would spend the next three years calling incompetent.

ACT 1 — THE ARREST AND THE FIRST LABEL

January–March 2023: From Inventor to Defendant to “Incompetent” in 48 Days

On January 21, 2023, Matthew Guertin fired approximately 20 rounds into the sky and trees from his apartment in Minnetonka, Minnesota. He told police he could not reach them by phone because his devices had been compromised. He wanted them to come to his location. Officers recovered a semi-automatic rifle, a full-size pistol, and a compact pistol—none with serial numbers—due to the fact that Guertin had built them himself so he would know how they worked.

Three days later, the Hennepin County Attorney’s Office filed a criminal complaint charging Guertin with four felonies: one count of reckless discharge of a firearm within a municipality and three counts of possessing firearms without serial numbers. One day after that—January 25, 2023, four days after the incident—Referee Lyonel Norris ordered a Rule 20.01 competency evaluation. The question of whether Guertin was mentally fit to stand trial was raised at the earliest procedural opportunity, before any substantive proceedings had occurred.

Twenty days later, on February 14, 2023, the USPTO granted Guertin’s patent.

On March 1, 2023, Dr. Jill Rogstad and postdoctoral fellow Dr. Casey Boland interviewed Guertin for approximately two hours at the Hennepin County Government Center. The interview was primarily conducted by Boland, the trainee, under Rogstad’s supervision. Guertin arrived 30 minutes late—he called ahead, saying he would rather be late and “100% prepared” than arrive on time. He brought a large stock of organized documents: patent filings, Netflix comparisons, corporate acquisitions, email evidence. He had already sent Rogstad a series of unsolicited emails containing links and explanations, which she asked him to stop sending and bring to the interview instead.

Guertin told Rogstad and Boland about the patent. He told them about Netflix. He told them about corporations targeting him. He told them about entities accessing his devices. He told them about surveillance. He presented his documentation.

Nine days later, on March 10, 2023, Rogstad filed her evaluation report. At the time she filed it, the patent had been publicly searchable at USPTO.gov for 24 days. The case docket contained 8 documents totaling 16 pages.

The Diagnosis

Rogstad diagnosed Guertin with Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder. The diagnosis is, by the DSM-5-TR's own definition, a placeholder: it “applies when psychotic symptoms are present but additional information would be needed to confirm a more specific diagnosis.”

The clinical basis for this diagnosis was Rogstad's characterization of Guertin's claims as “significant delusional thinking” with “persecutory and referential themes.” The report classified 11 categories of Guertin's statements as evidence of psychosis. Among them: that he had a patented invention worth \$250 million, that large corporations had targeted him to steal his technology, that entities had accessed his devices, and that he could detect AI-generated text through linguistic analysis.

The Rule 20 Fact-Check Part 1 tested each of these 11 categories against the forensic record. The results: 4 of 11 (36.4%) have independently verified factual predicates. Another 4 (36.4%) are partially verified. One (9.1%) is contextually plausible. Two (18.2%) are not supported.

The patent Rogstad classified as delusional had been granted by the federal government and was searchable on a public website. The \$250 million valuation she treated as grandiose falls below the floor of independent market estimates by a factor of 340. The Netflix filing gap—twelve days—is a matter of USPTO public record. The DKIM-authenticated LinkedIn searches from defense and intelligence entities are cryptographically verified.

Rogstad acknowledged in her report “the limits of my expertise in relation to technology matters.” She attempted to contact Guertin's patent attorney on March 10—the same day she filed the report. She did not reach her. She did not contact the USPTO. She did not consult a technology expert. She did not search Google Patents. She classified the claims as delusional and moved on.

One claim Rogstad did not verify was, from the available evidence, correctly classified. Guertin's assertion that entities intended to kill him—that a “hit” had been placed on him—has no support in the forensic record. The escalation from patent dispute to assassination conspiracy represents an inferential leap the evidence does not bridge. This is the claim where Rogstad's clinical framing is most defensible.

But one correctly classified claim does not validate ten incorrectly classified ones. And it does not excuse the absence of any effort to verify the claims that were verifiable. The patent existed. It was public. A phone call or a web search would have confirmed it. That call was not made until the day the report was already written.

ACT 2 — THE FOREGONE CONCLUSION

June–July 2023: A Pre-Committed Opinion, a Private Meeting, and a Hearing

Three months after Rogstad filed her evaluation, and three weeks before she was scheduled to testify at Guertin's evidentiary hearing, she met privately with Assistant County Attorney Jacqueline Perez for witness preparation. The date was June 12, 2023. Defense counsel was neither notified nor present.

Perez prepared a summary memo of the conversation, which was subsequently filed in Guertin's federal lawsuit (Case 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM, Doc. 43, Page 195). The memo contains the following statement, attributed to Rogstad: "Even if he did have patents approved, this would not change her mind about her ultimate opinion."

By June 12, 2023, the patent had been granted for four months. It was public. It was real. And the evaluator who had classified it as delusional told the prosecution—in a private meeting without defense present—that proof she was wrong would not change her conclusion.

The evidentiary hearing took place July 7–13, 2023, before Referee George Borer. Rogstad testified. Guertin testified. The court found Rogstad "credible and persuasive." On July 13, 2023, Guertin was formally found incompetent to proceed. The order was seven pages with case-specific findings.

The incompetency finding suspended criminal proceedings and triggered the civil commitment machinery. Guertin's case entered dormancy. A related mental health case—27-MH-PR-23-815—was opened. The system had labeled him, and the label would prove difficult to remove.

ACT 3 — THE ECHO

January 2024: A Second Opinion That Isn't One

On November 15, 2023, the court ordered a second Rule 20.01 evaluation. Dr. Adam Milz, a supervising forensic psychologist at Fourth Judicial District Psychological Services—the same unit that employed Rogstad—was assigned. On January 3, 2024, Milz conducted a videoconference interview lasting approximately two hours. He filed his report eight days later, on January 11, 2024.

The diagnosis was the same. The conclusion was the same. But the Fact-Check Part 2 and the Transcript Verification Supplement reveal that the evaluation was not an independent assessment. It was an echo.

Deference, Not Independence

Milz explicitly stated that Guertin's background information "was outlined in the previous report submitted to the Court and will not be reiterated herein." The diagnosis was carried forward from Rogstad. The clinical framing was imported wholesale. Milz classified 19 specific assertions by Guertin as evidence of "delusional thinking (i.e., fixed false beliefs that are inconsistent with external reality)." The Fact-Check Part 2 tested each one: 12 of 19 (63.2%) have verified factual predicates in the forensic record. Zero are affirmatively contradicted by the evidence.

Milz's sole collateral contact beyond the defendant was an 8-minute phone call with Bruce Rivers—the defense attorney Guertin was alleging was compromised. Contacts beyond Rivers: zero. Patent verification attempts: zero. LinkedIn email verification: zero. Categories of Guertin's claims where Milz engaged with the factual merits: zero of five.

The Transcript

Guertin recorded the January 3, 2024 Zoom meeting. The video was subsequently filed publicly in federal court (Doc. 78, Exhibit AB). An AI-generated transcript of the recording allows line-by-line comparison between what was said and what Milz wrote.

The Transcript Verification Supplement documented the following:

Substance use fabrication. Milz attributed to Guertin “a history of problematic use of several substances, including alcohol, marijuana, methamphetamine, crack cocaine, dimethyltryptamine (DMT), and lysergic acid diethylamide (LSD).” The transcript records Milz asking directly: “Meth, cocaine, pills, anything?” Guertin’s response: “No.” When asked about marijuana: “No.” LSD is never mentioned by either speaker. Crack cocaine is never mentioned by either speaker. DMT was described by Guertin as a single, transformative experience in 2018 that led him to stop drinking and start exercising. Milz listed it alongside crack cocaine and methamphetamine as evidence of “problematic use.”

Self-harm contradiction. The Imminent Risk section of Milz’s report states: “Mr. Guertin has a history of threatening to harm himself.” The transcript records five separate exchanges on this topic. At timestamp 00:06:23, Guertin states: “I’ve never had any of those thoughts in my life.” At 00:20:53: “Absolutely not.” At 00:21:18: “There’s never been any plan in my life to hurt myself or anyone else.” Milz’s own report contains an internal contradiction: the Mental Health History section records “no suicidal thinking” while the Imminent Risk section asserts “a history of threatening to harm himself.”

The Administrative Order

Five days after Milz filed his report, Guertin was found incompetent for the second time. The January 16–17, 2024 Finding of Incompetency and Order was entered administratively—no evidentiary hearing, no testimony, no opportunity for the defendant to contest the findings. This order triggered civil commitment screening with a five-day deadline. Based substantially on an evaluation that attributed substance use the defendant explicitly denied, asserted self-harm history the defendant explicitly denied, and classified as delusional 19 claims of which 63.2% have verified factual predicates—Guertin was committed.

ACT 4 — THE SUPERVISOR

December 2024: Zero Hours, Inherited Diagnosis, “Poor” Prognosis

The third evaluation was assigned to Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook, PsyD, LP, ABPP (Forensic). Cranbrook is the Chief of Psychological Services for the Fourth Judicial District. She is the supervisor of the organizational unit that produced all three evaluations. She supervised both Rogstad and Milz.

The assignment itself arose from a conflict of interest. Guertin had filed a federal lawsuit (Case 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM) naming both prior evaluators among the defendants. Cranbrook removed Milz from the case due to the conflict. She then assigned herself—the supervisor of the unit, whose subordinates had been sued by the subject of the evaluation.

Cranbrook's December 20, 2024 report documents multiple attempts to schedule an interview. Guertin declined each time, requesting that his attorney be present "due to the blatant lies and deceptive reports" in prior evaluations. On December 2, 2024, Cranbrook informed Guertin she needed to interview him within two weeks. Guertin emailed back—copying defense counsel Raissa Carpenter—explaining his position and attaching what he described as evidence of his competency and of irregularities in prior evaluations. He did not refuse categorically; he requested his attorney's presence. Cranbrook responded that she needed to meet with Guertin, not his attorney. She received no further response.

Hours of direct clinical contact: zero. Cranbrook never interviewed, met with, spoke to, or examined Matthew Guertin. Her entire evaluation is based on record review, email correspondence, and one phone call with a Vail Place case manager on July 26, 2024.

The Inherited Diagnosis

Cranbrook's Diagnostic Summary states: "Prior examiners have provided a diagnosis of Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder, which is currently maintained based upon record review." The diagnosis was not independently derived. It was inherited from evaluators whose reports contained documented procedural issues—including fabricated substance use attributions and self-harm contradictions—and whose methodology had been the subject of a federal lawsuit.

The Fact-Check Part 3 documented seven claims Cranbrook classified as symptomatic or delusional. Of those seven, five have substantially documented factual predicates in the forensic record. Cranbrook investigated none of them. The report also documented seven competency indicators that Cranbrook herself noted: compliance with Vail Place case management, employment (painting homes), engagement with treatment services, acknowledgment of depressive symptoms and difficulty concentrating, absence of acute symptoms, sophisticated legal communication in emails and filings, and the fact that the stayed commitment was allowed to expire. None of these indicators are discussed as mitigating the diagnosis.

Circular Reasoning

Three patterns of circular reasoning run through the Cranbrook evaluation. First: Guertin refused to participate in the evaluation without his attorney present, citing documented falsehoods in prior evaluation reports. Cranbrook classified this refusal as a symptom of mental illness. Second: Guertin filed a federal lawsuit challenging the evaluation process. Cranbrook classified the lawsuit's allegations as evidence of "paranoid beliefs." Third: Guertin's emails and filings challenging the competency framework itself were classified as "themes consistent with prior evaluations"—that is, as symptoms.

The circularity is structural: if challenging the evaluation is a symptom of the illness the evaluation diagnosed, then there is no act the subject can take that would constitute evidence against the diagnosis. **The system has no exit.**

The Treatment Catch-22

Cranbrook's prognosis section prescribes antipsychotic medication as the path to competency restoration. She acknowledges that Guertin is "apt to be unwilling to participate in such treatment voluntarily." She acknowledges that he "does not appear... [to] meet criteria for civil commitment at this time." Without compulsory treatment, she concludes, "the defendant's prognosis for attaining the capacity for competent participation in the legal process appears poor."

If the diagnosis is correct, Guertin cannot be treated without his consent, and compulsory treatment is unavailable. If the diagnosis is wrong, no treatment is needed. In either scenario, the system has produced a conclusion—"poor prognosis"—that functionally means indefinite suspension of proceedings with no mechanism for resolution. The case cannot move forward to trial. The defendant cannot be treated against his will. The competency question cannot be resolved. The loop is closed.

ACT 5 — THE BUILDER

2024–2025: What "Incompetent" Looks Like in Practice

While three evaluators were classifying his beliefs as delusional and his prognosis as poor, this is what Matthew Guertin was building:

The forensic database. The MCRO forensic database is a structured analytical repository containing 4,251 court-filed PDF documents from 9,146 cases in the Hennepin County District Court system, with full docket-level data for 2,903 of those cases. It holds approximately 2.9 million rows across 53 tables and 11 views, organized into four hierarchical trees: a children tree (PDF-level forensic analysis), a parents tree (case-level docket data), a hashpack tree (content hashing and row-level SHA256 verification), and a source tree (scrape provenance). Every statistic in every report produced from this database is reproducible via the SQL queries published in each report's appendix.

Building a database of this complexity requires understanding relational schema design, foreign key relationships, data normalization, indexing strategy, and query optimization. It requires writing and debugging hundreds of SQL queries. It requires a systematic methodology for downloading, organizing, parsing, and analyzing thousands of PDF documents. It requires maintaining data integrity across millions of rows. The person who built it was, at the time, under a diagnosis of psychotic disorder with "poor" prognosis for competency restoration.

The forensic report library. Fifty or more professionally structured forensic reports, each with reproducible SQL, statistical analysis, chain-of-custody documentation, and cross-references to the broader report corpus. Reports cover digital signature authentication, font and tracking forensics, docket anomaly detection, template cloning analysis, metadata authentication, and claim-by-claim verification of clinical evaluation reports. Each report follows a consistent structure: title block, disclaimer, executive summary, methods, numbered findings with background-findings-significance sub-sections, limitations, recommendations, and appendix SQL.

The federal lawsuit. Case 0:24-cv-02646-JRT-DLM, filed July 2024 in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. Eleven defendants named. Exhibit packages running into hundreds of pages. The case was dismissed under Younger abstention on September 30, 2024—not on the merits.

The pro se filings. A 110-page Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel citing 53 case law authorities across state and federal courts, including *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975), with 53+ footnotes containing hyperlinked URLs. A 50-page Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice containing 42 testable factual claims—of which 66.7% were independently verified as accurate by the Motion to Dismiss Content Context Analysis Report. An 8,075-page evidence filing on April 28, 2025: 61 documents across 50 docket indexes (135–184), constituting the largest single filing event in the 4,251-document MCRO corpus.

DKIM email authentication. Ninety-nine LinkedIn notification emails independently authenticated via cryptographic DKIM verification, each verified with a 100% pass rate and zero forgery indicators. This is not casual email forwarding. DKIM authentication requires understanding email header structure, DNS record lookup, and cryptographic signature verification.

In total, the MCRO database records 139 docket entries filed by Guertin in case 27-CR-23-1886, encompassing 9,085 pages of material. The case file as a whole contains 200 PDFs totaling 12,077 pages. Over half of the case’s docket activity (56.5%) was generated by the defendant.

The word “incompetent,” as used in Rule 20.01, means the defendant cannot “understand the proceedings, participate in the defense, or consult rationally with counsel.” The person producing this output understood the proceedings well enough to identify forensic anomalies in the court’s own documents. He participated in his defense by filing more material than any other party in any case in the corpus. He consulted with counsel—or attempted to, as the email evidence would show—in detail, with specificity, and with documentary support.

ACT 6 — THE OVERRIDE

March–April 2025: Found Competent. Then Not.

March 5, 2025: Koch’s Hearing

The March 5, 2025 hearing before Judge William H. Koch was the first contested competency proceeding in the history of the case. For the first time in two years of competency litigation, a judge directly examined the defendant under oath on the question of whether he could understand and participate in his own proceedings.

Guertin testified for approximately 40 of the hearing’s 61 transcript pages. Koch conducted direct examination on competency elements: understanding of charges, awareness of potential penalties, ability to identify legal strategies, comprehension of courtroom roles and procedures. The March 5 Hearing Claims Analysis Report extracted 47 testable factual claims from the transcript. Guertin’s claims were verified at higher rates than any other speaker’s.

Dr. Cranbrook was present at the hearing but was not called as a witness by either side. Both parties agreed to receive her report without cross-examination—meaning the only evaluator who had assessed Guertin (with zero hours of clinical contact) was not subjected to adversarial questioning about her methodology or conclusions.

On April 3, 2025, Koch issued an order finding Guertin competent to proceed. The order is a notable document in its own right: the Koch Competency Order Document Forensics Report found it was the first MSIP-labeled (Microsoft Information Protection) document in the entire 4,251-document MCRO corpus. Of 34 MSIP-labeled documents corpus-wide, 4 belong to Guertin's case.

Koch's order accomplished something analytically paradoxical. It simultaneously found Cranbrook's conclusion that Guertin suffered from mental illness to be "credible" while finding—based solely on Guertin's direct testimony, over the evaluator's written assessment of "poor" prognosis—that he was competent. The order credited Guertin's testimony over the only expert opinion before the court.

April 17, 2025: Hudleston's First Hearing

Fourteen days after Koch found Guertin competent, the case was before a different judge. Sarah Hudleston's first docket appearance on the case was January 31, 2025. On April 17, she held a 19-minute hearing—her second on this case.

The April 17 Hearing Claims Analysis Report extracted 22 testable claims. Two things happened at this hearing that would prove consequential. First, defense counsel Raissa Carpenter told Hudleston she "does not concur" with Koch's competency finding. The defendant's own attorney, in open court, told the new judge she disagreed with the prior judge's determination that her client was competent. Second, Carpenter told Hudleston she had not adopted and would not pursue Guertin's Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice—the 50-page pro se filing containing 42 testable claims with a 66.7% verified accuracy rate.

Guertin, on the record, requested discharge of counsel and pro se status.

April 29, 2025: The Override

Twelve days after the April 17 hearing, Hudleston convened a 22-minute proceeding—the shortest of the three hearings in this series. In those 22 minutes, she denied Guertin's Petition to Proceed as Pro Se Counsel, the 110-page filing citing 53 case law authorities, and ordered a fourth Rule 20.01 competency evaluation.

Koch's competency finding—the only finding in the case based on extended direct testimony—was effectively set aside 26 days after it was issued.

The April 29 Hearing Claims Analysis Report extracted 40 testable factual claims across five speakers. The verification results tell their own story. Guertin's 13 claims: 8 verified true (61.5%), 4 partially true (30.8%), 0 verified false. Hamid's 5 claims: 1 verified true (20.0%), 2 verified false (40.0%), 2 partially true/misleading. For the second consecutive hearing, the prosecution held the only directly refuted claims.

Hudleston explicitly stated on the record that the Motion to Dismiss was the basis for the fourth Rule 20 order. Not new clinical evidence. Not the volume of filings. Not the 8,075 pages of

forensic reports filed the day before. The Motion to Dismiss—the document Guertin’s own attorneys refused to pursue.

The hearing record contains zero discussion of any MCRO forensic report, any exhibit filed at docket indexes 135–184, or any evidence from the April 28 filing. The 110-page Pro Se Petition filed eight days earlier was not discussed by name. Hudleston referred instead to a standard form she had given Guertin at the April 17 hearing. The 8,075 pages were before the court. The court did not look at them.

ACT 7 — THE LOOP

The System That Cannot Stop

As of the most recent data in the MCRO database, case 27-CR-23-1886 has accumulated 246 docket events spanning January 24, 2023 through December 2, 2025—a period of 1,043 days from the earliest to the most recent recorded event. The case status remains Open. The number of dispositions remains zero.

The case has generated 29 Rule 20 competency events by database count, placing it at the 93.7th percentile among the 1,288 criminal cases in the MCRO corpus with any Rule 20 activity. The case has been handled by 13 distinct judicial officers—against a corpus median of 4. It contains 200 court-filed PDF documents totaling 12,077 pages. It is the most heavily documented case in the entire 4,251-document corpus.

Six competency evaluation cycles have been ordered. Three evaluators from the same organizational unit produced reports. Two findings of incompetency were entered. One finding of competency was entered—and was overridden 26 days later. As of January 2026, a fifth Rule 20.01 evaluation was ordered. The loop continues.

The Deference Chain

Each evaluation relied on the one before it rather than conducting fully independent clinical work. Rogstad (March 2023) performed a 2-hour interview, primarily conducted by a postdoctoral fellow, and classified patent claims as delusional without verification. Milz (January 2024) explicitly deferred to Rogstad for background information and carried the diagnosis forward. He conducted a 2-hour videoconference, attributed substance use the defendant denied, and asserted self-harm history the defendant denied. Cranbrook (December 2024) “maintained” the diagnosis without any clinical contact, inheriting it from the two evaluators whose work she supervised.

The deference chain runs: Rogstad → Milz defers to Rogstad → Cranbrook “maintains” from both → Koch rejects all three and finds Guertin competent → Hudleston overrides Koch 26 days later.

The Structural Diagnosis

The competency system in this case exhibits a structural property that no single participant may have intended but that the data makes visible: the system has no mechanism for the subject to establish that his claims are real.

Guertin's strategy for demonstrating competency was to demonstrate that the claims evaluators classified as delusional were, in fact, true. He presented patent documentation. He filed forensic analyses. He built a database. He authenticated emails. He cited case law. He organized evidence across hundreds of exhibits.

The system's response to this effort was to order another evaluation. The act of building evidence to prove his claims are real was itself classified as evidence of illness. Cranbrook wrote that Guertin's "communications reviewed contain themes consistent with prior evaluations"—meaning his ongoing assertion that his claims were true was treated as confirmation of the diagnosis that said they were false.

The circular reasoning is not subtle. It can be stated in a single sentence: if asserting the evaluation is wrong is a symptom of the illness the evaluation diagnosed, then there is no evidence the subject can produce that would count against the diagnosis.

The Numbers

The broader MCRO corpus provides context for what happened to Guertin. Among the 163 cases in the original MCRO seed set, 86.5% carry formal "Found Incompetent" orders—a rate the MH Over-Representation Report documented as 36 to 216 times the published national baseline of 0.4–2.4% of criminal defendants found incompetent. Among mental health cases linked to the MCRO seed cluster network, civil commitment rates exceed 99%.

These figures do not prove that any individual case was handled improperly. They establish the statistical environment in which Guertin's case was processed. A system where more than 86% of the cases examined carry incompetency findings is a system where incompetency is the norm, not the exception.

The Human Cost

The facts of Guertin's situation as of this report's date can be stated without editorializing:

Three years and two months of criminal proceedings with no resolution. Two findings of incompetency, one finding of competency, one override, and a fifth evaluation cycle ordered in January 2026. A stayed civil commitment order that was allowed to expire—meaning the state's own system determined he no longer met commitment criteria—followed by continued competency proceedings based on the same diagnosis. Zero dispositions on the underlying charges. An inability to proceed to trial, represent himself, or have his factual claims heard on their merits.

And throughout: an evidentiary record growing at a pace the system has shown no inclination to examine.

EPILOGUE — THE QUESTION

This report has documented a verified US patent, an independently modeled addressable market exceeding \$85 billion, a near-identical competitor patent filed 12 days later by a corporation with a market capitalization exceeding \$200 billion, 597 cryptographically authenticated LinkedIn searches from defense, intelligence, and technology entities, a forensic database containing 4,251 court-filed documents and 2.9 million analytical rows, more than 50 reproducible forensic reports, a 66.7% factual accuracy rate on independently tested claims, 8,075 pages of evidence filed into the court record in a single day, a 110-page pro se petition citing 53 case law authorities, and a defendant who testified under oath for 40 pages about his case with sufficient coherence that the presiding judge found him competent.

The system's response was to order another evaluation.

The question this report poses—but does not answer—is a factual one: What evidence, if any, would be sufficient?

APPENDIX A: REPORT DEPENDENCY MAP

The following table lists every source document referenced in this report, organized by tier.

Report / Document	Date	Scope	Acts Cited
Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Rogstad	Mar 10, 2023	First Rule 20 evaluation	1, 2
Perez_Witness_Statement_Dr_Rogstad	Jun 12, 2023	Prosecution witness prep memo	2
Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Milz	Jan 11, 2024	Second Rule 20 evaluation	3
Rule_20_Evaluation_Report__Cranbrook	Dec 20, 2024	Third Rule 20 evaluation (zero contact)	4
MCRO Fact-Check Rogstad (Part 1)	Mar 8, 2026	Claim-by-claim verification: 11 categories	1, Prologue
MCRO Fact-Check Milz (Part 2)	Mar 8, 2026	Claim-by-claim verification: 19 claims	3
MCRO Milz Transcript Supplement	Mar 9, 2026	Transcript vs. report comparison	3
MCRO Fact-Check Cranbrook (Part 3)	Mar 8, 2026	Claim-by-claim verification: 7 claims	4
MCRO Guertin R20 Competency Analysis	Mar 8, 2026	Cross-evaluator structural analysis	1–7
Narrative Arc (Report 1/10)	Mar 9, 2026	Series introduction, case statistics	5, 7
Discovery Fraud Evidence (2/10)	Mar 9, 2026	Three discovery productions	6
Email Evidence (3/10)	Mar 9, 2026	41 DKIM-authenticated emails	6
March 5 Hearing Claims (4/10)	Mar 9, 2026	47 claims, 4 speakers	6
Koch Order Forensics (5/10)	Mar 9, 2026	MSIP analysis, signature architecture	6
Motion to Dismiss (6/10)	Mar 9, 2026	42 claims, 66.7% accuracy	5, 6
April 17 Hearing Claims (7/10)	Mar 9, 2026	22 claims, 4 speakers	6
Pro Se Petition Filing (8/10)	Mar 9, 2026	110 pages, 53 authorities	5, 6
April 29 Hearing Claims (9/10)	Mar 9, 2026	40 claims, 5 speakers	6

APPENDIX B: VERIFICATION LEDGER

Each metric below was re-verified from the live database before inclusion in this report. All queries are in Appendix C.

Metric	Expected	DB Result	Status
Total docket events	246	246	Match
Rule 20 events (regex)	29	29	Match
Total PDFs	200	200	Match
Total pages	12,077	12,077	Match
Judicial officers	13	13	Match
Case status	Open	Open	Match
Earliest event	Jan 24, 2023	Jan 24, 2023	Match
Latest event	Dec 2, 2025	Dec 2, 2025	Match
MSIP documents (corpus)	34	34	Match
Apr 28 filing: PDFs	61	61	Match
Apr 28 filing: pages	8,075	8,075	Match
Apr 28 docket range	135–184	135–184	Match
Docs at Rogstad eval	8 (16 pp)	8 (16 pp)	Match
Docs at Milz eval	14 (35 pp)	14 (35 pp)	Match
Docs at Cranbrook eval	88 (2,136 pp)	88 (2,136 pp)	Match
Defendant-filed events	139	139	Match
R20 percentile (at 29)	94.9th	93.7th	Minor variance
Related MH case	27-MH-PR-23-815	27-MH-PR-23-815	Match

Note: The R20 percentile minor variance (94.9th vs. 93.7th) reflects different denominator definitions across reports. Report 1/10 used the 1,602 cases with ≥ 1 R20 event; this verification used 1,288 CR-type cases with R20 activity. Both computations are correct for their respective scope.

APPENDIX C: KEY SQL QUERIES

C1 — Case Identity

```
SELECT cr.case_uid, cr.case_id, cr.cluster_id, cr.cluster_name, cr.defendant_name FROM
case_registry cr WHERE cr.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

C2 — Total Docket Events

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_events FROM parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-
cr-23-1886';
```

C3 — Rule 20 Events

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS r20_events FROM parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-
cr-23-1886' AND event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?incomp|forensic.?
nav)';
```

C4 — Total PDFs and Pages

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_pdfs, SUM(pdf_page_count) AS total_pages FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

C5 — Distinct Judicial Officers

```
SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm) AS distinct_judges
FROM parents_case_events_judicial_officers WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

C6 — MSIP Documents Corpus-Wide

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS msip_docs FROM children WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag =
true;
```

C7 — April 28, 2025 Filing (Children)

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS pdf_count, SUM(pdf_page_count) AS total_pages FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND filing_date = '2025-04-28';
```

C8 — Documents at Each Evaluation Date

```
SELECT SUM(CASE WHEN filing_date <= '2023-03-10' THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) AS
docs_by_rogstad, SUM(CASE WHEN filing_date <= '2024-01-11' THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) AS
docs_by_milz, SUM(CASE WHEN filing_date <= '2024-12-20' THEN 1 ELSE 0 END) AS
docs_by_cranbrook FROM children WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

C9 — Defendant-Filed Events

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS defendant_filed, SUM(event_json__page_count) AS total_pages FROM
parents_case_events WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND
event_json__filing_party_name ILIKE '%guertin%';
```

C10 — R20 Percentile Calculation

```
WITH case_r20 AS (SELECT pce.case_uid, COUNT(*) AS r20_count FROM
parents_case_events pce JOIN case_registry cr ON pce.case_uid = cr.case_uid WHERE
cr.case_id LIKE '%-CR-%' AND pce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc|found.?
incomp|forensic.?nav)' GROUP BY pce.case_uid) SELECT COUNT(*) AS cases_with_r20,
ROUND(100.0 * (SELECT COUNT(*) FROM case_r20 WHERE r20_count <= 29) / COUNT(*),
1) AS percentile_at_29 FROM case_r20;
```

APPENDIX D: CLAIM VERIFICATION SUMMARY

Consolidated scorecard across all three Rule 20 evaluations.

Evaluator	Claims Tested	Verified	Partially Verified	Not Supported	Untested
Dr. Jill Rogstad (Mar 2023)	11	4 (36.4%)	4 (36.4%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)
Dr. Adam Milz (Jan 2024)	19	12 (63.2%)	4 (21.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (15.8%)
Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook (Dec 2024)	7	5 (71.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (28.6%)
TOTAL	37	21 (56.8%)	8 (21.6%)	2 (5.4%)	6 (16.2%)

Of 37 claims classified as delusional, symptomatic, or psychotic across three evaluations by three evaluators from the same organizational unit, 21 (56.8%) have independently verified factual predicates. An additional 8 (21.6%) are partially verified. Two (5.4%) are not supported by the forensic record. Zero are affirmatively contradicted.

Cross-Hearing Claim Verification (February–May 2025)

Speaker	Total Claims	Verified True	Verified False	Partially True	Other
Guertin (all 3 hearings)	~68	~42 (62%)	0 (0%)	~20 (29%)	~6 (9%)
Hamid (all 3 hearings)	~15	~4 (27%)	3 (20%)	~6 (40%)	~2 (13%)
Donnelly (all 3 hearings)	~10	~6 (60%)	0 (0%)	~2 (20%)	~2 (20%)
Carpenter (all 3 hearings)	~8	~5 (63%)	0 (0%)	~2 (25%)	~1 (12%)
Koch (Mar 5 only)	~8	~5 (63%)	0 (0%)	~2 (25%)	~1 (12%)
Hudleston (Apr 17 + 29)	~20	~9 (45%)	0 (0%)	~8 (40%)	~3 (15%)

Note: Cross-hearing totals are approximate aggregations from Reports 4, 7, and 9. Exact figures for each claim are documented in the individual hearing reports. The prosecution holds the only VERIFIED FALSE claims across all three hearings.