

MCRO

FORENSIC REPORT SERIES

April 17, 2025 Hearing
Full Claims Analysis

Hearing Before Judge Sarah Hudleston

Report 7 of 10 — Hearing Claims Extraction and Verification

Property	Value
Report Date	March 9, 2026
Case	27-CR-23-1886 (State v. Matthew David Guertin)
Hearing Date	April 17, 2025 (9:15 AM – 9:34 AM; 19 minutes)
Presiding Judge	Sarah Hudleston (first appearance on this case)
Transcript	15 pages, certified by Maya Funk, Official Court Reporter
Database	ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2)
Series Position	Report 7 of 10 — Second of three hearing claims-analysis reports
Verification Sources	MCRO DB (Tier C), Reports 1–6 (Tier A), 49+ forensic reports (Tier A), filed exhibits (Tier B)

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report applies the MCRO Claims Analysis Methodology to every testable factual assertion made by each speaker during the April 17, 2025 hearing in case 27-CR-23-1886. Each claim is extracted from the certified transcript, tested against the MCRO forensic database and prior report findings, and classified using the five-category system: VERIFIED TRUE, VERIFIED FALSE, PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING, UNVERIFIABLE, and INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY.

This report does not allege fraud, assign intent, or draw legal conclusions. Classifications reflect whether a speaker's factual assertion is independently confirmed, contradicted, or untestable using the available evidence. The transcript records what each person said; whether what they said is true is what this report tests. A person's authority—judicial, prosecutorial, or professional—does not substitute for evidence in this analysis.

All database queries are SELECT-only and reproducible via the SQL in the Appendix. Prior report findings are cited by report name. Transcript page references correspond to the page numbering within the certified court transcript.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The April 17, 2025 hearing is Judge Sarah Hudleston's first appearance on case 27-CR-23-1886. The hearing lasted approximately 19 minutes (9:15 to 9:34 AM). It was scheduled as a continuation of the long-delayed omnibus hearing. What occurred instead was: (1) defense counsel told the new judge they do not concur with the competency finding Koch entered 14 days earlier; (2) defense counsel told the new judge they had not adopted and would not pursue Guertin's Motion to Dismiss; (3) the prosecution agreed the motion should not be addressed; (4) Hudleston declined to consider the pro se motion; (5) Guertin requested discharge of his public defenders and pro se status; and (6) the hearing was continued to April 29 for a pro se petition hearing.

This analysis extracted 22 testable factual claims across four speakers. The results:

- Hudleston (8 claims): 5 VERIFIED TRUE (62.5%), 2 PARTIALLY TRUE (25.0%), 0 VERIFIED FALSE, 1 UNVERIFIABLE (12.5%)
- Donnelly (7 claims): 4 VERIFIED TRUE (57.1%), 1 VERIFIED FALSE (14.3%), 1 PARTIALLY TRUE (14.3%), 1 UNVERIFIABLE (14.3%)
- Hamid (3 claims): 2 VERIFIED TRUE (66.7%), 1 PARTIALLY TRUE (33.3%)
- Guertin (4 claims): 3 VERIFIED TRUE (75.0%), 1 UNVERIFIABLE (25.0%)
- Overall: 14 of 22 claims VERIFIED TRUE (63.6%); 1 VERIFIED FALSE (4.5%); 3 PARTIALLY TRUE (13.6%); 2 UNVERIFIABLE (9.1%); 0 INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY
- The single VERIFIED FALSE claim belongs to Donnelly, who characterized the contested competency hearing as "a request, a demand...that was made by Mr. Guertin." The docket record shows the hearing arose from the statutory Rule 20.01 process, not from a defendant-initiated demand.
- The most consequential finding in this report is not any individual false claim but the systematic information deficit created by what no speaker told Hudleston. No speaker mentioned the 266 pages of forensic exhibits filed February 28 (indexes 122–125). No speaker mentioned the discovery fraud evidence. No speaker mentioned the evaluator contact hours. No speaker described the substance of Koch's competency analysis. Hudleston made every subsequent decision on this case from an information baseline constructed during this 19-minute hearing.

Scope Overview

Metric	Value
Total Testable Claims Extracted	22
Speakers Analyzed	4 (Hudleston, Donnelly, Hamid, Guertin)
Hearing Duration	~19 minutes (9:15–9:34 AM)
Transcript Pages	15 (3 substantive pages per speaker average)
Claims VERIFIED TRUE	14 (63.6%)
Claims VERIFIED FALSE	1 (4.5%)
Claims PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING	3 (13.6%)
Claims UNVERIFIABLE	2 (9.1%)
Claims INTERNALLY CONTRADICTIONARY	0
Prior Reports Cross-Referenced	8
Database Queries Executed	6
Docket Events on Record (as of Apr 17)	149

METHODS

The certified 15-page transcript was read in its entirety. Each speaker's statements were parsed for testable factual assertions. A "claim" is any statement asserting something is true about events, evidence, procedures, persons, legal requirements, or a person's capacity. Procedural directions, scheduling logistics, and pure legal opinions were excluded unless they contained embedded factual assertions.

Each extracted claim was tested against three evidentiary tiers: (1) Tier C — the MCRO forensic database via SELECT-only SQL queries targeting `parents_case_events`, `children`, `parents_attorneys_defense_active`, and `parents_case_events_judicial_officers` for case 27-CR-23-1886; (2) Tier A — the full library of 49+ MCRO forensic reports, with particular reliance on Reports 2–6 in this series, the three Rule 20 Fact Check reports (Rogstad, Milz, Cranbrook), and the Discovery Fraud Competency Chronology; and (3) Tier B — the March 5, 2025 hearing transcript (Report 4), the Motion to Dismiss (Report 6), the Pro Se Petition (Index 133), and the email exhibits (EML-A series).

Claims are classified using the five-category system established in Report 4 to enable direct cross-hearing comparison: VERIFIED TRUE (independently confirmed by Tier A/C evidence), VERIFIED FALSE (directly contradicted), PARTIALLY TRUE/MISLEADING (kernel of truth with material omission or misleading framing), UNVERIFIABLE (cannot be tested with available data), and INTERNALLY CONTRADICTORY (contradicts other claims by the same person).

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Speaker Inventory and Hearing Structure

Background

This finding catalogs every person who spoke during the hearing, their procedural role, and the scope of their participation. Unlike the March 5 hearing (61 pages, ~2 hours), this hearing is brief and procedurally oriented.

Findings

Speaker	Role	Pages	Under Oath	Est. Pages
Sarah Hudleston	Presiding Judge	3–14	No (judicial)	~5
Emmett Donnelly	Public Defender	3–4, 7, 9, 14	No (counsel)	~3
Mawerdi Hamid	Prosecutor	3, 4–5, 9, 12	No (counsel)	~1
Matthew Guertin	Defendant	5–6, 9–14	No (not sworn)	~4
Raissa Carpenter	Public Defender	Appearance only	No	<0.5
Court Clerk	Clerk	3 (call only)	No	<0.5

Significance

Three structural contrasts with the March 5 hearing (Report 4) are immediately apparent. First, Guertin was not placed under oath at this hearing; his statements are on the record but not sworn testimony. Second, Carpenter did not speak beyond the initial appearance; Donnelly handled all substantive defense communications. Third, the hearing is dominated by Hudleston and Donnelly's exchange, with Guertin intervening to contest the framing of his situation. The

prosecutor's role is minimal—three brief statements totaling approximately one page of transcript.

Connecting Context

At the March 5 hearing, Guertin testified under oath for approximately 40 of 61 pages and was the dominant voice. Here, the attorneys and judge control the narrative. Guertin must interrupt to be heard. This structural shift—from a hearing centered on the defendant's testimony to one where counsel speaks about the defendant—becomes critical context for the information deficit analysis in Finding 4.

Finding 2: Complete Claims Registry — All Speakers

Background

Every testable factual claim by each speaker is cataloged below with page references, verification evidence, and classification. Claims are grouped by speaker.

Judge Hudleston — 8 Claims

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
H-01	3	The omnibus hearing had been postponed several times based on the Rule 20.01 referral and evaluation report.	DB: 4 Rule 20.01 orders (Jan 2023, Nov 2023, May 2024, Oct 2024). Multiple continuances documented. Omnibus repeatedly delayed.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-02	3	The Rule 20 report was contested.	DB: March 5, 2025 contested competency hearing confirmed. Koch took case under advisement. Report 4 documents full hearing.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-03	3	Judge Koch ultimately entered a finding recently of competence.	DB: April 3, 2025 'Found Competent' event and Order-Other (Index 127), attributed to William Koch. Report 5 confirms.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-04	5	Defense counsel are "very well trained in the law and very experienced."	Professional qualifications of Carpenter and Donnelly are not independently verified in this project. Standard judicial characterization of officers of the court.	UNVERIFIABLE
H-05	5	Defense counsel "have defended you and put forth your interests in this recent competency proceeding."	Report 4: Donnelly conducted opening/closing at March 5 hearing. However, Donnelly instructed court NOT to enter Guertin's exhibits (122–125) at closing. Report 3: Zero defense counsel docket filings Feb–Apr 2025. Report 3: Zero responses to Feb 20 discovery fraud email. Koch's order footnote 1 records defense declined to offer exhibits.	PARTIALLY TRUE
H-06	4	Courts don't generally accept additional pro se motions when someone is represented.	This is a statement of general legal practice. Minnesota law recognizes hybrid representation restrictions but also defendant's right to be heard. Procedural claim, not factual assertion about this case.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-07	12	"I'm bound by the competency finding."	Correct as a legal principle. Koch's April 3 competency finding was the operative court order. However, Hudleston ordered a 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation 12 days later (April 29), raising the question of what changed between this statement and that order.	VERIFIED TRUE
H-08	5	The motion to dismiss "was filed yesterday."	DB: Motion to Dismiss (Index 131) filed April 16, 2025. Hearing is April 17, 2025. One day prior confirmed. Document metadata: XMP create date April 16, 2025 at 3:07 PM CDT.	VERIFIED TRUE

Emmett Donnelly — 7 Claims

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
D-01	3	The contested competency hearing was held in front of	DB: March 5, 2025 hearing confirmed (event_index 107). April 3, 2025 'Found	VERIFIED TRUE

		Judge Koch. He made a ruling.	Competent' (event_index 105) and Order-Other (event_index 104), both attributed to Koch.	
D-02	3	"That was a request, a demand for a competency hearing that was made by Mr. Guertin."	DB: The contested hearing arose from the statutory Rule 20.01 process. The 3rd R20 order was issued Oct 15, 2024 by Judge Askalani. Cranbrook's report filed Dec 20, 2024. Guertin did contest the finding—i.e., he challenged the incompetency conclusion—but the hearing itself exists because the evaluation was ordered by the court. Framing this as Guertin's "demand" misattributes the procedural origin. The process that created the hearing was court-initiated.	VERIFIED FALSE
D-03	4	Defense counsel provided representation during the competency hearing.	Report 4: Donnelly gave opening/closing statements at March 5 hearing. Carpenter was present. This is confirmed by the March 5 transcript.	VERIFIED TRUE
D-04	4	"That doesn't mean that we concur with the ruling." (referring to Koch's competency finding)	This is a statement of Donnelly's professional position—he is telling Hudleston that defense counsel disagrees with Koch's finding that Guertin is competent. Not a testable factual claim per se, but the framing is significant: defense counsel is signaling to a new judge that the operative competency finding should not be relied upon.	PARTIALLY TRUE
D-05	4	Guertin has filed various pro se motions including a motion to dismiss that includes a demand for an evidentiary hearing.	DB: Motion to Dismiss (Index 131, April 16). Exhibit Lists at 128–130 (April 10–14). Report 6 confirms the motion does include a demand for evidentiary hearing.	VERIFIED TRUE
D-06	4	"We have not filed that motion. We have not adopted that motion."	DB: Zero defense counsel filings in the Feb–Apr 2025 window confirmed. Report 3: Zero defense counsel docket events in this period. The motion (Index 131) lists Guertin as filer.	VERIFIED TRUE
D-07	4	"We do not intend to bring it up for a hearing."	This is a statement of counsel's intention, not a testable fact. However, it is testable whether defense counsel subsequently brought the motion for hearing: the docket confirms they did not.	UNVERIFIABLE

Mawerdi Hamid — 3 Claims

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
HM-01	4	"Defendant is represented. He filed the pro se motion."	DB: Carpenter (lead) and Donnelly (co-counsel) listed as active defense attorneys. Motion to Dismiss (Index 131) filed by Guertin pro se. Both statements confirmed.	VERIFIED TRUE
HM-02	4	"The counsels are not adopting or filing this motion on his behalf."	Consistent with Donnelly's statements. DB confirms zero defense counsel filings Feb–Apr 2025.	VERIFIED TRUE
HM-03	4–5	The motion "is not properly before the Court and should not be addressed."	This is a legal characterization, not purely factual. The motion was in fact filed into the docket system and assigned Index 131. Whether a pro se motion filed by a represented defendant is "properly before	PARTIALLY TRUE

			the court” is a legal question. However, Minnesota law recognizes the defendant's right to be heard, and the motion was accepted into the court's electronic filing system.	
--	--	--	---	--

Matthew Guertin — 4 Claims

ID	Pg	Claim Summary	Verification	Result
G-01	5	Public defenders are assigned because he satisfied the criteria of not making enough money.	Standard public defender appointment criteria under Minn. Stat. § 611.14 et seq. Income-based eligibility is the standard mechanism.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-02	6	The motion was filed yesterday at 3:15 PM.	DB: Index 131 filing date April 16. Document metadata: XMP create date 2025-04-16T20:07:10 UTC (3:07 PM CDT). E-file stamp time visible in transcript footer. Report 6 confirms filing.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-03	5–6	His legal strategy is to have the Motion to Dismiss heard and ruled upon.	Consistent with the motion's content (Report 6) and the Pro Se Petition's statements (Index 133). The Pro Se Petition explicitly states this is the core purpose of seeking self-representation.	VERIFIED TRUE
G-04	12	There is still “some sort of determination being made about whether or not I am allowed to proceed with representing myself.”	Guertin is characterizing the pro se petition process as another competency gatekeeping exercise. This is his interpretation; the Faretta inquiry is a standard legal process distinct from Rule 20 competency. However, his underlying concern—that another assessment of his capacity is being interposed—proved prescient: Hudleston ordered a 4th Rule 20 evaluation 12 days later.	UNVERIFIABLE

Finding 3: Per-Person Verification Scorecard

Background

This finding aggregates the claim-by-claim results into a per-speaker scorecard, directly comparable to the Report 4 scorecard from the March 5 hearing.

Findings

Speaker	Total	Verified True	Verified False	Partially True	Unverifiable	Contradictory
Hudleston	8	5 (62.5%)	0	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	0
Donnelly	7	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	0
Hamid	3	2 (66.7%)	0	1 (33.3%)	0	0
Guertin	4	3 (75.0%)	0	0	1 (25.0%)	0
TOTAL	22	14 (63.6%)	1 (4.5%)	3* (13.6%)	2* (9.1%)	0

* Two additional claims (D-04 and D-07) straddle the line between opinion and factual assertion. D-04 (Donnelly's non-concurrence with Koch's ruling) is classified PARTIALLY TRUE because while it is an accurate statement of Donnelly's position, the framing carries significant factual implications. D-07 (intention not to bring the motion for hearing) is classified UNVERIFIABLE as to intent, though it proved accurate in practice.

Significance

Donnelly is the only speaker who produced a VERIFIED FALSE claim in this hearing (D-02: misattributing the contested hearing's origin to Guertin's "demand"). This is notable because Donnelly also produced the highest volume of substantive claims and is the speaker who shaped Hudleston's understanding of the case's procedural history. Guertin's factual accuracy rate (75.0%) is the highest of any speaker in this hearing, continuing the pattern from Report 4 where his verification rate was 61.3% (and 0.0% false).

Finding 4: What Hudleston Was Told vs. What the Record Shows

Background

This is the most important analysis in this report. Judge Hudleston’s first encounter with case 27-CR-23-1886 occurred during this 19-minute hearing. Every decision she subsequently made—including the April 29 order overriding Koch’s competency finding—was informed by the baseline understanding she formed here. This finding systematically reconstructs what information she received and what she did not receive.

Findings

Part A: What She Was Told

Topic	What Hudleston Was Told	What the Record Shows	Gap
Case Posture	Omnibus postponed due to R20 process; Koch found Guertin competent recently.	Accurate. Multiple postponements confirmed. Koch’s April 3 order confirmed.	ACCURATE
Contested Hearing Origin	Donnelly: the contested hearing was Guertin’s “demand.”	Misleading. The hearing arose from the statutory R20 process. Guertin contested the evaluator’s finding—which is his statutory right—not an independent demand.	MISLEADING
Defense Counsel Position on Koch Ruling	Donnelly: “That doesn’t mean that we concur with the ruling.”	Defense counsel explicitly told the new judge they disagree with the competency finding that allows the case to proceed. No factual basis was articulated for this disagreement.	SIGNIFICANT FRAMING
Motion to Dismiss	Filed yesterday. Counsel has not adopted it. Not properly before the court.	The motion exists (Index 131, 50 pages). Its content—discovery fraud, evaluator misconduct, Brady violations, patent claims—was never described to Hudleston.	ACCURATE BUT INCOMPLETE
Defense Counsel Quality	Hudleston: counsel are very experienced and have put forth Guertin’s interests.	Partially supported. Donnelly did represent Guertin at the March 5 hearing. However, Report 3 documents zero responses to the Feb 20 discovery fraud email and zero defense counsel docket filings Feb–Apr 2025.	INCOMPLETE
Pro Se Process	Hudleston described the Faretta petition process accurately and offered continuance.	Standard procedure correctly described. The pro se petition process she outlined matches Minnesota practice.	ACCURATE

Part B: Material Omissions — What She Was NOT Told

The following material facts were available in the court record at the time of this hearing. No speaker brought any of them to Hudleston’s attention.

Omitted Topic	What the Record Contains	What Hudleston Was Told
Discovery Fraud Exhibits (Feb 28)	Guertin filed 266 pages of forensic analysis at indexes 122–125 documenting alleged discovery manipulation, including 259 embedded comparison images.	No speaker mentioned these filings. The filings existed in the docket for 48 days before this hearing.
Feb 20 Email to Counsel	Guertin sent Carpenter and Donnelly a	No speaker disclosed that defense

	completed forensic analysis of discovery manipulation on Feb 20, 2025, with links to PDFs, 20 comparison images, and supporting documents. Zero responses from either attorney (Report 3, verified via SHA-256).	counsel had received forensic evidence of discovery manipulation and not responded.
Koch's Specific Findings	Koch found Guertin demonstrated understanding of charges, roles of parties, nature of trial, value of counsel, and plea bargaining. Koch found Guertin's testimony about his professional career "apparently credible." (Report 5)	No speaker described the substance of Koch's analysis. Hudleston was told only that Koch "entered a finding."
Evaluator Contact Hours	Three evaluations across 27 months with a combined total of approximately 4–5 hours of clinical contact. Cranbrook: zero hours of direct examination (Cranbrook Fact Check, Report 1).	No speaker informed Hudleston about the evaluator contact hours or Cranbrook's zero-contact evaluation.
Evaluator Report Metadata	Rogstad's report authored by "GuzmanC" (Rogstad Fact Check). All three evaluation reports carry metadata anomalies documented across three dedicated forensic reports.	No speaker mentioned metadata concerns with any evaluation report.
Guertin's March 5 Testimony	Guertin testified under oath for approximately 40 pages about discovery fraud, patent theft, his professional background, evaluator conduct, and competency elements (Report 4).	No speaker described what Guertin actually testified about at the March 5 hearing.
Defense Counsel Inaction	Zero defense counsel docket filings in the Feb–Apr 2025 period (DB-confirmed). Zero responses to discovery fraud evidence email. Defense declined to enter Guertin's exhibits at March 5 closing (Koch order, footnote 1).	No speaker informed Hudleston that defense counsel had filed nothing in the case for the entire period.
Motion Content	The 50-page Motion to Dismiss addresses discovery fraud (Section IV), Brady violations (Section V), three evaluator fact checks (Section III), patent fraud (Section VI), and defense counsel conflict (Section VII) (Report 6).	No speaker described any of the motion's 11 sections or its factual bases. Hudleston was told only that it was a "Motion to Dismiss all Charges with Prejudice" and that counsel disagreed with it.

Significance

The information deficit is systematic. Hudleston received three categories of input: (1) accurate but skeletal procedural facts (Koch found competency, omnibus was delayed); (2) defense counsel's characterization of their own client's position as one they disagreed with; and (3) joint attorney consensus that the pro se motion should not be addressed. She received zero information about the evidentiary substance of anything Guertin had filed, testified about, or documented. The 266 pages of forensic exhibits at indexes 122–125 were as invisible to Hudleston as if they had never been filed.

This gap is not attributable to time pressure (the hearing lasted only 19 minutes with much of it spent on scheduling). It is attributable to the fact that the only parties positioned to inform Hudleston about the record—the attorneys and the defendant—either chose not to (counsel) or were procedurally constrained from doing so (Guertin, whose pro se filings were deemed not properly before the court).

Connecting Context

At the March 5 hearing (Report 4), Koch heard approximately 2 hours of testimony and examined the case in detail before reaching his competency determination. At this hearing, Hudleston received 19 minutes of procedural discussion with zero testimony, zero evidence review, and zero discussion of the case's substantive record. Twelve days later, she would override Koch's finding. The information available to each judge at the time of their respective decisions is not comparable.

Finding 5: Defense Counsel's "Disagreement" — Anatomy and Implications

Background

Donnelly made two distinct "disagreement" statements during this hearing. The first concerned Koch's competency finding. The second concerned Guertin's Motion to Dismiss. These are analytically distinct and carry different implications for the information Hudleston received.

Findings

Statement 1: Disagreement with Koch's Competency Finding (Page 4)

Donnelly's exact words: "That doesn't mean that we concur with the ruling." This was stated in context of describing the March 5 hearing and Koch's competency finding. He did not articulate a factual basis for the disagreement. He did not identify any specific error in Koch's analysis. He did not claim new clinical evidence had emerged since April 3.

Testing this against the available record:

- Koch's order was based on approximately 2 hours of in-person testimony in which Guertin demonstrated competency across all standard elements (Report 4, Report 5).
- Koch credited both Cranbrook's mental illness diagnosis AND found Guertin met the legal competency standard—the correct legal framework under Minnesota law.
- Between April 3 (Koch's order) and April 17 (this hearing), no new clinical evaluation, no new R20 report, and no motion to reconsider the competency finding appears in the docket.
- Report 3: Carpenter sent one email to Guertin in this period (April 3, notifying him of the competency order). Neither attorney articulated any concern about the competency finding in the email record.
- No defense counsel filing challenging or questioning Koch's competency finding exists in the docket (DB-confirmed).

Statement 2: Non-Adoption of the Motion to Dismiss (Page 4)

Donnelly's exact words: "We have not filed that motion. We have not adopted that motion. But it is not — we do not intend to bring it up for a hearing, but it is not our role to dispose of that motion either."

This statement is factually accurate: defense counsel did not file or adopt the motion (DB-confirmed). However, the characterization carries an implicit message to the new judge: this is a motion the defendant's own lawyers do not support. No speaker described the motion's content or factual bases. Report 6's analysis shows the motion's factual claims have a 66.7% verification rate (28 of 42 testable claims independently confirmed). The motion was not frivolous; its factual foundation substantially aligns with the forensic evidence. Whether counsel's non-adoption reflects professional judgment, institutional constraints, or some other factor cannot be determined from the available record.

Significance

The combined effect of these two statements is significant for the information baseline they constructed. Donnelly told Hudleston: (1) the competency finding should not be relied upon, and (2) the defendant's motion should not be heard. Both positions align with the prosecution's interests (maintaining the charges, avoiding the motion's factual allegations). Neither position is accompanied by a factual basis articulated on the record. This is the posture that Guertin's Pro Se Petition (Index 133, filed 4 days later) describes as "counsel...aligned themselves with an adverse position."

Whether defense counsel's positions constitute legitimate professional disagreement or something more problematic is beyond the scope of this forensic analysis. What this report documents is the factual record: defense counsel told a new judge they disagreed with the competency finding without stating a basis, and they declined to pursue a motion whose underlying factual claims are substantially supported by independent evidence.

Finding 6: Cross-Hearing Claim Evolution (March 5 → April 17)

Background

This finding tracks how key topics were characterized at the March 5 hearing (Report 4) versus the April 17 hearing, identifying shifts in framing, emphasis, and factual accuracy.

Findings

Topic	March 5 Hearing (Report 4)	April 17 Hearing	Claim Evolution
Guertin's Competency	Koch directly examined Guertin for ~40 pages. Guertin demonstrated understanding of charges, court roles, plea bargaining, value of counsel. Koch: competent.	Donnelly: "we don't concur with the ruling." No factual basis offered. No examination. No testimony. No clinical evidence cited.	Shift from evidence-based determination to unsupported characterization.
Discovery Fraud	Guertin testified under oath for multiple pages about manipulated photographs, aspect ratio anomalies, OneDrive provenance, ggilbertson username. Donnelly presented this as defense's position.	Not mentioned by any speaker. The 266 pages of exhibits (122–125) and the Feb 20 email are invisible.	Total disappearance from the record.
Motion to Dismiss	Did not exist at March 5.	Filed April 16 (50 pages). Described only as a pro se filing counsel disagrees with. No content discussed.	New topic, but introduced only as a procedural problem, not a substantive filing.
Defense Counsel Role	Donnelly conducted opening/closing. Called no other witnesses. Declined to enter Guertin's exhibits at closing.	Donnelly tells new judge they disagree with both the competency finding and the defendant's motion.	Shift from nominal advocacy to open opposition to client's positions.
Pro Se Request	Guertin had previously filed a pro se petition (April 2024, denied by Klein).	Guertin requests discharge of public defenders. Hudleston initiates Faretta process for April 29.	New instance of pro se request, now following competency finding.
Evaluator Evidence	Both sides agreed to receive Cranbrook's report without cross-examination. Cranbrook present but not called.	Not mentioned. No discussion of any evaluator's findings, methods, or contact hours.	Total disappearance from the record.

Significance

The most striking pattern is selective disappearance. The discovery fraud evidence that occupied substantial portions of Guertin's March 5 testimony—and that defense counsel itself presented as its position at that hearing—is entirely absent from the April 17 proceeding. The evaluator evidence that formed the clinical basis for the competency dispute is entirely absent. The factual record that Koch spent hours examining is reduced to a one-sentence procedural acknowledgment. What replaces this factual substance is counsel's characterization: they disagree with the ruling, they disagree with the motion, and the new judge should proceed accordingly.

Finding 7: Hudleston Information Deficit — Structured Gap Analysis

Background

This finding synthesizes Findings 4 and 6 into a structured matrix for use in Report 9 (April 29 hearing analysis). The gap assessment uses a three-tier scale: FULL (Hudleston received materially complete information), PARTIAL (received some information but with significant omissions), and NONE (topic was not raised).

Findings

Topic	Information Level	Gap Detail
Case procedural posture	PARTIAL	Knew omnibus was delayed; knew Koch found competency. Did not know specific procedural history, number of evaluations, or judicial officer rotation.
Koch competency analysis	NONE	Knew Koch made a finding. Did not know the basis (2 hours testimony, specific competency elements demonstrated, dual holding on illness + competency).
Discovery fraud evidence	NONE	No speaker mentioned indexes 122–125, the Feb 20 email, the ggilbertson metadata, aspect ratio anomalies, or any discovery dispute.
Rule 20 evaluation history	NONE	No speaker described the three evaluators, their methods, their contact hours, their metadata anomalies, or the Cranbrook zero-contact issue.
Motion to Dismiss content	NONE	Knew a motion existed and was filed yesterday. Did not know its 11 sections, its factual bases, or its 66.7% verified claim rate (Report 6).
Defense counsel Feb–Apr activity	PARTIAL	Knew counsel was on the case. Did not know about zero filings, zero email responses, or the exhibit exclusion at March 5 closing.
Defendant's prior testimony	NONE	Did not know what Guertin testified about under oath at the March 5 hearing.
Patent / IP claims	NONE	No mention of InfiniSet, Netflix, US Patent 11,577,177, or any technology-related claims.

Significance

Of eight major case topics, Hudleston received NONE-level information on five, PARTIAL on two, and FULL on zero. This hearing gave her enough procedural orientation to know where the case stood on the calendar, but virtually nothing about the substantive record that Koch had spent hours examining. When she returned to the bench on April 29 to make the most consequential decision of the case—ordering a 4th competency evaluation that overrode Koch's finding—her factual foundation consisted primarily of this 19-minute hearing plus whatever she reviewed independently in the interim.

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

- This analysis covers only what appears in the certified transcript. Off-record conversations (including the two noted recesses) may have conveyed additional information. However, any information communicated off-record is not part of the court record and is not available for verification.
- Hudleston may have reviewed the docket independently before or after this hearing. Judges routinely review case files. However, the transcript reflects no reference to any docket filing by index number, no discussion of exhibit content, and no indication that the substance of prior proceedings was reviewed.
- Defense counsel's disagreement with Koch's finding may reflect legitimate professional concern about their client's mental health that they chose not to articulate publicly. This report documents what was said on the record; unexpressed internal reasoning cannot be evaluated.
- The "demand" characterization (D-02, classified VERIFIED FALSE) could reflect Donnelly's use of informal language rather than deliberate misrepresentation. The distinction between "contesting an evaluator's finding" and "demanding a hearing" is meaningful procedurally but may not have been intended as a precise legal characterization.
- Hamid's minimal participation (approximately 1 page) may reflect prosecutorial strategy (let defense counsel do the framing) rather than lack of relevant information.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

- Obtain any bench notes or chambers review records for Hudleston in the April 17–29 window to determine what docket materials she reviewed independently.
- Review Hudleston's April 29 hearing statements (Report 9) for any indication that she reviewed the docket beyond what this hearing provided.
- Compare the information baseline established here against Hudleston's specific findings in the April 29 order to determine which of her stated reasons are traceable to information received at this hearing versus information obtained elsewhere.
- Cross-reference defense counsel's positions at this hearing against their positions at the April 29 hearing to determine if the "disagreement" framing was maintained, escalated, or retracted.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

A1 — Docket Events as of April 17, 2025

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date AS event_date, event_name,
       event_json__filing_party_name AS filing_party, docket_index
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
      AND event_json__date <= '2025-04-17'
ORDER BY event_json__date DESC, event_index
LIMIT 30;
```

A2 — Judicial Officers for April 2025 Events

```
SELECT pce.event_index, pce.event_json__date AS event_date,
       pce.event_name,
       jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm AS judge
FROM parents_case_events pce
LEFT JOIN parents_case_events_judicial_officers jo
  ON pce.case_uid = jo.case_uid
  AND pce.event_index = jo.event_index
WHERE pce.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
      AND pce.event_json__date BETWEEN '2025-04-01' AND '2025-04-30'
ORDER BY pce.event_json__date, pce.event_index DESC;
```

A3 — Defense Counsel Filings Feb–Apr 2025

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date AS event_date, event_name,
       event_json__filing_party_name AS filing_party
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
      AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2025-02-01' AND '2025-04-30'
      AND (event_json__filing_party_name ILIKE '%carpenter%'
           OR event_json__filing_party_name ILIKE '%donnelly%')
ORDER BY event_json__date;
-- Returns: 0 rows
```

A4 — Rule 20 Event History

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

A5 — Documents Filed Between Koch Order and April 17 Hearing

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, filing_type
FROM children
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
      AND filing_date BETWEEN '2025-04-03' AND '2025-04-17'
ORDER BY filing_date;
```

A6 — Active Defense Attorneys

```
SELECT attorney_json__attorney_norm, attorney_json__is_lead
FROM parents_attorneys_defense_active
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```