

MCRO

FORENSIC REPORT SERIES

The Email Evidence

Carpenter/Donnelly Communications: February–April 2025

Report 3 of 10 — Attorney-Client Communication Forensic Analysis

Report Date: March 9, 2026 | Database Queried: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2) | Federal Exhibit: Doc. 61, 0:25-cv-02670-PAM-DLM (Filed 07/12/2025)

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents an objective forensic analysis of email communications between Matthew Guertin and his defense attorneys Raissa Carpenter and Emmett Donnelly during the critical February–April 2025 period in case 27-CR-23-1886. The analysis integrates three distinct evidentiary sources: (1) five original .eml source files verified via independent SHA-256 hash computation against the federally-filed exhibit; (2) the complete 215-page Exhibit EML-A (Doc. 61, Guertin v. Walz, 0:25-cv-02670-PAM-DLM, filed 07/12/2025) as parsed and authenticated in the MCRO Exhibit EML-A Part 1 report; and (3) the live MCRO forensic database for case docket cross-referencing.

This report does not allege fraud, assign intent, or draw legal conclusions. Communication patterns are presented quantitatively. Non-response periods are documented as factual gaps in the authenticated email record. Defense counsel may have communicated through channels not captured in this corpus (phone, in-person, text message). All database metrics are reproducible via the SQL queries in the Appendix.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the email communications between Guertin and his defense attorneys during the 68-day window from February 20, 2025 (when Guertin sent his discovery fraud analysis to counsel) through April 29, 2025 (when Judge Hudleston ordered a fourth competency evaluation). The findings are based on five original .eml files independently authenticated against federal court records, the complete 41-email EML-A exhibit registry, and MCRO database docket events.

- Five .eml source files (emails #35–39 from the EML-A registry) were independently verified via SHA-256 hash computation. All five hashes match the values printed in the federally-filed Exhibit EML-A (Doc. 61, 0:25-cv-02670-PAM-DLM) byte-for-byte.
- Email #38 (Van Guilder → Guertin, March 3, 2025) passed DKIM verification (rsa-sha256, d=hennepin.us), DMARC (p=reject), SPF, and ARC authentication as recorded by Proton Mail's receiving server. This constitutes independent cryptographic proof that this email originated from Hennepin County's mail infrastructure.
- One email attachment (email #36: 00__Discovery-Fraud__Brief-Introduction-of-Facts__MISSING-PAGE-1.pdf, 108,491 bytes) was independently verified via SHA-256 hash computation. The hash matches the value printed in the exhibit: c88e9d2b65d34ed693119f58bbc53bc1d1f2612e00cf457866f821d936c4ecae.

- On February 20, 2025, Guertin emailed Carpenter and Donnelly with a completed forensic analysis of discovery manipulation, including links to three PDF analysis reports, 20 comparison images, and key supporting documents. Zero responses from either Carpenter or Donnelly appear in the authenticated email record. The next email from Carpenter to Guertin occurs 42 days later, on April 3, 2025.
- Between February 20 and April 29, 2025 (68 days), Guertin sent 5 emails in the authenticated chain. Carpenter sent 1 email (the April 3 competency order notification). Donnelly sent 0 emails. Van Guilder sent 1 email (discovery link on March 3).
- A search of the MCRO database for case 27-CR-23-1886 reveals zero docket events filed by defense counsel during the entire February 1 – April 30, 2025 period. All 92 docket events in this window were filed by either Guertin (pro se) or judicial officers.
- Van Guilder's March 3, 2025 email stated she excluded all videos from the discovery production because they were "all body cams and squad videos." Guertin's same-day response cited MN Statute §13.825(Subd. 4(b)) and Rule 9 to challenge this exclusion. No response from Van Guilder, Carpenter, or Donnelly appears in the record.
- Carpenter's April 3 email used the domain Raissa.Carpenter@pubdef.state.mn.us, a transition from the Raissa.Carpenter@hennepin.us domain used in all prior emails. Her contact signature listed raissa.carpenter@mnpd.us. This three-domain pattern is consistent with an institutional transition from county to state public defender infrastructure.
- This report establishes 11 claim-verification anchors—specific, timestamped communications that can be tested against hearing claims in Reports 4, 7, and 9 regarding what defense counsel knew, when they learned it, and what actions they took or failed to take.

Scope Overview

Metric	Value
Primary Case	27-CR-23-1886 (State v. Guertin)
Report Window	February 20 – April 29, 2025 (68 days)
Emails Analyzed (Window)	7 (5 Guertin, 1 Van Guilder, 1 Carpenter)
Full EML-A Registry	41 emails authenticated (Oct 2024 – Jun 2025)
.eml Files Independently Verified	5 of 5 (SHA-256 match confirmed)
Attachment Hashes Verified	1 of 1 (SHA-256 match confirmed)
DKIM-Authenticated Emails	1 (email #38, hennepin.us, DKIM+DMARC+SPF pass)
Federal Exhibit Source	Doc. 61, 0:25-cv-02670-PAM-DLM (215 pages)
Docket Events (Feb–Apr 2025)	92 events; 0 by defense counsel
Defense Counsel Filings in Window	0 (DB-confirmed)
Carpenter Responses to Discovery Evidence	0
Donnelly Responses (Entire Window)	0
Claim-Verification Anchors Established	11

Key Metrics

Metric	Value	Context
5/5	SHA-256 hashes verified	All .eml files match federal exhibit byte-for-byte
1/1	Attachment hash verified	PDF attachment cryptographically identical
42 days	Carpenter silence after Feb 20 email	Next Carpenter email: Apr 3, 2025
0	Carpenter/Donnelly responses to discovery fraud evidence	Thread 8: complete non-response
0	Defense counsel docket filings (Feb–Apr 2025)	DB-confirmed across 92 total events
68 days	Feb 20 email to Apr 29 4th Rule 20 order	Window of documented inaction
DKIM pass	Email 38 authentication	hennepin.us domain, rsa-sha256, DMARC p=reject

METHODS

This report integrates three distinct evidence sources with different authentication characteristics:

Source 1: Original .eml files. Five .eml files (emails #35–39 from the EML-A registry, spanning February 20 – March 3, 2025) were provided as original source files. Each file was independently hashed using SHA-256 and compared against the hash values printed in the federally-filed Exhibit EML-A. Email headers were parsed for DKIM signatures, Authentication-Results, ARC chains, and SPF records. Email bodies were extracted and analyzed for content, attachments, and embedded links.

Source 2: Federal Exhibit EML-A. The complete 215-page exhibit PDF (Doc. 61, Guertin v. Walz, 0:25-cv-02670-PAM-DLM, filed July 12, 2025) was text-extracted and cross-referenced against the MCRO Exhibit EML-A Part 1 forensic report, which provides the comprehensive registry of all 41 authenticated emails with their SHA-256 hashes, thread structure, and narrative analysis.

Source 3: MCRO forensic database. SELECT-only queries were executed against the PostgreSQL database (Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii) to retrieve docket events, attorney appearances, and filing records for case 27-CR-23-1886 during the February–April 2025 window. Tables used: parents_case_events, parents_case_events_judicial_officers, parents_case_events_attorneys, parents_attorneys_defense_active.

Authentication methodology: DKIM verification requires live DNS lookup of the signing domain's public key, which was not available in the report production environment. However, the receiving mail server (mail.protonmail.ch) performed DKIM verification at time of receipt and recorded the result in the Authentication-Results header. This header is part of the .eml file and is therefore covered by the SHA-256 hash, meaning it cannot have been modified after the file was hashed without invalidating the hash. The DKIM pass recorded by Proton Mail's server is therefore as reliable as the SHA-256 verification itself.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: Multi-Layer Authentication of Source .EML Files

Background

Five original .eml files were provided for independent verification against the SHA-256 hashes printed in the federally-filed Exhibit EML-A. These emails cover the critical February 20 – March 3, 2025 period, which includes the pivotal discovery fraud notification email and the discovery video dispute.

Findings

All five SHA-256 hashes computed from the provided .eml files match the hashes printed in the federally-filed exhibit byte-for-byte. Additionally, the one verifiable attachment (a PDF in email #36) also produces a matching hash:

#	Date (UTC)	From	SHA-256 (first 16)	Exhibit Match
35	Feb 20, 23:09	Guertin	65ec2a1fe4e5cd5c	VERIFIED
36	Feb 21, 16:43	Guertin	d33a5b091569b60e	VERIFIED
37	Feb 24, 14:33	Guertin	e284a972bb19e2e6	VERIFIED
38	Mar 3, 16:24	Van Guilder	0da0758ac9c77afb	VERIFIED
39	Mar 3, 20:09	Guertin	93663d4a46d4afe1	VERIFIED

Email #38 carries additional cryptographic authentication from the receiving mail server:

Protocol	Result	Domain	Details
DKIM	PASS	hennepin.us	rsa-sha256, selector1, 1024-bit key
DMARC	PASS (p=reject)	hennepin.us	Policy: reject unauthorized senders
SPF	PASS	hennepin.us	smtp.mailfrom=hennepin.us
ARC	PASS	microsoft.com	Chain: Microsoft Exchange → Proton Mail

Significance

The SHA-256 verification establishes that the five .eml files analyzed in this report are bit-for-bit identical to the files whose hashes are printed in the federal court exhibit. This means: (a) the email content analyzed here is the same content filed into federal court; (b) no modification has occurred to any file since the hash was computed; (c) any factual findings derived from these emails are traceable to a court-filed record.

The DKIM authentication on email #38 provides an independent, cryptographic proof chain separate from SHA-256. DKIM verification confirms the email was sent from Hennepin County's mail infrastructure (hennepin.us domain) and was not forged or modified in transit. The DMARC policy of p=reject means Hennepin County has configured its domain to instruct receiving servers to reject emails that fail authentication—indicating this is a domain with actively managed email security. This email's content (Van Guilder excluding all video from discovery production) is therefore authenticated at the infrastructure level.

Finding 2: The February 20, 2025 Email — Discovery Fraud Analysis Transmission

Background

Email #35 is the single most consequential communication in the Carpenter/Donnelly thread. Sent on February 20, 2025 at 23:09 UTC (5:09 PM CST), it represents the moment when Guertin formally transmitted his completed discovery fraud analysis to both defense attorneys. Its content, timing, and the response (or lack thereof) it received form the backbone of multiple hearing claims analyzed in later reports in this series.

Findings

Email #35 was sent from MattGuertin@protonmail.com to Raissa.Carpenter@hennepin.us (CC: Emmett.Donnelly@hennepin.us). Subject line: “My Discovery Fraud Analysis is Complete | URGENT Action is Required.” The email body contains the following structured content:

Section	Content Summary
Discovery Fraud PDFs	Links to three analysis PDFs hosted on Storj: (1) Brief Introduction of Facts, (2) Forensic Analysis of 5 Images, (3) Forensic Analysis of 1 Image
Fraudulent Images	Link to folder with 20 paired images comparing Aug 3, 2023 discovery set vs. Feb 13, 2025 set
Key Documents	Links to: original Aug 2023 discovery PDF, April 2024 Motion to Compel, Catch-22 discovery fraud explanation
Competency Hearing	Requests potential continuance to address findings before hearing
Discovery Video	Requests all available video recordings; acknowledges bodycam must be viewed in person
PDF Viewing Instructions	Instructs recipients to disable scroll mode for flipbook-style image comparison
Impact Statement	States discovery manipulation began with Aug 2023 production; claims it was used in evaluations that led to civil commitment and competency determinations
Action Request	Requests in-person meeting to discuss filings, possible continuance, and competency reevaluation

The email documents a specific forensic methodology: comparison of image aspect ratios between the August 3, 2023 discovery production and the February 13, 2025 production, identifying 20 images with manipulated X-axis scaling to enforce a uniform 16:9 aspect ratio. This methodology is consistent with what Guertin subsequently filed at docket indexes 122–125 on February 28, 2025, and with what he testified about at the March 5 hearing.

Response

No response from Carpenter or Donnelly appears in the authenticated email record. The next communication from Carpenter to Guertin is email #40, dated April 3, 2025—a 42-day gap. That email concerned the competency order, not the discovery evidence.

Claim-Verification Anchor

CVA-01: This email establishes that Carpenter and Donnelly received Guertin's completed forensic analysis of discovery manipulation by February 20, 2025—13 days before the March 5 hearing. Any hearing claim that defense counsel was unaware of, surprised by, or unprepared for Guertin's discovery fraud testimony is testable against this dated, authenticated communication.

CVA-02: The email specifically requested a continuance of the competency hearing to discuss the findings. Whether this request was acted upon, communicated to the court, or ignored is testable against the docket record and hearing transcripts.

Finding 3: The February 21, 2025 Follow-Up — Attachment Correction

Findings

Email #36, sent approximately 17.5 hours after email #35, is a follow-up correcting a missing page from one of the PDF analysis reports. Guertin notes that the PDF titled “00__Discovery-Fraud__Brief-Introduction-of-Facts.pdf” was missing its first page and attaches the corrected file.

The attachment—“00__Discovery-Fraud__Brief-Introduction-of-Facts__MISSING-PAGE-1.pdf” (108,491 bytes)—was independently verified via SHA-256 hash: c88e9d2b65d34ed693119f58bbc53bc1d1f2612e00cf457866f821d936c4ecae (match confirmed). The content of this attachment, as visible in the federal exhibit at pages 199–200, is a detailed table listing all 20 discovery image pairs with their pixel dimensions, original aspect ratios, and manipulated 16:9 ratios.

Significance

The attachment’s content (aspect ratio comparison table with specific pixel dimensions, image filenames, and ratio calculations for 20 image pairs) is consistent with the forensic methodology Guertin described in his February 28 exhibit filings and his March 5 hearing testimony. The table includes filenames containing the embedded username pattern “ggilbertson”—the same pattern documented in Report 2 as appearing in the February 13, 2025 discovery production.

CVA-03: This attachment establishes that the specific forensic data (pixel dimensions, aspect ratios, image filenames) existed in documented form by February 21, 2025—seven days before the exhibit filings and twelve days before the hearing.

Finding 4: The Discovery Video Dispute (Emails #37–39)

Background

Emails #37–39 form a separate sub-thread addressing discovery video materials. This thread runs parallel to the unanswered discovery fraud evidence thread and involves a new participant: JoAnne Van Guilder, a paralegal at the Hennepin County Public Defender's Office. Both Carpenter and Donnelly were CC'd on all three emails.

Findings

Email #37 (Guertin → Van Guilder, Feb 24, 2025): Guertin requests access to all video content in his discovery file. He references a prior in-person meeting where he was told bodycam footage would not be included. He asks for a share link to everything else. Both Carpenter and Donnelly are CC'd.

Email #38 (Van Guilder → Guertin, Mar 3, 2025): Van Guilder responds after 7 days. She states she is sending a link to “all of the discovery in your case minus the photos which have already been shared.” She then states: “Please be advised that I did not include any videos, as they are all body cams and squad videos.” This email is the only communication in the five-email set that carries DKIM authentication from hennepin.us, providing independent cryptographic proof of its origin from Hennepin County government infrastructure.

Email #39 (Guertin → Van Guilder, Mar 3, 2025): Guertin responds the same day with five substantive points: (1) asks about SD card footage from a camera he used during the incident, noting police told him it was the only item warranted; (2) requests police station surveillance footage showing him hyperventilating upon arrival, which he identifies as exculpatory evidence of an acute stress reaction; (3) asks for the specific statute barring him from bodycam footage; (4) notes that standard Rule 9 discovery demands routinely include bodycam and squad video; (5) cites MN Statute §13.825(Subd. 4(b)) as granting him the right to bodycam footage as a subject of the recording.

Response

No further response from Van Guilder, Carpenter, or Donnelly appears in the authenticated email record regarding Guertin's statutory arguments or his request for non-bodycam video footage (SD card footage, police station surveillance).

Significance

CVA-04: Van Guilder's email establishes that all video was excluded from discovery production and the stated reason was that the videos were “all body cams and squad videos.” This is testable against any hearing claim about the scope of discovery production.

CVA-05: Guertin's response establishes that he raised a specific statutory argument (§13.825) for his right to bodycam footage by March 3, 2025—two days before the hearing. Whether defense counsel acted on this argument is testable against the docket and hearing record.

CVA-06: Guertin's request for non-bodycam video (SD card footage, station surveillance) identifies categories of video that are not subject to any bodycam restriction. Whether these materials were ever produced is testable.

Finding 5: The 42-Day Communication Silence (February 20 – April 3, 2025)

Background

The EML-A Part 1 report documented a 53-day email silence from Carpenter between her last intensive-period email and the competency order. This finding narrows the lens to the specific gap between Guertin's February 20 discovery fraud email and Carpenter's next communication.

Findings

Between Guertin's email #35 (February 20, 2025) and Carpenter's email #40 (April 3, 2025), 42 days elapsed. During this 42-day period, the following events occurred in case 27-CR-23-1886 (from the MCRO database):

Date	Event	Filed By
Feb 28	Exhibit List (docket 122)	Guertin
Feb 28	Exhibit List (docket 123)	Guertin
Feb 28	Exhibit List (docket 124)	Guertin
Feb 28	Exhibit List (docket 125)	Guertin
Mar 5	Hearing Held In-Person	Administrative
Mar 5	Taken Under Advisement	Judge Koch
Apr 3	Found Competent	Judge Koch
Apr 3	Order-Other (docket 127)	Judge Koch

During this 42-day gap: Guertin filed 266 pages of forensic exhibits; a contested competency hearing was held where Guertin testified about discovery fraud for the bulk of the hearing; Judge Koch took the matter under advisement; and Koch ultimately found Guertin competent. At no point during this period does the authenticated email record show any communication from Carpenter or Donnelly to Guertin regarding the discovery evidence, the hearing, the hearing preparation, or the result.

Carpenter's April 3 email (email #40 in the registry) states simply: "Judge Koch issued the attached order today finding you competent to proceed. Let me know if you have any questions." The email makes no reference to the discovery fraud evidence, the February 20 email, or any of the issues Guertin raised in emails #35–39.

Significance

The 42-day non-response period coincides precisely with the most consequential phase of the competency proceeding. The authenticated email record contains no evidence of defense counsel engaging with their client's forensic evidence, discussing hearing strategy, or communicating about the outcome of the hearing they attended on his behalf.

CVA-07: The 42-day gap establishes that no email communication from defense counsel to Guertin is documented between the discovery fraud notification and the competency finding. Any hearing claim that defense counsel communicated with their client about the discovery evidence during this period would require evidence from a channel not captured in this record.

Finding 6: Defense Counsel Knowledge Timeline

Findings

The following timeline reconstructs what Carpenter and Donnelly demonstrably knew about the discovery evidence and when, based solely on authenticated email communications, court-filed documents, and hearing attendance:

Date	Knowledge Event	Source	Tier
Feb 13, 2025	Personally delivered 3rd discovery production to Guertin in person	Email #35 reference; hearing testimony	B
Feb 20, 2025	Received Guertin's forensic analysis of discovery manipulation with links to 3 PDFs, 20 comparison images, and supporting documents	Email #35 (SHA-256 verified)	B+
Feb 21, 2025	Received corrected attachment with 20-image comparison table showing specific pixel dimensions and aspect ratios	Email #36 (SHA-256 verified, attachment verified)	B+
Feb 24, 2025	CC'd on Guertin's additional discovery request to Van Guilder for video footage	Email #37 (SHA-256 verified)	B+
Feb 28, 2025	Guertin filed 266 pages of exhibits at docket 122–125 (public record)	DB: event indexes 108–111	C
Mar 3, 2025	CC'd on Van Guilder's email excluding all video from discovery	Email #38 (SHA-256 + DKIM verified)	B+
Mar 3, 2025	CC'd on Guertin's statutory challenge to video exclusion citing §13.825	Email #39 (SHA-256 verified)	B+
Mar 5, 2025	Present in courtroom during Guertin's testimony about discovery fraud	Transcript; Koch order (Exhibit p. 206)	B
Apr 3, 2025	Emailed Guertin the competency order (no mention of discovery)	Email #40 (EML-A registry)	B

The “Tier” column indicates the evidence source: B = court record/transcript; B+ = authenticated email with independent SHA-256 verification; C = MCRO database confirmed. Communications marked B+ carry the strongest authentication because they are independently verifiable through cryptographic hash comparison against a federal court exhibit.

CVA-08: This timeline establishes a cumulative knowledge record. By March 5, 2025 (the hearing date), Carpenter and Donnelly had received the forensic analysis (Feb 20), the corrected comparison table (Feb 21), and had been CC'd on the video discovery dispute (Feb 24, Mar 3, Mar 3). They had also observed Guertin file 266 pages of exhibits into the docket (Feb 28). They then sat in the courtroom while their client testified about these findings.

Finding 7: Zero Defense Counsel Filings (February–April 2025)

Findings

A query of the MCRO database (see Appendix A3) for all docket events in case 27-CR-23-1886 between February 1 and April 30, 2025 where the filing party contains “Carpenter,” “Donnelly,” or “Public Defender” returned zero results.

During this same period, the database records 92 docket events. Of these, 79 were filed by “Matthew David Guertin,” 8 were filed by judicial officers (Koch, Hudleston), 3 were administrative entries, and 2 were transcripts filed by the court reporter.

Significance

Defense counsel filed no motions, no responses, no discovery-related filings, and no documents of any kind into the case docket during the 89-day window spanning February 1 through April 30, 2025. This period encompasses: the discovery fraud notification (Feb 20), Guertin’s 266-page exhibit filing (Feb 28), the contested competency hearing (Mar 5), Koch’s competency finding (Apr 3), Guertin’s Motion to Dismiss (Apr 16), the April 17 hearing, the pro se petition (Apr 21), 50 MCRO forensic report filings (Apr 28), and the April 29 hearing.

CVA-09: The zero-filing finding is database-confirmed and establishes that defense counsel took no documented docket action during the entire crisis sequence. Any hearing claim that defense counsel was actively working the case, investigating the discovery evidence, or preparing responsive filings is testable against this record.

Finding 8: Carpenter's Email Domain Transition

Findings

Emails #1–34 in the EML-A registry (October 2024 – February 2025) use the domain Raissa.Carpenter@hennepin.us. Email #40 (April 3, 2025) uses Raissa.Carpenter@pubdef.state.mn.us. Email #41 (June 27, 2025) also uses the pubdef.state.mn.us domain. The contact signature in emails #40–41 lists raissa.carpenter@mnps.us.

This transition from hennepin.us to pubdef.state.mn.us occurred between February 11, 2025 (last email on hennepin.us domain) and April 3, 2025 (first email on pubdef.state.mn.us domain). The EML-A Part 1 report documented this as a three-domain pattern consistent with an institutional transition from Hennepin County to the state public defender system.

Significance

The domain transition itself is not probative of any issue in this report. However, it is relevant to authentication: emails sent from hennepin.us carry DKIM signatures verifiable against Hennepin County's DNS records, while emails from pubdef.state.mn.us would carry different DKIM signatures. The transition does not affect SHA-256 verification, which is file-level rather than domain-level.

Finding 9: Claim-Verification Anchor Summary

Background

This report establishes 11 timestamped, authenticated facts that serve as testable anchors for the claims analysis in Reports 4, 7, and 9. Each anchor is derived from a SHA-256-verified email or a database-confirmed docket event.

CVA	Date	Anchor Statement	Source
CVA-01	Feb 20	Carpenter/Donnelly received completed discovery fraud analysis	Email #35
CVA-02	Feb 20	Guertin requested continuance of hearing to discuss findings	Email #35
CVA-03	Feb 21	Specific forensic data (pixel dimensions, ratios) documented in attachment	Email #36 att.
CVA-04	Mar 3	Van Guilder excluded all video because “all body cams and squad videos”	Email #38
CVA-05	Mar 3	Guertin cited §13.825 for right to bodycam footage	Email #39
CVA-06	Mar 3	Guertin identified non-bodycam video categories (SD card, station surveillance)	Email #39
CVA-07	Feb 20–Apr 3	42-day gap with zero defense counsel email communications	EML-A registry
CVA-08	By Mar 5	Cumulative knowledge: analysis + attachment + video dispute + 266pg filing + hearing	Multi-source
CVA-09	Feb–Apr	Zero defense counsel docket filings in 89-day window	DB query
CVA-10	Apr 3	Carpenter’s competency order email made no reference to discovery evidence	Email #40
CVA-11	Feb 20	Guertin stated he “no longer [has] any confidence that those involved have acted in good faith”	Email #35

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

This report documents email communications only. Carpenter and Donnelly may have communicated with Guertin through channels not captured in this corpus, including phone calls, text messages, in-person meetings, or communications through third parties. The March 5 hearing transcript may document in-court communications between counsel and client that are not reflected in email.

The 42-day email gap does not necessarily indicate 42 days of zero communication. It indicates 42 days with zero email communication in the authenticated record. The standard of practice for defense counsel communication frequency is not established in this report.

Van Guilder's exclusion of video from discovery production may reflect a standard office procedure for handling bodycam and squad video, rather than a decision specific to this case. The distinction between bodycam/squad video and other video categories (SD card, station surveillance) may not have been recognized as significant in the discovery production workflow.

Carpenter's April 3 email about the competency order may have been preceded by a phone call or meeting in which the discovery evidence was discussed. The email's brevity does not conclusively establish that the topic was not addressed through other means.

DKIM verification was performed by the receiving server (Proton Mail) at time of receipt, not independently by this analysis. While the DKIM result is embedded in the SHA-256-verified .eml file and therefore cannot have been retroactively modified, the original DKIM verification itself relied on Proton Mail's server infrastructure.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

1. Obtain Carpenter's and Donnelly's email records for the February–April 2025 period through formal discovery or subpoena to determine whether they communicated with each other, with the prosecution, or with the court about Guertin's discovery evidence.
2. Review phone records and text message logs for Carpenter and Donnelly to determine whether non-email communication occurred during the 42-day gap.
3. Verify the DKIM signature on email #38 by performing a live DNS lookup of selector1._domainkey.hennepin.us and comparing the public key against the signature in the DKIM-Signature header.
4. Cross-reference Van Guilder's discovery production logs against the actual evidence inventory for case 27-CR-23-1886 to determine whether non-bodycam video exists and was withheld.
5. All SHA-256 hashes in this report are independently reproducible using any standard SHA-256 implementation (sha256sum on Linux, Get-FileHash on Windows, shasum -a 256 on macOS) applied to the source .eml files.
6. All database findings are reproducible using the SQL queries in the Appendix against the PostgreSQL database (Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii).

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

All statistics in this report are reproducible from the following queries. Database: PostgreSQL (Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii). Connection: READ-ONLY. Queries marked SELECT-ONLY.

A1 — Docket Events for Case 27-CR-23-1886 (Feb–Apr 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 BETWEEN '2025-02-01' AND '2025-04-30'
ORDER BY event_index;
```

A2 — Defense Attorney Roster

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

A3 — Defense Counsel Filings (Feb–Apr 2025) — RETURNS ZERO ROWS

```
SELECT event_index, event_json__date, event_name,
       event_json__filing_party_name
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%'
           OR event_json__filing_party_name ILIKE '%public defender%')
ORDER BY event_index;
```

A4 — Judicial Officers on Feb–Apr 2025 Events

```
SELECT pce.event_index, pce.event_json__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 '2025-02-01' AND '2025-04-30'
      AND jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm IS NOT NULL
ORDER BY pce.event_index;
```

A5 — SHA-256 Verification Commands (Command Line)

```
# Reproduce on any system with sha256sum:
sha256sum 35_My_Discovery_Fraud_Analysis_is_Complete__URGENT_Action_is_Required_2025-02-
20T23_09_39_00_00.eml
# Expected: 65ec2a1fe4e5cd5c69cda15350b076f7540a352a3710976d427b343e4884fdca

sha256sum 36_Re_My_Discovery_Fraud_Analysis_is_Complete__URGENT_Action_is_Required_2025-
02-21T16_43_35_00_00.eml
# Expected: d33a5b091569b60e1837ac8f7fb8352e0ecf2161a2fab4f4ea297c17ce661c04
```

```
sha256sum 37_Matt_Guertin__27-CR-23-1886__Additional_Discovery_Request_2025-02-24T14_33_16_00_00.eml
# Expected: e284a972bb19e2e65c2ba4a94d0b6a674f27e9c499a08221f9a71622551b7503
```

```
sha256sum 38_RE__External__Matt_Guertin__27-CR-23-1886__Additional_Discovery_Request_2025-03-03T16_24_56_00_00.eml
# Expected: 0da0758ac9c77afb24930fbb5ff7fb09fcb770dbf2dcfb4da23b591348cc8e23
```

```
sha256sum 39_RE__External__Matt_Guertin__27-CR-23-1886__Additional_Discovery_Request_2025-03-03T20_09_11_00_00.eml
# Expected: 93663d4a46d4afe160271f53904368fa90804bcd79db09e5e669f652288eaa4
```