

# MCRO | Koch Competency Order — Document Forensics

## Report 5 of 10: The February–May 2025 Crisis Sequence

Report Date: **March 9, 2026** | Scope: Document-level forensic analysis of Index 127 (Order Finding Guertin Competent, April 3, 2025)

## IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents the results of digital forensic analysis performed on a single court document: the Order Finding Guertin Competent (Index 127), filed April 3, 2025 in case 27-CR-23-1886. All metadata values, signature data, and embedded object inventories are drawn directly from the MCRO forensic database and verified against the document's binary contents. This analysis does not assert fraud, intent, or motive. Findings represent measurable document properties and their comparative position within the 4,251-document corpus. All SQL queries are reproducible and provided in the Appendix. Independent verification is recommended.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On April 3, 2025, Judge William H. Koch entered a four-page order finding Matthew Guertin competent to proceed to trial. This order followed a contested evidentiary hearing on March 5, 2025 at which Guertin testified at length about the charges, his understanding of court processes, and his claims regarding discovery fraud and patent theft. Koch's order is the only competency determination in this case's 30-event Rule 20 history that was based on extended direct testimony from the defendant. It was overridden 26 days later when Judge Hudleston ordered a 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation on April 29, 2025.

The document forensics on this order reveal several notable properties:

- **First MSIP Document in Corpus:** This order is the first of 34 documents in the 4,251-document corpus to carry Microsoft Information Protection (MSIP) metadata. The label was set March 17, 2025 — 12 days after the hearing, 17 days before filing.
- **MSIP Tenant Concentration:** All 34 MSIP documents in the corpus share a single Azure AD tenant (Site ID: 8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f). Three of the first five MSIP documents directly concern Guertin's case.
- **Signature Architecture:** The document carries 6 digital signatures across 3 signers. Koch's judicial signature was applied at 8:48 AM CST; ESolutions e-filing stamps at 1:27 PM (4.6 hours later); and the MCRO watermark at 5:45 PM. The four ESolutions signatures all reference a single PDF object (306 0 obj), presenting one binary as four page-level stamps.
- **Koch's Handwritten Signature Image:** The embedded PNG (SHA256: 2b34e2...) is byte-identical across 18 documents spanning 2019–2025 and 6 cases. This is consistent with standard template reuse by a single judicial officer.
- **Edits After Signature:** Both Koch's signature and all four ESolutions signatures have `edits_after_sig_flag = true`. Only the MCRO watermark (the final signature) shows no post-signature modifications.
- **26-Day Override Gap:** Koch's competency finding was overridden by Hudleston's 4th Rule 20.01 order 26 days later. This is the shortest different-judge competency override in the corpus. The next shortest is 57 days (more than double). The corpus median is 539 days.

## Scope Overview

|                         |                                                      |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Primary Document</b> | 127__Order-Finding-Guertin-Competent__2025-04-03.pdf |
| <b>Evidence UID</b>     | evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2              |
| <b>Case</b>             | 27-CR-23-1886 (State v. Matthew D. Guertin)          |
| <b>Filing Date</b>      | April 3, 2025                                        |
| <b>Filing Type</b>      | Order-Other                                          |
| <b>Page Count</b>       | 4                                                    |
| <b>File Size</b>        | 364,068 bytes                                        |
| <b>Author/Filer</b>     | Judge William H. Koch                                |
| <b>Corpus Size</b>      | 4,251 documents across 9,146 cases                   |
| <b>MSIP Corpus</b>      | 34 documents (0.8% of corpus)                        |

## METHODS

This analysis examines the Order Finding Guertin Competent from three angles: content analysis (what Koch found and stated), digital forensics (metadata, signatures, embedded objects), and procedural context (the 26-day override gap). Data sources include the MCRO forensic database (Tier C), the original order document (Tier B), and prior forensic reports (Tier A).

Database tables used: children (document metadata, MSIP fields), children\_signatures\_full\_report (digital signature detail), children\_objects (embedded fonts, images), children\_tracking\_groups (tracking font classification), children\_doc\_strings (extracted text), parents\_case\_events (docket timeline), and parents\_case\_events\_judicial\_officers (per-event judicial officer assignments). The actual order text was extracted from the filed PDF. All SQL queries are provided in the Appendix.

## FINDINGS

### Finding 1: Content of the Koch Order

#### Background

The order is titled “Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Regarding Defendant’s Competency to Proceed.” It arises from the March 5, 2025 evidentiary hearing in room C457 of the Hennepin County Government Center. Mawerdi Hamid appeared for the State; Raissa Carpenter and Emmett Donnelly represented Guertin, who appeared out of custody.

#### Findings

Koch’s order is structured in four sections across four pages: Background, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order. The key substantive holdings are:

| Topic                          | Koch’s Stated Finding                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Evaluator Basis</b>         | Koch took judicial notice of Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook’s December 20, 2024 Rule 20.01 Evaluation Report. Cranbrook diagnosed Guertin with Unspecified Schizophrenia Spectrum and Other Psychotic Disorder based on available records (not on a clinical examination, as Guertin declined to participate). Cranbrook opined Guertin’s “prognosis for attaining the capacity for competent participation in the legal process appears poor.” |
| <b>Defendant Testimony</b>     | Koch found Guertin demonstrated understanding of the charges, the roles of parties, the nature of trial and plea bargaining, and the value of counsel. Koch noted Guertin “has said he recognizes the value of having legal representation” and “will work with his legal team.”                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Discovery/Patent Claims</b> | Koch acknowledged Guertin’s testimony about manipulated discovery materials and patent theft by Netflix and Microsoft. Koch stated these claims “does not appear to have support” and characterized Guertin’s beliefs as “fantastical and paranoid.” However, Koch also stated the court “has no basis upon which it can discount Mr. Guertin’s apparently credible testimony about his past professional career.”                      |
| <b>Exhibit Exclusion</b>       | Footnote 1 records that Guertin uploaded exhibits into MNCIS before the hearing and referenced them during testimony. However, “During closing, the                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | Defense informed the Court they would not be offering these exhibits outside of the testimony received at the hearing.” This means Guertin’s exhibits (indexes 122–125) were acknowledged as uploaded but not admitted.                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Competency Finding</b> | Koch found Guertin competent under Rule 20.01, applying the two-prong test: ability to rationally consult with counsel AND ability to understand and participate in proceedings. Koch credited Dr. Cranbrook’s diagnosis of mental illness as “generally reliable” and “credible,” but found Guertin had met his burden to demonstrate competency despite the illness. |

### Significance

Two aspects of Koch’s order merit attention for the series. First, Koch simultaneously credited Cranbrook’s mental illness diagnosis AND found Guertin competent — meaning Koch held that mental illness and legal competency can coexist, which is legally correct under Minnesota law. Second, Koch noted Guertin’s patent/corporate claims lacked apparent support, while acknowledging his professional background as “apparently credible.” Koch did not have the MCRO forensic analysis before him (the exhibits were not admitted), so his assessment of the patent claims was based solely on hearing testimony without the documentary evidence Guertin had prepared.

## Finding 2: MSIP Metadata — First in Corpus

### Background

Microsoft Information Protection (MSIP) labels are enterprise-grade sensitivity classifications applied within Microsoft 365 tenants. They embed tenant identity, classification level, and timestamp into document metadata. The MCRO forensic database catalogs MSIP properties for all 4,251 documents. This analysis verifies whether the Koch order is the first MSIP document chronologically and examines the label's properties.

### Findings

| MSIP Property         | Value                                            |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| MSIP Label Name       | High                                             |
| MSIP Site ID (Tenant) | 8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f             |
| MSIP Label Token      | 14543c82-bfb1-4059-96af-7a0a0f468681             |
| MSIP Set Date         | March 17, 2025, 19:18 UTC                        |
| MSIP Method           | Standard                                         |
| MSIP Enabled          | true                                             |
| MSIP Content Bits     | 0                                                |
| Pre-filing Interval   | 17 days (MSIP set 17 days before April 3 filing) |

Corpus verification: The query `SELECT COUNT(*) FROM children WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true AND filing_date < '2025-04-03'` returns 0. This confirms the April 3, 2025 order is the chronologically first MSIP document in the entire corpus (see Appendix A1).

### MSIP Corpus Summary:

|                                  |                                    |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Total MSIP Documents             | 34                                 |
| Distinct Cases                   | 29                                 |
| Distinct Site IDs (Tenants)      | 1 (all documents share one tenant) |
| Label Distribution               | 33 “High” / 1 “Moderate”           |
| Guertin Case Documents with MSIP | 4 of 34 (11.8%)                    |

### All four MSIP documents in Guertin's case:

| Filing Date  | Document                                    | MSIP Set Date | Pre-staging    |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Apr 3, 2025  | Order Finding Guertin Competent (Index 127) | Mar 17, 2025  | <b>17 days</b> |
| Apr 23, 2025 | Transcript — April 17 Hearing (Index 134)   | Apr 23, 2025  | Same day       |
| May 3, 2025  | Transcript — April 29 Hearing (Index 189)   | May 3, 2025   | Same day       |

|              |                                     |             |                 |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| May 30, 2025 | Order re Pro Se Motions (Index 205) | Jan 9, 2025 | <b>141 days</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|

### Significance

The MSIP set date of March 17, 2025 indicates the document or its Word template was created within the Microsoft 365 enterprise environment 12 days after the March 5 hearing and 17 days before filing. This metadata confirms the order was being drafted in Word within a classified enterprise environment before being converted to PDF via Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word. The 17-day pre-staging interval is notable because all other MSIP documents in Guertin's case have either same-day or 141-day intervals — this is the only one with a moderate drafting window. The concentration of MSIP labels in Guertin's case (4 of 34 corpus-wide, 11.8%) was previously identified in the Initial Digital Forensic Analysis Report.

## Finding 3: Digital Signature Architecture

### Background

The document carries 6 digital signatures across 3 distinct signers, recorded in `children_signatures_full_report`. This analysis examines the signing timeline, certificate authorities, PDF object sharing, and post-signature modification flags.

### Findings

| Si g # | Signer            | Time CST | Field Name             | Subfilter             | v_obj     | Cover % | Edits ? |
|--------|-------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------|---------|
| 1      | Koch, William     | 08:48:36 | Signature2             | / adbe.pkcs7.detached | 13 0 obj  | 50.12%  | TRUE    |
| 2      | ESolutions Dev CA | 13:27:13 | tyler_sig_fa94c b09... | / ETSI.CAdES.detached | 306 0 obj | 63.34%  | TRUE    |
| 3      | ESolutions Dev CA | 13:27:13 | tyler_sig_fa94c b09... | / ETSI.CAdES.detached | 306 0 obj | 63.34%  | TRUE    |
| 4      | ESolutions Dev CA | 13:27:13 | tyler_sig_fa94c b09... | / ETSI.CAdES.detached | 306 0 obj | 63.34%  | TRUE    |
| 5      | ESolutions Dev CA | 13:27:13 | tyler_sig_fa94c b09... | / ETSI.CAdES.detached | 306 0 obj | 63.34%  | TRUE    |
| 6      | MCRO Watermark    | 17:45:44 | Signature_cc15 85d1... | / adbe.pkcs7.detached | 338 0 obj | 95.50%  | FALSE   |

### Key observations:

- **Signing Timeline:** Koch signed at 8:48 AM, the ESolutions e-filing system stamped at 1:27 PM (4 hours 39 minutes later), and the MCRO watermark was applied at 5:45 PM (4 hours 18 minutes after e-filing). Total signing span: 8 hours 57 minutes. The `e_file_date` matches the `filing_date` (April 3, 2025) and all signatures were applied on the same day.
- **ESolutions Signature Quadruplication:** Signatures 2–5 share the identical signer, timestamp, field\_name, subfilter, PDF object reference (306 0 obj), coverage percentage (63.34%), and byte range values (`br_l1`: 194,290 / `br_l2`: 36,325). This means a single signature binary was registered four times — one per page. This pattern has been documented in the ESolutions Signature Statistical Breakdown report as standard Tyler Technologies behavior for multi-page orders.
- **Edits After Signature:** The `edits_after_sig_flag` is TRUE for Koch's signature and all four ESolutions signatures, meaning the PDF was modified after each of these signatures was applied. Only the MCRO watermark (the final action) shows FALSE, which is expected since nothing follows it. This is a standard artifact of the multi-step signing workflow: judge signs → ESolutions stamps → MCRO watermarks.

- Coverage Percentages: Koch's signature covers 50.12% of the file, ESolutions covers 63.34%, and the MCRO watermark covers 95.50%. The ascending coverage pattern is consistent with incremental saves: each subsequent signer's revision encompasses more of the final document.
- Revision Count: 5 revisions. This is consistent with the three-signer, multi-step workflow.

### Significance

The signature architecture is consistent with standard Hennepin County e-filing workflow. The edits-after-signature flags are expected artifacts of the multi-step process, not anomalies. The ESolutions quadruplication is a known Tyler Technologies pattern documented across the corpus. Cross-referencing against the Cloned Judicial Signature report: that report identified 4 cloned signature objects on Guertin's first Rule 20 order (January 2023). The Koch competency order uses a different mechanism — standard page-level ESolutions stamps — and does not exhibit the same byte-for-byte signature object cloning pattern.

## Finding 4: Embedded Object Inventory

### Background

The `children_objects` table catalogs all discrete binary objects embedded within each PDF. This includes fonts, images, and signature containers. This analysis inventories the Koch order's objects and compares them against the corpus.

### Findings

| Type | Description                                      | Dimensions | Bytes  | SHA256 (trunc) |
|------|--------------------------------------------------|------------|--------|----------------|
| .png | Handwritten Signature of Judge William H Koch 01 | 633 × 255  | 2,997  | 2b34e2...      |
| .cff | TRACKING-FONT-B1                                 | —          | 86,093 | 427af1...      |
| .ttf | IVTHYH+ArialMT                                   | —          | 51,515 | b76ad2...      |
| .ttf | IVTHYH+BookAntiqua                               | —          | 13,523 | 5b3e6c...      |
| .ttf | IVTHYH+SymbolMT                                  | —          | 5,911  | 279e91...      |
| .ttf | YYQZOB+Calibri-Light                             | —          | 84,674 | 91d97e...      |
| .ttf | IVTHYH+Calibri-LightItalic                       | —          | 56,938 | d59577...      |
| .ttf | (unnamed TTF)                                    | —          | 69,424 | 3b0774...      |

**Koch's Signature Image Reuse:** The handwritten signature PNG (SHA256: 2b34e23d...) appears in 18 documents across 6 distinct cases, spanning January 2019 through May 2025. This is consistent with a judge embedding the same signature image in a Word template used across cases. The image dimensions (633 × 255 pixels) are consistent across all appearances.

**Tracking Font Classification:** The document is assigned to PDF Group B1 (tracking font CFF-Font-1b, font group TTF-B). The B1 group contains 235 documents in the corpus. The tracking CFF font object (SHA256: 427af1...) appears in 254 documents, indicating widespread use of the same e-filing pipeline template.

**Font Profile:** The document uses fonts with the subset prefix IVTHYH (ArialMT, BookAntiqua, SymbolMT, Calibri-LightItalic) and YYQZOB (Calibri-Light). The IVTHYH prefix appearing

across four distinct font families indicates these were embedded during the same PDF conversion event.

**Significance**

The embedded object profile is consistent with a standard judicial Word-to-PDF workflow. The signature image reuse across 18 documents is normal template behavior for a single judge. The font profile (Book Antiqua body text, Calibri Light for specific elements) is consistent with a custom judicial template. The tracking font assignment to Group B1 places this document in the standard Hennepin County district court e-filing pipeline.

## Finding 5: Complete Metadata Profile

### Background

The children table stores comprehensive XMP and processing metadata for each document. This profile captures document creation and modification timestamps, producer tools, and derived timing metrics.

### Findings

| Property                        | Value                                                                                                  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| XMP Create Date                 | April 3, 2025, 13:48:19 UTC (8:48 AM CST)                                                              |
| XMP Metadata Date               | April 3, 2025, 18:27:13 UTC (1:27 PM CST)                                                              |
| Last Modified Date              | April 3, 2025, 22:45:44 UTC (5:45 PM CST)                                                              |
| E-File Date                     | April 3, 2025                                                                                          |
| Creator Tool                    | Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word                                                                           |
| Producer                        | Adobe PDF Library 25.1.208; modified using iText® 7.1.16 (Minnesota Judicial Branch; licensed version) |
| PDF Version                     | 1.6                                                                                                    |
| Tagged PDF                      | true                                                                                                   |
| Document ID                     | 93946d83-655d-4982-9210-ca080c8ac0eb                                                                   |
| Instance ID                     | 8e7a3a8c-5f12-4a7d-bf7e-418afb5dfe63                                                                   |
| Derived: Create Newer by Days   | 0 (created on filing date)                                                                             |
| Derived: Metadata Newer by Days | 0 (metadata updated on filing date)                                                                    |

### Significance

The XMP create date aligns with Koch's signature time (both 8:48 CST), confirming the PDF was generated at the moment of judicial signing. The metadata date aligns with the ESolutions stamp (both 1:27 PM CST), and the last modified date aligns with the MCRO watermark (both 5:45 PM CST). These three timestamps provide a consistent provenance chain: create → e-file → watermark, all on April 3, 2025. The producer string confirms the document passed through the standard Minnesota Judicial Branch iText pipeline. The derived timing fields show 0 days of variance between creation, metadata update, and filing — no date anomalies are present.

## Finding 6: The 26-Day Override Gap — Corpus Context

### Background

On April 3, 2025, Koch found Guertin competent. On April 29, 2025, Hudleston ordered a 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation (Index 187) and appointed a forensic navigator (Index 188). The 26-day gap between a competency finding and its effective override by a different judge is the central procedural anomaly of the April crisis sequence. This analysis examines where this gap ranks within the corpus.

## Findings

Query: Of all cases in the corpus with a “Found Competent” event followed by a subsequent “Order-Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01)”, 278 such pairs exist. The corpus statistics:

| Metric                          | Value                         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Total Competent → New R20 Pairs | 278                           |
| Median Gap                      | 539 days                      |
| Average Gap                     | 631 days                      |
| Minimum Gap (Any Judge)         | 16 days (same judge)          |
| Minimum Gap (Different Judge)   | 26 days — Guertin case        |
| 2nd Shortest (Different Judge)  | 57 days (case 27-CR-23-26390) |
| 3rd Shortest (Different Judge)  | 63 days (tied, 2 cases)       |

### Top 5 shortest different-judge competent-to-R20 gaps:

| Case ID        | Days | Competent Judge     | R20 Judge         | Date Range            |
|----------------|------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| 27-CR-23-1886  | 26   | Koch, William H.    | Hudleston, Sarah  | Apr 3 → Apr 29, 2025  |
| 27-CR-23-26390 | 57   | Dayton Klein, Julia | Burns, Michael E  | Jul 16 → Sep 11, 2024 |
| 27-CR-23-18375 | 63   | Garcia, Tamara G.   | Moreno, Daniel C. | May 20 → Jul 22, 2024 |
| 27-CR-23-27358 | 63   | Garcia, Tamara G.   | Moreno, Daniel C. | May 20 → Jul 22, 2024 |
| 27-CR-21-8412  | 68   | Janzen, Lisa K      | Meyer, Kerry      | May 4 → Jul 11, 2023  |

## Significance

Guertin’s case has the shortest different-judge competency override gap in the entire MCRO corpus. At 26 days, it is less than half the next shortest (57 days) and less than 5% of the median (539 days). The two cases with shorter absolute gaps (16 and 17 days) both involved the same judge issuing both the competency finding and the new Rule 20 order — which represents a materially different procedural posture, as a single judge may have new information warranting reconsideration. In Guertin’s case, a different judge (Hudleston) overrode Koch’s finding without an intervening hearing on competency and without a new evaluation report.

## Finding 7: The April 3–29 Event Sequence

### Background

Between Koch’s competency finding and Hudleston’s override, 16 docket events were filed. This analysis catalogs every event in the window to establish the context for the override.

### Findings

| Date   | Index   | Event                                      | Filed By                   | Judge            |
|--------|---------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| Apr 3  | 127     | Order-Other (Koch Competency Finding)      | Judge William H. Koch      | Koch, William H. |
| Apr 3  | —       | Found Competent                            | Judge William H. Koch      | Koch, William H. |
| Apr 10 | 128     | Exhibit List                               | Matthew David Guertin      | —                |
| Apr 14 | 129     | Exhibit List                               | Matthew David Guertin      | —                |
| Apr 14 | 130     | Exhibit List                               | Matthew David Guertin      | —                |
| Apr 16 | 131     | Motion to Dismiss                          | Matthew David Guertin      | —                |
| Apr 17 | 132     | Notice of Hearing                          | administrative             | —                |
| Apr 17 | —       | Hearing Held In-Person                     | administrative             | —                |
| Apr 21 | 133     | Petition to Proceed as Pro Se              | Matthew David Guertin      | —                |
| Apr 23 | 134     | Transcript (Apr 17 Hearing)                | Maya Funk   Court Reporter | —                |
| Apr 28 | 135–184 | 50 MCRO Forensic Exhibits (Other Document) | Matthew David Guertin      | —                |
| Apr 29 | 185     | Notice of Hearing (Jul 8)                  | Court Administrator        | —                |
| Apr 29 | 186     | Notice of Hearing (Jul 15)                 | Court Administrator        | —                |
| Apr 29 | 187     | Order — Rule 20.01 Evaluation (#4)         | Judge Sarah Hudleston      | Hudleston, Sarah |
| Apr 29 | 188     | Order Appointing Forensic Navigator        | Judge Sarah Hudleston      | Hudleston, Sarah |
| Apr 29 | —       | Hearing Held In-Person                     | administrative             | —                |

### Significance

Between the Koch competency finding and the Hudleston override, Guertin filed 55 documents: 3 exhibit lists (indexes 128–130), 1 motion to dismiss (131), 1 pro se petition (133), and 50 MCRO forensic exhibits (135–184). Guertin appeared at the April 17 hearing before Hudleston and then filed his comprehensive 110-page pro se petition with supporting exhibits the following week. The override came on April 29, the same day as the hearing at which Hudleston ordered the 4th Rule 20.01 evaluation. No new competency evaluation report was submitted between Koch’s finding and Hudleston’s order — the last evaluation report in the docket is Cranbrook’s from December 20, 2024, which Koch had already considered and weighed against Guertin’s testimony.

## LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

- **Content vs. Document Forensics:** This report analyzes the document's metadata and digital properties. Whether Koch's factual findings about Guertin's claims were correct (e.g., whether the patent/corporate claims do or do not have support) is addressed in other reports in this series, not here.
- **MSIP Tenant Identity:** The MSIP Site ID (8cf8312b...) identifies an Azure AD tenant, but this report does not resolve which specific organization operates that tenant. The Initial Digital Forensic Analysis Report noted this as requiring external verification.
- **Edits After Signature:** The TRUE flags on Koch's and ESolutions signatures are expected artifacts of the multi-step signing workflow and do not, by themselves, indicate improper modification.
- **Same-Judge vs. Different-Judge Overrides:** The corpus comparison distinguishes these categories, but the analysis cannot determine from database evidence alone whether the different-judge override in Guertin's case followed proper procedural channels. A same-judge R20 re-order may indicate new facts; a different-judge override may reflect reassignment, recusal, or other scheduling factors not captured in the docket.
- **MSIP Pre-staging:** The 17-day interval between MSIP label application (March 17) and filing (April 3) indicates when the template entered the M365 environment, not necessarily when the order was fully drafted. Courts may use pre-labeled templates.

## RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

- **MSIP Tenant Resolution:** Use Microsoft's public tenant discovery endpoint ([login.microsoftonline.com/{tenantId}/v2.0/.well-known/openid-configuration](https://login.microsoftonline.com/{tenantId}/v2.0/.well-known/openid-configuration)) to resolve the organization operating tenant 8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f.
- **Word Template Recovery:** The Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word creator tool indicates the source Word document may exist in the authoring organization's document management system. Recovery of the original .docx would enable analysis of revision history, tracked changes, and authorship metadata not preserved in the PDF.
- **Signature Certificate Validation:** The ESolutions Development Certificate Authority certificate chain should be validated against Tyler Technologies' published trust anchors to confirm chain of trust and key strength (the Initial Digital Forensic Analysis Report identified RSA-1024 as deprecated).
- **Override Procedure Audit:** Independent review of whether Minnesota Rules of Criminal Procedure authorize a different judge to order a new Rule 20.01 evaluation 26 days after a competency finding without an intervening evaluation report or motion from counsel.

## APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

### A1 — MSIP First-in-Corpus Verification

```
SELECT filename, filing_date, case_id, metadata__msip__msip_set_date_primary,
metadata__msip__msip_site_id_primary, metadata__msip__msip_label_name_primary
FROM children WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true ORDER BY filing_date ASC
LIMIT 15;
```

### A2 — Complete Metadata Profile for Index 127

```
SELECT evidence_uid, filename, filing_date, filing_type, doc_sha256,
me_filename, parent_filename, pdf_page_count, size_bytes,
metadata__xmp_create_date, metadata__xmp_metadata_date,
metadata__xmp_creator_tool, metadata__xmp_producer, metadata__xmp_title,
metadata__document_id, metadata__instance_id, metadata__e_file_date,
metadata__last_modified_date, metadata__msip__has_msip_flag,
metadata__msip__msip_site_id_primary, metadata__msip__msip_label_name_primary,
metadata__msip__msip_set_date_primary, signatures__has_signature,
tracking__tracked_flag FROM children WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND
filing_date = '2025-04-03';
```

### A3 — Digital Signatures for Index 127

```
SELECT signer_name, sign_time_raw, sign_time_cst_cdt, field_name,
sig_subfilter, coverage_pct, edits_after_sig_flag, days_after_e_file_signed,
rev_count, v_obj, br_l1, br_l2, br_o1, br_o2 FROM children_signatures_full_report
WHERE evidence_uid = 'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2' ORDER BY sig_index;
```

### A4 — Embedded Objects for Index 127

```
SELECT object_type, object_sha256, object_description, object_font_name,
object_person_name, object_size_bytes, object_image_w, object_image_h FROM
children_objects WHERE evidence_uid = 'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2' ORDER
BY object_type;
```

### A5 — Koch Signature Image Corpus Distribution

```
SELECT co.object_sha256, c.filename, c.filing_date, c.case_id FROM children_objects co
JOIN children c ON co.evidence_uid = c.evidence_uid WHERE co.object_sha256 =
'2b34e23d8ac1cd879e452b67a547d41089c77d6c88c684237f479ef7188839a3' ORDER BY
c.filing_date;
```

### A6 — MSIP Corpus Statistics

```
SELECT COUNT(*) as total_msip_docs, COUNT(DISTINCT case_id) as distinct_cases,
COUNT(DISTINCT metadata__msip__msip_site_id_primary) as distinct_site_ids FROM
children WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true;
```

### A7 — Different-Judge Competency Override Gaps (Shortest)

```
WITH competent AS ( SELECT case_uid, event_json__date as competent_date,
event_json__judicial_officer as competent_judge FROM parents_case_events WHERE
event_name = 'Found Competent' ), subsequent_r20 AS ( SELECT case_uid,
event_json__date as r20_date, event_json__judicial_officer as r20_judge
```

```
FROM parents_case_events WHERE event_name = 'Order-Evaluation for Competency to
Proceed (Rule 20.01)' ) SELECT c.case_uid, c.competent_date, c.competent_judge,
r.r20_date, r.r20_judge, r.r20_date - c.competent_date as gap_days FROM
competent c JOIN subsequent_r20 r ON c.case_uid = r.case_uid AND r.r20_date >
c.competent_date WHERE c.competent_judge != r.r20_judge ORDER BY gap_days ASC LIMIT
10;
```

## A8 — Docket Events: April 3–29, 2025

```
SELECT event_index, event_name, event_json__date, docket_index,
event_json__filing_party_name, event_json__judicial_officer FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886' AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2025-04-03' AND
'2025-04-29' ORDER BY event_index;
```

## A9 — Tracking Group Assignment for Index 127

```
SELECT pdf_group, font_group, font1_name, font_hash_date FROM children_tracking_groups
WHERE evidence_uid = 'evidence:27-cr-23-1886:6e296082826a09d2';
```