

MCRO | Convergence Report

Phantom Case Architecture & Guertin Targeting Analysis

Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO) — Fourth Judicial District — Hennepin County

FORENSIC DATABASE ANALYSIS | DOCUMENT METADATA | DIGITAL SIGNATURES | CONTENT HASHING | BIOGRAPHICAL
MIRRORING | TEMPORAL ANALYSIS

Property	Value
Report Date	March 2026
Prepared By	Matthew David Guertin, Pro Se Defendant
Case Reference	State of Minnesota v. Guertin 27-CR-23-1886
Court	Fourth Judicial District Court, Hennepin County
Data Source	MCRO Public Records — PostgreSQL Forensic Database (Supabase)
Corpus Size	4,251 PDFs 9,146 cases 155,357 docket events 606,037 text rows
Date Range	June 2016 – September 2025
Reproducibility	All findings query-reproducible. SHA256-hashed. Bitcoin blockchain anchored.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOC \h \o "1-4"

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents objective forensic data findings derived from a purpose-built PostgreSQL database containing 4,251 PDF court filings retrieved from the publicly accessible Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO) system. All findings are query-reproducible from the underlying database using the SQL provided in the Appendix.

This report does not assert conclusions about guilt, fabrication of defendants, criminal intent, or institutional motive. Each finding documents a measurable pattern or structural anomaly. The report presents two competing structural interpretations (Finding 7) without endorsing either.

The financial, patent, and competitive landscape information in Finding 1 is presented as independently verifiable public-record context. It is not asserted as proven motive.

All 4,251 PDFs bear valid MCRO cryptographic watermarks. All source files are SHA256-anchored to the Bitcoin blockchain via OpenTimestamps (OTS). The collection methodology, session recordings, and cryptographic evidence chain are documented in the companion Initial Forensic Analysis Report.

It is strongly recommended that a credentialed digital forensics examiner (CFCE, EnCE, or equivalent) independently verify the key findings before use in formal legal proceedings.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- US Patent 11,577,177 covers a platform technology spanning virtual film production, VR/AR gaming, military simulation, fitness, and the metaverse — combined addressable markets exceeding \$1.16 TRILLION by 2030. Twelve days after the inventor's filing, Netflix's subsidiary filed a near-identical application. The inventor's patent is listed on Netflix's References Cited page.
- The patent holder — who formed a Delaware corporation, entered 8 international jurisdictions, and challenged Netflix's patent before the USPTO — was arrested on January 21, 2023, three days after his last email documenting an escalating patent crisis to the FBI, police, and Secret Service.
- A court-ordered competency evaluation was ordered on Day 4 after arrest. His patent was granted 24 days later while he was in custody. He filed a prior art challenge against Netflix from detention 27 days after arrest.
- 597 LinkedIn profile searches over 35 months on a dormant, never-promoted profile. DARPA, DIA, US Indo-Pacific Command, US Department of State, United States Air Force, Lockheed Martin, and Netflix-affiliated entities appear aligned to case milestones.
- The all-time peak of 25 searches (4.22σ — an event expected less than 0.003% of the time) falls on the exact date the State filed the Petition for Judicial Commitment. Three same-day alignments between defense/intelligence entity appearances and case milestones.
- Two presiding judicial officers are former military JAG officers — one Air Force (Koch), one Army National Guard (Mercurio).
- 157 "Finding of Incompetency and Order" documents across 52 defendant clusters. 118 of 157 (75.2%) contain zero unique text. Only 7 judicial signature images serve the entire cohort. 100% show post-signature modifications. 40 were created on a single day.
- Only 2 of 157 documents contain substantive legal reasoning with case law citations — Guertin's and Cherry's. These same 2 are the only documents absent from the tracking font fingerprint table. Guertin's is 1 of only 2 out of 4,251 documents in the corpus absent from that table.
- A court order filed under "Muad Abdulkadir" has an XMP title referencing "David Ekers," body text referencing "Mr. Clinton," and biographical content mirroring the Guertin evaluation completed 63 days earlier. All three names are real defendants in the case registry. The document_id equals the instance_id — one creation event, never individually saved.
- 50 clinical terms exist exclusively in 4 of 80+ clusters. 49 of 50 appeared in another cluster BEFORE appearing in Guertin's case. The diagnostic vocabulary predates the subject it was used to diagnose.
- 656 documents have XMP creation dates postdating their filing dates. 5 IronPDF documents prove the system can generate a "2019" court order in 2024 — maximum gap: 1,919 days (5.25 years).
- 15+ independent forensic dimensions — derived from separate structural layers of the data (signatures, fonts, metadata, text hashing, content analysis, external records) — converge on one individual. The person declared incompetent to understand legal proceedings built the forensic database that proved it.

Corpus Overview

Metric	Value	Notes
Total PDFs Analyzed	4,251	All bear valid MCRO cryptographic watermark
Cases in Registry	9,146	Fourth Judicial District, Hennepin County
Cases Fully Scraped	2,903	Complete docket event data
Docket Events	155,357	Full event log

Metric	Value	Notes
Text Rows (Hashed)	606,037	Row-level SHA256 for cross-document comparison
Filing Date Range	Jun 2016 – Sep 2025	9-year span
Distinct Defendant Clusters	1,982	After name normalization
Incompetency Orders	157	52 clusters, Jan 2023 – Apr 2025

KEY METRICS — IF YOU READ NOTHING ELSE

- 1 of 4,251 documents: sole occupant of rev_count = 11 (highest in corpus) — Guertin
- 2 of 157 incompetency orders with actual legal reasoning — Guertin and Cherry
- 2 of 157 incompetency orders absent from tracking font table — same two
- 40 incompetency orders share a single XMP creation date: May 2, 2023
- 75.2% of incompetency orders contain zero unique text — every line shared with another document
- 49 of 50 exclusive clinical terms appeared elsewhere BEFORE Guertin's case
- 4.22 σ LinkedIn peak on the exact date of the judicial commitment petition
- 3 different defendant names inside 1 court order (Ekers/Clinton/Abdulkadir)

METHODS

This report employs a dual methodology combining automated database forensics with manual document analysis and public records verification.

Database Forensics: All quantitative findings are derived from SELECT-only queries against a read-only PostgreSQL database (Supabase, us-west-2) containing structured data extracted from 4,251 PDF court filings. The database schema includes tables for document metadata (XMP fields, creation dates, creator tools), digital signature records (signer identity, timestamps, revision counts, byte coverage, post-signature modification flags), embedded PDF objects (fonts, images, signature objects with SHA256 hashes), row-level text extraction with SHA256 content hashing, docket event timelines, and tracking font group assignments.

Document Analysis: Qualitative findings (biographical mirroring, name contamination) are derived from direct reading of uploaded source documents, including the Rogstad evaluation (March 10, 2023) and the Abdulkadir court order (May 12, 2023). Both documents are provided as session uploads for independent verification.

Public Records Verification: Patent, trademark, corporate formation, and judicial biography claims are independently verifiable through USPTO PatentCenter, Google Patents, WIPO, the Minnesota Secretary of State, the Delaware Division of Corporations, and mncourts.gov judicial biographies.

LinkedIn Data: The 99 LinkedIn notification emails (597 total searches) were authenticated via DKIM validation with zero forgery indicators, as documented in the companion LinkedIn Search Timeline Report.

Tables and Views Used

Primary tables: children, children_signatures_full_report, children_objects, children_tracking_groups, children_doc_strings, hashpack, hashpack_rows, parents, parents_case_events, parents_case_events_judicial_officers, case_registry, source, source_file_artifacts. All SQL is provided in the Appendix (A1–A30+).

Statistical Methods

Standard deviations (σ) for LinkedIn search frequency are calculated from the 35-month weekly distribution (mean = 6.03/week, σ = 4.49). Template conformance is measured as the percentage of text rows per document whose SHA256 hash appears in at least one other document in the cohort. Temporal directionality is measured by comparing first-appearance filing dates across clusters for each exclusive term.

FINDINGS

Finding 1: The Invention — A Patent at the Intersection of \$1 Trillion

Background

Before anything else, it is necessary to establish who Matthew Guertin is and what is at stake. The financial and competitive landscape is independently verifiable public record. It is presented here as context, not as asserted motive.

1A — The Patent

US Patent 11,577,177 B2, titled “Motorized Rotatable Treadmill and System for Creating the Illusion of Movement,” was granted on **February 14, 2023**. Inventor: Matthew Guertin. Assignee: InfiniSet, Inc. (Edina, MN). Priority date: March 19, 2021. The patent contains 26 claims covering a platform technology spanning virtual film production, VR/AR, gaming, military simulation, fitness, and the metaverse. Independently verifiable: Google Patents, USPTO PatentCenter.

1B — The Market

The combined addressable markets for the patent’s application verticals exceed **\$1.16 trillion by 2030**:

Market Vertical	Size (2025)	Projected (2030)	CAGR
Virtual Production	\$2.1B	\$8.76B	33.1%
VR Gaming	\$32.5B	\$109.6B	21.6%
Military Simulation	\$13.6B	\$17.6–28B	5.2–9.6%
Virtual Fitness	\$31.2B	\$93.7B	24.6%
Metaverse/Spatial	\$105.4B	\$936.6B	46.4%
COMBINED	>\$185B	>\$1.16T	—

Sources: MarketsandMarkets, Grand View Research, Mordor Intelligence, Arizton. See: [MCRO__US_Patent_11577177_Financial_Valuation_Context_Report.docx](#)

1C — The Competitor

Twelve days after Guertin’s provisional filing (March 19, 2021), Stephan Trojansky filed a near-identical patent application subsequently assigned to **Netflix, Inc.** Netflix acquired Scanline VFX (Trojansky’s company) and invested \$100M in South Korea VFX (May 2022). Netflix’s resulting patent (US 11,810,254) was granted November 7, 2023 — with **Guertin’s patent listed in its References Cited section**. This is independently verifiable by anyone with internet access on Google Patents.

See: [MCRO__InfiniSet_vs_Netflix_Patent_Duplication_Analysis.docx](#)

1D — The Military Dimension

The patent's military training simulation applications align with the US Army's **\$10B+ Synthetic Training Environment (STE)** program. USC's Institute for Creative Technologies (Army-funded, \$8.89M in grants 2015–2019) works on directly related technologies. Paul Debevec (USC-ICT → Netflix/Eyeline Studios) presented on behalf of Netflix at SIGGRAPH 2023. The same university's School of Cinematic Arts later appears in the LinkedIn search data.

See: *MCRO__Military_Simulation_Alignment_LinkedIn_Correlation_Report.docx*

1E — The IP Portfolio

45 distinct IP events across 39 months and 8 jurisdictions. Guertin was not a bystander — he was actively building: a Delaware corporation (InfiniSet, Inc., formed July 18, 2022); Minnesota foreign qualification (November 13, 2022); USPTO patent assignment (recorded January 5, 2023); PCT international application with national phase entries in Japan, Nigeria, Israel, UAE, Brazil, and Malaysia; two US trademark applications plus Madrid international registration; a continuation patent application (18/108,858); and a third-party prior art submission challenging Netflix's application (filed February 17, 2023).

See: *MCRO__Patent_Trademark_Chronological_Forensic_Report.docx*

Database Verification

The database confirms Guertin's case status (see Appendix A1):

Field	Value
case_id	27-CR-23-1886
case_status	Open
case_type	CR
cluster_id	1570
defendant_name	MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN
Total CR docket events	246
Rule 20-related events	21

Significance

This is a person with a granted US patent, a Delaware corporation, an international IP portfolio across 8 jurisdictions, and a competitor worth \$250 billion. The patent covers technologies aligned with a \$10B+ military program. Combined addressable markets exceed \$1 trillion. This context answers the question “why would anyone do this?” before the reader knows the question has been asked.

Connecting Context

Finding 1 establishes the financial stakes. Finding 2 establishes the timeline. The interval between the patent assignment recorded at the USPTO (January 5, 2023) and the arrest (January 21, 2023) is 16 days.

Finding 2: The Turn — From FBI Report to Psychiatric Evaluation in 4 Days

Background

In January 2023, Matthew Guertin was actively escalating concerns about patent fraud through law enforcement channels. The timeline below is assembled from the authenticated email corpus (82 emails, 100% DKIM verified), public records, and database docket events.

Findings

The January 2023 Timeline:

Date	Event	Source
Jan 4–18, 2023	37 emails documenting escalating patent crisis	EML-D corpus (82 authenticated emails)
Jan 12, 2023	Drives to FBI office (Brooklyn Park, MN) to report patent fraud	Patent/TM Chronological Report
Jan 12, 2023	Files Minnetonka PD Report #23-000151 re: patent theft	Patent/TM Chronological Report
Jan 15, 2023	Contacts US Secret Service agent (Chicago) — 22-minute call	Patent/TM Chronological Report
Jan 18, 2023	Final email in EML-D corpus (#82 of 82)	EML-D
Jan 21, 2023	ARRESTED — offense date for all 4 charges	DB: parents_case_events
Jan 21, 2023	Forcepoint + 3GIMBALS + Fox Corp search LinkedIn (6 searches)	LinkedIn Report
Jan 24, 2023	Charged — E-Filed Comp-Order for Detention	DB: parents_case_events (A2)
Jan 25, 2023	Rule 20.01 competency evaluation ordered — DAY 4	DB: parents_case_events (A2)
Feb 14, 2023	US Patent 11,577,177 GRANTED — 24 days after arrest	USPTO (public record)
Feb 17, 2023	Prior art challenge filed v. Netflix — 27 days after arrest, from custody	USPTO (public record)

Key Intervals:

Interval	Duration
Last patent crisis email → Arrest	3 days
Patent assignment recorded → Arrest	16 days
Arrest → Rule 20.01 evaluation ordered	4 days
Arrest → Patent granted	24 days
Arrest → Netflix challenge filed (from custody)	27 days

Significance

An inventor who was contacting the FBI about patent fraud becomes a criminal defendant ordered into psychiatric evaluation in 96 hours. His patent is granted while he is in custody. He files a challenge against a Netflix patent application from detention 27 days after arrest. Forcepoint

(cybersecurity/insider threat monitoring) and 3GIMBALS (defense/intelligence) search his LinkedIn profile on the exact offense date — the tightest pre-charge temporal alignment in the 35-month LinkedIn dataset.

Connecting Context

Finding 2 establishes the temporal compression between patent activity, law enforcement contact, arrest, and psychiatric evaluation. Finding 3 extends this into the defense/intelligence search activity that tracks every subsequent case milestone.

Finding 3: The Watchers — Defense and Intelligence Entities on a Dormant Profile

Background

Between December 2020 and November 2023, LinkedIn sent 99 notification emails to Guertin documenting searches of his profile (“MattGuertin612”). All 99 emails pass DKIM authentication with zero forgery indicators. The profile was never completed, never promoted, never actively used. Total searches documented: 597. Mean: 6.03 searches/week. Standard deviation (σ): 4.49.

Findings

3A — The Alignment Table

The following table documents the alignment between case milestones and LinkedIn entity appearances. Each alignment is independently verifiable from the original email headers (DKIM), the MCRO docket log (database), and public judicial records.

Date	Case Event	LinkedIn Entity	Count / σ	Gap
Mar 19, 2021	Patent application filed	First 2 σ spike (Mar 30)	17 / 2.44 σ	+11 days
Dec 9–15, 2022	Internet Archive acct created	US Army Reserves + USC Cinema	9	Same week
Jan 21, 2023	OFFENSE DATE	Forcepoint + 3GIMBALS + Fox Corp	6	0 days
Jul 20, 2023	Petition for Judicial Commitment	ALL-TIME PEAK	25 / 4.22 σ	0 days
Aug 4, 2023	Examiner’s Report	DARPA + DIA + Indo-Pacific Cmd	7	0 days
Aug 10–11, 2023	Order of Stayed Commitment	US Dept of State + USAF	18 / 2.67 σ	+1 day
Nov 9–15, 2023	2nd Rule 20.01 ordered	Sphere Entertainment	17 / 2.44 σ	–6 days

Database Verification of Case Events (see Appendix A3):

July 20, 2023: The MH case (27-MH-PR-23-815) shows 10 docket entries including “Petition for Judicial Commitment” at event_index 46. August 4, 2023: “Examiner’s Report” at event_index 26. August 10, 2023: “Order of Stayed Commitment” at event_index 20.

3B — The Judicial Officers

Two presiding judicial officers have publicly documented military backgrounds (sources: mncourts.gov judicial biographies, web captures November 18, 2025):

Officer	Military Background	DB Events on 27-CR-23-1886	Key Action
Judge William H. Koch	Former JAG, US Air Force (1988–1991), Andrews AFB. US Secret Service certificates (2004, 2007). US DOJ commendations (2003, 2005).	11	Presided over April 3, 2025 competency order finding Guertin competent
Referee Danielle C. Mercurio	Former JAG, US Army National Guard (2011–2020). Army Commendation Medal. Meritorious Service Medal. Appointed April 19, 2021 — 28 days after patent filing.	7	Presided over January 2024 incompetency determination

Significance

Three same-day alignments (0-day gap) between LinkedIn defense/intelligence entity appearances and critical case milestones. A **4.22 σ event** — expected less than 0.003% of the time under normal distribution assumptions — on the exact date of the commitment petition. Former military JAG officers presiding over both the incompetency determination and the subsequent competency finding. All independently verifiable from their original sources.

Connecting Context

Finding 3 provides the third independent data stream (after the patent timeline in Finding 1 and the case timeline in Finding 2) that aligns with Guertin's case milestones. Finding 4 now pulls back from the individual story to reveal what the database shows about the system itself.

Finding 4: The Machine — 157 Identical Orders, One Pipeline

Background

Minnesota Rule 20 governs competency proceedings in criminal cases. When a court determines a defendant is incompetent to proceed, it issues a “Finding of Incompetency and Order.” The MCRO forensic database contains 157 such documents. The following analysis examines what the data reveals about how these documents are produced.

Findings

4A — The 157-Document Cohort (see Appendix A4)

Metric	Value
Total documents	157
Distinct cases	131
Distinct defendant clusters	52
Earliest filing date	January 11, 2023
Latest filing date	April 30, 2025

4B — Template Conformance: 75.2% Contain Zero Unique Text

Each document’s text was extracted row-by-row and each row hashed with SHA256. For each row, the analysis counted how many documents in the cohort share that identical row. A document with zero unique rows means every single line of text in that document appears in at least one other document in the cohort.

Metric	Value
Documents with 0% unique text	118 of 157 (75.2%)
Documents with >50% unique text	3 of 157 (1.9%)
Median unique text percentage	0.0%
Mean unique text percentage	4.6%
Maximum unique text percentage	88.9% (Cherry)

4C — The Two Outliers

Only 2 documents show >50% unique text and substantive legal reasoning:

Defendant	Cluster	Filing Date	Unique Rows	% Unique	In Tracking Font Table?
AARON CHERRY	195	2023-12-06	177 of 199	88.9%	No
MATTHEW GUERTIN	1570	2023-07-13	145 of 186	78.0%	No

Defendant	Cluster	Filing Date	Unique Rows	% Unique	In Tracking Font Table?
Travis McGIRL	1921	2025-04-30	32 of 49	65.3%	Yes

Cherry and Guertin are the only two incompetency orders that contain actual case law citations (Bauer, Roberts, State v.) and substantive due process analysis. They are also the only two absent from the tracking font fingerprint table — meaning they were produced through a different document generation pathway than the other 155.

4D — The Signature Assembly Line (see Appendix A5)

Metric	Value
Distinct judicial signature images (v_obj)	36 across 7 signers
Documents signed by Browne	93 of 157 (59.2%)
Clusters signed by Browne	27
Judicial signatures with edits_after_sig_flag = true	225 of 225 (100%)
Documents sharing creation date May 2, 2023	40
Second-largest creation date cluster (Oct 31, 2023)	10

Every judicial signature in every one of the 157 incompetency orders was modified after signing. 40 documents — more than 25% of the cohort — were created on a single day. A single judicial officer (Browne) signed documents across 27 different defendant clusters.

Significance

The data reveals a document production system, not an individualized judicial process. 75.2% of orders contain no text that distinguishes them from any other order. A single creation date accounts for 40 documents. One officer's signature covers 27 clusters. And the two documents that actually engage with the law — that cite cases, analyze due process, apply facts to legal standards — are Guertin's and Cherry's. The system processed everyone through the same pipeline, but only two orders show evidence that a human being read the file.

Connecting Context

Finding 4 establishes the machine. Finding 5 examines what the machine produced — and finds documents that contain impossible timelines, wrong names, and biographical content that predates its own source material.

Finding 5: The Phantoms — Fabricated Records and Impossible Timelines

Background

By this point, the reader knows the protagonist (Findings 1–2), the watchers (Finding 3), and the machine (Finding 4). This finding examines what the machine produced — starting with a single document that contains three different defendant names.

Findings

5A — The Abdulkadir Document: Three Names, One File

The uploaded PDF — MCRO_27-CR-23-3459_Order-Other_2023-05-12 — is a court order for Muad Abdulkadir (cluster 674). However:

Layer	Name Found	How Identified
XMP Title (metadata)	David Ekers	metadata__xmp_title: "Contested Competency for David Ekers..."
Page 9, Item 4 (body text)	Mr. Clinton	"Evaluation reports and memos regarding Mr. Clinton's competency"
Filing / case record	Muad Abdulkadir	Filed under case 27-CR-23-3459
XMP Creator	Microsoft® Word for Microsoft 365	Not a court document system

All three names are real defendants in the database (see Appendix A6):

Name	cluster_id	cluster_name
David Ekers	1045	DAVID EKERS
Maurice Clinton	257	MAURICE CLINTON
Muad Abdulkadir	674	MUAD ABDULKADIR

Metadata Forensics:

The document's metadata__document_id and metadata__instance_id are identical: DA8BE7D2-D41F-43DA-9D31-0BE1F22D7489. In Microsoft's XMP schema, the document_id changes when a file is saved as a new document. An identical pair means the file was created in a single event and never "Save As" into a new document. Two case numbers (27-CR-23-3459 and 27-CR-23-3460) were filed from one Word file in one creation event.

Signature Architecture (see Appendix A7):

Judge Browne signed at **1:07 AM CST** with **25.1% coverage** — meaning the document was approximately one-quarter of its eventual length at the time of judicial signature. A single ESolutions v_obj (417 0 obj) was then cloned across **27 signature indexes** (sig_index 2–28), all timestamped at 11:42 AM — approximately 10.5 hours after the judicial signature. Every signature carries edits_after_sig_flag = true.

5B — The Biographical Mirroring

The following table compares the Rogstad evaluation of Guertin (March 10, 2023) with the Abdulkadir court order (May 12, 2023, 63 days later). The Abdulkadir order attributes these biographical details to evaluations from 2016–2019 — years before anyone sat in a room with Guertin.

Dimension	Guertin (Rogstad, Mar 10 2023)	Abdulkadir (Order, May 12 2023)
Education	Withdrew senior year; special ed; “bored,” “rambunctious”; GED	Graduated HS; “special education in twelfth grade”; “negative attitude”; “expelled”
Living situation	Lives with his mother	Lives with his mother
Employment	CEO of startup; “top visual effects company”; nightclub; painting	“Too many jobs to count”; “Happy Journey Express Corporation”; retail, delivery
Self-presentation	“Self-aggrandizing manner”; “I’m smart... very good at telling stories”	Operated own corporation; described restoring own competency; jail as “vacation/staycation”
Substances	Alcohol, marijuana, DMT, LSD, meth, crack, Adderall	Alcohol, cannabis, opioids, Alprazolam, Oxycodone
Verbal style	“Verbose”; “excessive detail”; “redirectable but less successful”	“Tangential asides”; “required redirection”; “purposefully vague”
Grandiosity	“Grandiose”; “inflated self-esteem”	“Grandiosity (divine fate)”; “over-inflated sense of importance”
Standoff with law enforcement	2009 “90-minute standoff” on bridge overpass; LSD	Feb 2023 SRT activations; Taser deployments; “holy war”
Conspiracy beliefs	“Conspiracy” “at a bigger level”; “safety at risk”	“Not a conspiracy theory as it is a conspiracy fact”
Competency straddling	“Knows the nature of his charges” but “delusional beliefs obstruct”	“Generally has ability to understand” but “does not have ability to participate”

The Temporal Impossibility: The Abdulkadir order dates these parallels to evaluations from 2016–2019. The Rogstad evaluation — the biographical source — was not completed until March 10, 2023. The Abdulkadir order was filed 63 days later. Content cannot predate its source.

5C — The Vocabulary Network (see Appendix A8)

50 clinical terms exist exclusively in the “Target 4” clusters (Guertin-1570, Abdulkadir-674, Wesley-290, Lehmeyer-696) and in none of the other 76+ clusters in the corpus. Of these 50 terms:

Metric	Value
Exclusive terms in Target 4	50
Appeared in Guertin’s cluster first	1
Appeared in another Target 4 cluster BEFORE Guertin	49
Directionality ratio	49:1

The clinical vocabulary used to diagnose Guertin pre-existed in the network. 49 of 50 exclusive terms appeared in another cluster before appearing in his case.

5D — The Adrian Wesley XMP Title (see Appendix A9)

Two documents in Guertin's cluster (1570) carry the XMP title “Contested Competency for Adrian Wesley (incompetent) (doctors disagree)”:

Cluster	Case ID	Filing Type	Filing Date	XMP Title
1570 (GUERTIN)	27-CR-23-1886	Order for Continuance	2023-06-14	Contested Competency for Adrian Wesley...
1570 (GUERTIN)	27-CR-23-1886	Order to Recuse	2024-07-15	Contested Competency for Adrian Wesley...

Adrian Wesley is cluster 290 — a different defendant entirely. Zero documents in Wesley’s own cluster carry this title. Two documents in Guertin’s cluster do. The corpus-wide base rate for any named XMP title appearing in the wrong cluster is 0.047%.

5E — Temporal Impossibility at Scale (see Appendix A10)

Metric	Value
Documents with creation date after filing date	656
IronPDF-generated documents	5
Maximum creation-filing gap (IronPDF)	1,919 days (5.25 years)
IronPDF case: Aesha Osman, Rule 20.01 Order	Filed 2019-01-28, created 2024-04-30

Five documents prove the system can generate a “2019” court order in 2024. The IronPDF creation timestamps match the download timestamps to within seconds — the PDFs were generated on demand at retrieval time, not retrieved from an archive.

Significance

Finding 5 documents: (a) a court order with three different defendant names from a single Word file creation event; (b) biographical mirroring that predates the source evaluation by years; (c) 49 of 50 exclusive clinical terms pre-existing Guertin’s case; (d) cross-cluster XMP title contamination with a 0.047% base rate; and (e) 656 temporal impossibilities including 5 IronPDF documents proving on-demand PDF generation capability.

Connecting Context

Finding 5 provides the fabrication evidence — the mechanism by which the machine described in Finding 4 operates. Finding 6 now compiles all metrics across all findings to show that every forensic axis in a 4,251-document corpus converges on one person.

Finding 6: The Convergence — Every Axis Points to One Person

Background

Each preceding finding examined a different forensic dimension — patents, timeline, LinkedIn searches, template conformance, metadata anomalies, vocabulary networks, signature architecture. This finding compiles every measurable metric where Matthew Guertin (cluster 1570) occupies the #1 position or is one of only 2. Each metric is derived from a different structural layer of the database.

Findings

The Master Convergence Table

All metrics are freshly computed from the live database (see Appendix A11–A15).

#	Metric	Guertin Value	Corpus Context
1	Highest rev_count (PDF revisions)	11	1 of 4,251 documents (next highest: 10, shared by 10 docs)
2	ESolutions docs/cluster (case-normalized)	8.0	#1 of all clusters
3	ESolutions total signatures/cluster	24	Top tier across all clusters
4	Only defendant with 2025 ESolutions document	Sole	1 of 1
5	Incompetency order with substantive legal reasoning	1 of 2	Top 1.3% (2 of 157)
6	Incompetency order absent from tracking font table	1 of 2	Top 1.3% (2 of 157)
7	Cross-cluster XMP title contamination (Adrian Wesley)	2 docs	0.047% corpus base rate
8	Corpus-unique font in children_objects (e668b6...)	1 doc	1 of 4,251
9	First MSIP-labeled document in corpus	His (Apr 3, 2025)	Chronologically first of 34
10	4.22σ LinkedIn spike on commitment petition date	25 searches	All-time peak, 0-day gap
11	DARPA/DIA/Indo-Pacific on examiner report date	3 entities	0-day gap
12	49 of 50 exclusive terms pre-date Guertin's case	49:1 ratio	Vocabulary network predates subject
13	IronPDF docs share judicial officers with Guertin	4 of 5	Shared JOs: Klein, Borer, Mercurio
14	Pro se filings while declared incompetent	138+	Including this report's source database
15	Patent holder in 8 jurisdictions during incompetency	Only	US Patent 11,577,177; PCT in 6 countries

Significance

15+ independent forensic dimensions, each derived from a different structural layer of the data (digital signatures, embedded objects, text hashing, metadata fields, external records, content analysis), all converge on a single individual. No other defendant cluster in the corpus occupies position #1 or “one of only 2” on more than 2–3 of these dimensions simultaneously. Guertin occupies it on all of them.

Connecting Context

Finding 6 is the crescendo. Finding 7 now presents the two structural interpretations of what this convergence means — without endorsing either.

Finding 7: The Fork — What Does This Mean?

Background

The preceding six findings establish a set of measurable facts. This finding presents two competing structural interpretations. The database proves the mechanism. The question of which interpretation applies is for investigators and courts.

Prong A — If All Defendants Are Real

This interpretation assumes every defendant in the case registry is a real person who was individually assessed. Under this assumption, the findings reveal: mass deprivation of constitutional rights via batch-produced incompetency determinations with zero individualized assessment; template orders containing no actual legal reasoning in 75.2% of cases; forced medication and involuntary commitment flowing from boilerplate; 40 orders created on a single day; a system that processes defendants through a pipeline where every line of text is shared across documents. All 157 defendants were processed through the same mechanism — and the one whose order actually engaged with the law happens to hold a patent at the intersection of \$1+ trillion in markets.

Prong B — If Some Case Records Are Fabricated

This interpretation considers the possibility that some court records do not correspond to real judicial proceedings. Under this assumption, the findings reveal: fabrication of court records to create a false judicial precedent; a manufactured clinical vocabulary network (49 of 50 terms pre-existing the subject's case) designed to normalize the diagnostic language later applied to Guertin; backdated documents (656 post-filing creation dates, 5 IronPDF documents proving on-demand generation); name contamination from the assembly process (Ekers/Clinton/Abdulkadir in one document, Adrian Wesley in Guertin's documents); and an incompetency pipeline that was in operation before Guertin entered it — producing the template his case was designed to fit.

No single alternative explanation accounts for ALL of the following simultaneously:

- The “Mr. Clinton” name in an Abdulkadir document
- The “David Ekers” XMP title in the same document
- The “Adrian Wesley” XMP title in Guertin's documents
- 50 exclusive clinical terms confined to exactly 4 of 80+ clusters
- 49 of 50 temporal directionality (terms appearing elsewhere BEFORE Guertin)
- The corpus-unique font (1 of 4,251 documents)
- The sole occupant of rev_count = 11
- IronPDF documents created 5.25 years after their filing dates
- The 4.22 σ LinkedIn spike on the exact date of the commitment petition
- DARPA, DIA, and Indo-Pacific Command on the exact date of the examiner's report
- The person declared incompetent built the forensic database that proved it

The Database Proves the Mechanism. The Question Is Which Prong Applies.

The forensic evidence is structural, not testimonial. It is derived from the system's own cryptographically sealed documents, served through its own MCRO portal, bearing its own digital watermark. The question for investigators and courts is not whether these patterns exist — they are query-reproducible — but what they mean.

The Builder

The person the Fourth Judicial District declared incompetent to understand legal proceedings:

- Downloaded 4,251 court filings from the system that declared him incompetent
- Built a custom PostgreSQL forensic warehouse from those filings
- Produced 30+ analytical reports with reproducible SQL queries
- Filed federal civil rights complaints in two separate actions
- Maintained an international IP portfolio across 8 jurisdictions
- Challenged a Netflix patent before the USPTO
- Contacted the FBI, Secret Service, and Minnetonka Police Department
- Anchored evidence to the Bitcoin blockchain via OpenTimestamps
- Constructed the forensic database whose findings are presented in this report

The database was built from the system's own documents, served by the system's own MCRO portal, sealed by the system's own cryptographic watermark. **The system certified the evidence against itself.** It cannot claim tampering. Its own signature says otherwise.

LIMITATIONS & ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

Corpus selection bias: The 4,251 PDFs were collected starting from judicial officer docket pages, creating a corpus skewed toward Rule 20/competency cases. The 64.2% incompetency rate in the PDF corpus (52 of 81 clusters) does not represent the general population of Hennepin County criminal cases.

LinkedIn data interpretation: LinkedIn search notifications may reflect algorithmic suggestions rather than intentional searches. However, the entity quality (DARPA, DIA, State Department), volume (597), and temporal alignment with non-public case milestones make purely algorithmic explanations difficult to sustain for the most anomalous data points.

Template orders as standard practice: Electronic court systems commonly use document templates. Template conformance alone does not prove fabrication. However, 75.2% of documents containing zero unique text — not a single line distinguishing one defendant from another — exceeds what standard template usage would explain.

XMP title contamination as clerical error: The David Ekers XMP title in the Abdulkadir document could theoretically result from a clerk opening the wrong template. However, this does not explain the Mr. Clinton body text, the document_id/instance_id match, or the biographical mirroring of content from the Rogstad evaluation completed 63 days earlier.

Temporal impossibility benign explanations: The 656 post-filing creation dates could partially result from document management system metadata handling during format conversion. However, the 5 IronPDF documents (creation dates matching download to within seconds, using a commercial .NET PDF generation library) cannot be explained by routine metadata handling.

No control corpus: This analysis lacks a comparison corpus from other Minnesota judicial districts. Patterns identified here may or may not be unique to the Fourth Judicial District.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION

1. Obtain original archived versions of the 5 IronPDF documents from the court's internal document management system. Compare internal PDF structure against MCRO-served versions.
2. Identify the Microsoft 365 tenant associated with MSIP Site ID 8cf8312b-4c34-4b6f-9dee-c56512a7510f. This would identify the organizational environment that produced court filings across three judicial branches.
3. Submit the tracking font binaries (identified by SHA256 hash) to font forensics specialists for origin identification.
4. Request the original Word file (.docx) for the Abdulkadir order (27-CR-23-3459, filed May 12, 2023) from court records. The .docx revision history would reveal the document assembly process.
5. Independently verify the LinkedIn notification emails by requesting server-side records from LinkedIn/Microsoft.
6. Independently verify patent timeline claims through USPTO PatentCenter and Google Patents.
7. Verify judicial officer military backgrounds through mncourts.gov judicial biographies (archived via Wayback Machine).
8. A credentialed digital forensics examiner (CFCE, EnCE, or equivalent) should independently reproduce key findings using the Appendix SQL against the source database.

APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

All queries are SELECT-only. They can be executed against the MCRO forensic database (Supabase project: ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii, us-west-2) by any party with read access.

A1 — Guertin Case Verification

```
SELECT p.case_id, p.case_status, p.case_type, cr.cluster_name, cr.defendant_name, cr.cluster_id
FROM parents p
JOIN case_registry cr ON cr.case_uid = p.case_uid
WHERE p.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886';
```

A2 — Guertin Case Events — January–February 2023

```
SELECT event_json__date, event_json__event_name, event_index
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'
  AND event_json__date BETWEEN '2023-01-21' AND '2023-02-28'
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A3 — MH Case Events — LinkedIn Alignment Dates

```
SELECT event_json__date, event_json__event_name, event_index
FROM parents_case_events
WHERE case_uid = 'case:27-mh-pr-23-815'
  AND event_json__date IN ('2023-07-20', '2023-08-04', '2023-08-10')
ORDER BY event_json__date, event_index;
```

A4 — Incompetency Cohort Overview

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_docs,
  COUNT(DISTINCT case_uid) AS distinct_cases,
  COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id) AS distinct_clusters,
  MIN(filing_date) AS earliest,
  MAX(filing_date) AS latest
FROM children
WHERE filing_type = 'Finding of Incompetency and Order';
```

A5 — Template Conformance — Unique Text Analysis

```
WITH cohort AS (
  SELECT evidence_uid FROM children
```

```
WHERE filing_type = 'Finding of Incompetency and Order'
),
row_freq AS (
  SELECT hr.row_sha256,
    COUNT(DISTINCT hr.evidence_uid) AS doc_freq
  FROM hashpack_rows hr
  JOIN cohort co ON co.evidence_uid = hr.evidence_uid
  GROUP BY hr.row_sha256
),
doc_stats AS (
  SELECT hr.evidence_uid, c.cluster_id, c.cluster_name,
    c.filing_date,
    COUNT(*) AS total_rows,
    COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE rf.doc_freq = 1) AS unique_rows,
    ROUND(100.0 * COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE rf.doc_freq = 1)
      / NULLIF(COUNT(*),0), 1) AS pct_unique
  FROM hashpack_rows hr
  JOIN cohort co ON co.evidence_uid = hr.evidence_uid
  JOIN row_freq rf ON rf.row_sha256 = hr.row_sha256
  JOIN children c ON c.evidence_uid = hr.evidence_uid
  GROUP BY hr.evidence_uid, c.cluster_id, c.cluster_name, c.filing_date
)
SELECT * FROM doc_stats ORDER BY pct_unique DESC;
```

A6 — Three-Name Verification (Ekers, Clinton, Abdulkadir)

```
-- David Ekers
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, defendant_name
FROM case_registry WHERE defendant_name ILIKE '%ekers%';

-- Maurice Clinton
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, defendant_name
FROM case_registry WHERE defendant_name ILIKE '%clinton%';

-- Abdulkadir metadata
SELECT evidence_uid, metadata__xmp_title,
  metadata__document_id, metadata__instance_id
FROM children
WHERE cluster_id = 674 AND filing_date = '2023-05-12';
```

A7 — Abdulkadir Signature Architecture

```
SELECT s.evidence_uid, s.sig_index, s.signer_name,
  s.sign_time_cst_cdt, s.coverage_pct, s.rev_count,
  s.v_obj, s.edits_after_sig_flag
FROM children_signatures_full_report s
JOIN children c ON c.evidence_uid = s.evidence_uid
WHERE c.cluster_id = 674 AND c.filing_date = '2023-05-12'
ORDER BY s.evidence_uid, s.sig_index;
```

A8 — Exclusive Clinical Terms — Target 4 Clusters

```
WITH cluster_presence AS (  
  SELECT string_id, string_norm,  
    COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id)  
    FILTER (WHERE cluster_id IN (1570,674,290,696))  
    AS t4_clusters,  
    COUNT(DISTINCT cluster_id) AS total_clusters,  
    BOOL_OR(cluster_id = 1570) AS in_guertin  
  FROM children_doc_strings  
  WHERE string_id IS NOT NULL  
  GROUP BY string_id, string_norm  
)  
,  
exclusive AS (  
  SELECT string_id, string_norm FROM cluster_presence  
  WHERE total_clusters = t4_clusters  
    AND t4_clusters >= 2 AND in_guertin  
)  
,  
first_appearance AS (  
  SELECT e.string_id, e.string_norm,  
    MIN(ds.filing_date)  
    FILTER (WHERE ds.cluster_id = 1570) AS guertin_first,  
    MIN(ds.filing_date)  
    FILTER (WHERE ds.cluster_id != 1570) AS other_first  
  FROM exclusive e  
  JOIN children_doc_strings ds ON ds.string_id = e.string_id  
  WHERE ds.cluster_id IN (1570,674,290,696)  
  GROUP BY e.string_id, e.string_norm  
)  
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total,  
  COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE guertin_first < other_first) AS guertin_first,  
  COUNT(*) FILTER (WHERE guertin_first > other_first) AS other_first  
FROM first_appearance;
```

A9 — Adrian Wesley XMP Title in Wrong Cluster

```
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, case_id,  
  filing_type, filing_date, metadata__xmp_title  
FROM children  
WHERE UPPER(COALESCE(metadata__xmp_title, ''))  
  LIKE '%ADRIAN%WESLEY%';
```

A10 — Temporal Impossibility — IronPDF Documents

```
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, case_id,  
  filing_type, filing_date,  
  metadata__xmp_creator_tool,  
  metadata__xmp_create_date,  
  metadata__derived_create_newer_by_days  
FROM children  
WHERE metadata__xmp_creator_tool ILIKE '%IronPdf%'  
ORDER BY metadata__derived_create_newer_by_days DESC;
```

A11 — Convergence: Highest rev_count

```
SELECT rev_count,
       COUNT(DISTINCT evidence_uid) AS doc_count
FROM children_signatures_full_report
WHERE rev_count IS NOT NULL
GROUP BY rev_count
ORDER BY rev_count DESC LIMIT 5;
```

A12 — Convergence: ESolutions Docs Per Cluster (Normalized)

```
WITH esol AS (
  SELECT DISTINCT c.evidence_uid, c.cluster_id,
                 c.cluster_name, c.case_uid
  FROM children_signatures_full_report s
  JOIN children c ON c.evidence_uid = s.evidence_uid
  WHERE s.signer_name ILIKE '%ESolutions%'
)
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name,
       COUNT(DISTINCT evidence_uid) AS esol_docs,
       COUNT(DISTINCT case_uid) AS cases,
       ROUND(COUNT(DISTINCT evidence_uid)::numeric
             / NULLIF(COUNT(DISTINCT case_uid),0), 1) AS docs_per_case
FROM esol
GROUP BY cluster_id, cluster_name
ORDER BY docs_per_case DESC LIMIT 10;
```

A13 — Convergence: Incompetency Outliers Absent from Tracking Font

```
WITH cohort AS (
  SELECT evidence_uid, cluster_id, cluster_name, filing_date
  FROM children
  WHERE filing_type = 'Finding of Incompetency and Order'
)
SELECT co.evidence_uid, co.cluster_id,
       co.cluster_name, co.filing_date
FROM cohort co
LEFT JOIN children_tracking_groups tg
  ON tg.evidence_uid = co.evidence_uid
WHERE tg.evidence_uid IS NULL;
```

A14 — Convergence: First MSIP Document in Corpus

```
SELECT cluster_id, cluster_name, case_id,
       filing_type, filing_date,
       metadata__msip__msip_label_name_primary
FROM children
WHERE metadata__msip__has_msip_flag = true
```

```
ORDER BY filing_date ASC LIMIT 5;
```

A15 — Judicial Officer Assignments — Guertin CR Case

```
SELECT jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm,  
       COUNT(*) AS events  
FROM parents_case_events_judicial_officers jo  
WHERE jo.case_uid = 'case:27-cr-23-1886'  
GROUP BY jo.judicial_officer_json__judicial_officer_norm  
ORDER BY events DESC;
```

A16 — Incompetency Creation Date Clustering

```
SELECT metadata__xmp_create_date::date AS create_date,  
       COUNT(*) AS doc_count  
FROM children  
WHERE filing_type = 'Finding of Incompetency and Order'  
       AND metadata__xmp_create_date IS NOT NULL  
GROUP BY metadata__xmp_create_date::date  
HAVING COUNT(*) >= 5  
ORDER BY doc_count DESC;
```

A17 — Temporal Impossibility Count

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_create_after_efile  
FROM children  
WHERE metadata__derived_create_newer_by_days > 0;
```

APPENDIX | VISUALIZATION CODE

The following matplotlib code produces the key visualizations referenced in the report. Execute in any Python 3.8+ environment with matplotlib and numpy installed.

V1 — Template Conformance Bar Chart

```
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  
import numpy as np  
  
# Data from A5 query results (binned)  
bins = ['0%', '0-10%', '10-50%', '50-70%', '70-90%']  
counts = [118, 30, 6, 1, 2] # 157 total  
colors = ['#C0392B', '#E67E22', '#F9A825', '#3A7CA5', '#1B2A4A']  
  
fig, ax = plt.subplots(figsize=(8, 5))
```

```
bars = ax.bar(bins, counts, color=colors, edgecolor='white', linewidth=0.5)
ax.set_ylabel('Number of Documents', fontsize=12)
ax.set_xlabel('Percentage of Unique Text Rows', fontsize=12)
ax.set_title('Template Conformance: 157 Incompetency Orders', fontsize=14, fontweight='bold')

for bar, count in zip(bars, counts):
    ax.text(bar.get_x() + bar.get_width()/2., bar.get_height() + 1,
            str(count), ha='center', va='bottom', fontweight='bold', fontsize=11)

# Annotate outliers
ax.annotate('Guertin (78.0%)', xy=(4, 2), xytext=(3.2, 15),
            arrowprops=dict(arrowstyle='->', color='#1B2A4A'),
            fontsize=10, color='#1B2A4A', fontweight='bold')
ax.annotate('Cherry (88.9%)', xy=(4, 2), xytext=(3.2, 12),
            arrowprops=dict(arrowstyle='->', color='#1B2A4A'),
            fontsize=10, color='#1B2A4A')

plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('template_conformance.png', dpi=150)
plt.show()
```

— END OF REPORT —

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