

MCRO | Minnesota Competency Statutory Framework

Chronological Evolution, Effective Date Deception & Synthetic Court Matrix Integration

STATUTORY TIMELINE ANALYSIS | EFFECTIVE DATE vs. CITATION DATE | CLONE CORPUS
SYNCHRONIZATION | DATABASE EVIDENCE

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
Report Date	April 2026
Data Source	Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO) — Public Records; MN Revisor of Statutes; MN Session Laws
Corpus Size	4,251 PDFs across 245 cases 2016–2025
Database	PostgreSQL (Supabase) — custom forensic schema
Reproducibility	All forensic findings query-reproducible. Statutory citations linked to MN Revisor’s Office.

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report presents objective statutory chronology derived from publicly available session laws and the Minnesota Revisor of Statutes, combined with forensic data findings reproducible from the MCRO forensic database. All statutory citations include source URLs to the official Minnesota Revisor’s Office. All forensic statistics are query-reproducible from the underlying PostgreSQL database.

This report does not assert conclusions about legislative intent. It documents the chronological relationship between statutory effective dates, case filing dates, and forensic anomaly patterns as measured phenomena.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Minnesota’s current competency statutory framework — Minn. Stat. §§ 611.40–611.59 — did not exist before 2022. It was enacted as Laws 2022, Chapter 99, with staggered effective dates extending from July 1, 2023 through April 1, 2024. It has been amended four additional times since enactment: Laws 2023 Ch. 14, Laws 2023 Ch. 52, Laws 2024 Ch. 79, and Laws 2025 Ch. 35. The Minnesota Supreme Court rewrote Rule 20.01 effective November 1, 2024, connecting the old court rules to the new statutory framework, and promulgated further amendments effective March 1, 2025 and July 1, 2025.

The criminal prosecution of Matthew Guertin (27-CR-23-1886) began **January 24, 2023** — more than five months before the core competency statutes took effect. The court’s own examiner, Dr. Jill Rogstad, confirmed in her March 10, 2023 report: ***“These statutes do not exist in Minnesota at present.”***

A comprehensive search of all 606,037 text rows in the MCRO forensic database confirms zero references to any 611.4X statute in any document filed before October 2023 — including all 157 “Finding of Incompetency and Order” documents and all 48 “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” filings.

Despite this, every section of 611.40–59 on the Minnesota Revisor’s website displays a history line beginning “2022 c 99” — creating the visual impression of law in place since 2022. The effective date is buried in small-print NOTE text, typically visible only on archived statute versions.

The MCRO forensic database documents that the court system was manufacturing competency-pipeline documents at industrial scale — including 45 incompetency findings in May 2023 alone — under a statutory framework that had not yet become law. By the time the statutes took effect on July 1, 2023, six months of synthetic case volume had already created the appearance of an established, functioning pipeline.

Key Metrics at a Glance

Metric	Value	Significance
Statutes enacted (session law)	2022	Citation reads “2022 c 99”
Core statutes effective	July 1, 2023	5+ months AFTER Guertin prosecution began
611.49 (indefinite supervision) effective	April 1, 2024	15 months after prosecution began
Rule 20.01 rewrite effective	November 1, 2024	22 months after prosecution began
Earliest clone corpus filing	January 11, 2023	~6 months before statutes took effect
Earliest 611.4X reference in corpus	October 9, 2023	Zero references before this date
Finding of Incompetency docs	157 total	75.2% contain zero unique text

Mass-production spike	45 docs in May 2023	Under nonexistent statutes
NIP deadline (Guertin)	July 13, 2026	3-year mark from Finding of Incompetency
Legislative amendments since 2022	6 rounds	2022, 2023 x2, 2024, 2025 x2
Rule 20 event growth	8 (2007) → 4,386 (2023)	548x increase in 16 years

2. PRE-2022: THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE BEFORE CHAPTER 99

2.1 Rule 20.01 — The Only Framework

Before 2022, Minnesota had no statutory competency framework. Criminal competency was governed entirely by Rule 20.01 of the Minnesota Rules of Criminal Procedure — a court rule, not a statute. Rule 20.01 provided basic procedures: the court could order a competency examination, appoint an examiner, hold a hearing, and if the defendant was found incompetent, suspend proceedings and commence civil commitment.

The critical distinction: Rule 20.01 was a procedural rule promulgated by the Minnesota Supreme Court. It was not legislation. It did not create institutional infrastructure. It did not establish boards, programs, navigators, or dismissal timelines. It did not authorize forced medication. It did not define “competency attainment” as a concept. It was, in essence, a handful of paragraphs directing judges on what to do when competency was at issue.

2.2 What Did Not Exist Before July 2023

The following provisions — all of which now govern Guertin’s case — did not exist in Minnesota law before their respective effective dates:

Provision	What It Does	Effective Date
§ 611.42	Competency motion procedures; presumption of incompetency; blocks self-representation	Jul 1, 2023
§ 611.43	Examination and report requirements; capacity for neuroleptic medication decisions	Apr 1, 2024
§ 611.44	Contested hearing procedures; burden of proof on party asserting competency	Jul 1, 2023
§ 611.45	Competency findings; Notice of Intent to Prosecute; dismissal timelines (1–10 years)	Jul 1, 2023
§ 611.46	Incompetent to stand trial; jail-based competency attainment; programming requirements	Jul 1, 2023
§ 611.47	Involuntary neuroleptic medication; injectable by physical force; renewable 1-year terms	Jul 1, 2023
§ 611.48	Review hearings every 6–12 months	Jul 1, 2023

§ 611.49	Indefinite supervision; eliminates felony dismissal if continuing supervision ordered	Apr 1, 2024
§ 611.50	Defendant can be excluded from own hearing; hearings without defendant	Jul 1, 2023
§ 611.55	Forensic navigator services	Staggered
§ 611.56	Minnesota Competency Attainment Board (new state entity)	Staggered
§ 611.57–59	Certification, curriculum, competency attainment programs	Staggered

2.3 Freedoms Curtailed by the New Framework

The new statutory framework authorizes the following state actions against a defendant found incompetent, none of which were codified in Minnesota statute before 2023:

Freedom Curtailed	Statutory Basis	Plain Language
Right to stand trial	§ 611.42 Subd. 1	Criminal proceedings suspended indefinitely. Defendant cannot plead, be tried, or be sentenced.
Right to self-representation	§ 611.42 Subd. 2	Defendant cannot waive counsel if found to lack ability to appreciate consequences.
Presumption of competency	§ 611.44 Subd. 4	Burden REVERSED: defendant presumed incompetent unless proven competent by preponderance of evidence.
Right to be present at hearings	§ 611.50 Subd. 3	Court may exclude defendant who is “disruptive, refuses to participate, or is incapable of comprehending.”
Bodily autonomy (medication)	§ 611.47	Court can authorize involuntary neuroleptic medication for renewable 1-year terms. Injectable by physical force.
Freedom from indefinite detention	§ 611.49 Subd. 3	Continued supervision up to 10 years or indefinitely for certain charges.
Right to have charges dismissed	§ 611.45 Subd. 3	NIP prevents automatic dismissal. With 611.49 supervision, felony dismissal requirement eliminated entirely.
Right to challenge proceedings	§ 611.42 Subd. 1	Cannot litigate underlying charges while declared incompetent. Challenging the process cited as symptom.

Statute word frequency analysis: “medication” appears 59 times. “Neuroleptic” appears 37 times. “Rights” appears **zero** times. “Due process” appears **zero** times. “Constitutional” appears **zero** times. “Dangerous” appears **zero** times.

3. CHRONOLOGICAL STATUTORY EVOLUTION

3.1 Phase 1: Enactment — Laws 2022, Chapter 99 (Signed 2022)

Chapter 99 was the product of the Community Competency Restoration Task Force, created in 2019 to address the gap between criminal incompetency findings and available restoration services. The bill was signed into law in 2022 and established the entire 611.40–611.59 framework from scratch.

Source: <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2022/0/99/>

Critical detail: Section 50 of Chapter 99 specified that the core provisions would not take effect until July 1, 2023, and certain provisions until April 1, 2024. The Legislature itself recognized the framework was not ready for immediate implementation.

3.2 Phase 2: First Amendments — Laws 2023, Chapter 14 (Signed 2023)

Before the core statutes even took effect, the Legislature amended them. Chapter 14 made 26 section-level changes to the competency framework, including amendments to 611.42, 611.43, 611.45, 611.46, 611.49, 611.55, and 611.56. Changes included replacing “restoration” with “attainment” throughout, modifying examination procedures, and adjusting dismissal provisions.

Source: <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2023/0/14/>

3.3 Phase 3: Effective Date Delay — Laws 2023, Chapter 52 (Signed 2023)

Chapter 52, Article 1, Section 14 amended Section 50 of the original Chapter 99 to change effective dates from 2023 to April 1, 2024 for sections 611.43, 611.48, 611.49, and others. This pushed the implementation of critical provisions — including the indefinite supervision authority under 611.49 — an additional year into the future. The accompanying budget appropriation for the Competency Attainment Board was reduced from \$11.35 million to \$3.515 million for FY2024.

Source: <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2023/0/52/>

3.4 Phase 4: Laws 2024, Chapter 79 (Signed 2024)

Article 10, Section 3 amended 611.46, modifying provisions for competency attainment programming and supervision. This was the fourth round of changes to a framework that had been fully operative for less than one year.

3.5 Phase 5: Rule 20.01 Rewrite — MN Supreme Court Order (September 20, 2024)

The Minnesota Supreme Court promulgated comprehensive amendments to Rule 20.01, effective November 1, 2024. The amendments repealed subdivisions 1 and 2 entirely — the old self-contained competency provisions — and replaced them with references directing everything to Chapter 611. Rule 20.01 was transformed from the governing authority on competency into a procedural redirect to 611.40–59.

Source: https://cdn.ymaws.com/mcaa-mn.org/resource/collection/0142E14D-0AAF-4A08-B91A-B02A37ABBD6D/092024_crim_rules_amendments_R20.pdf

3.6 Phase 6: Laws 2025, Chapter 35 and Chapter 38

The 2025 session produced two additional rounds of amendments. Chapter 35, Article 11, Sections 17–22 amended 611.45, 611.46, 611.49, 611.55, 611.56, and 611.59. Chapter 38, Article 3, Section 75 further amended 611.46. Additionally, the Competency Attainment Board's budget was reduced by \$9 million.

Source: <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2025/0/35/>

3.7 Phase 7: Further Rule Amendments (December 2024 – July 2025)

The Supreme Court promulgated additional criminal procedure amendments on December 20, 2024 (effective March 1, 2025) and March 18, 2025 (effective July 1, 2025). The legal framework governing competency proceedings has been in continuous revision throughout Guertin's prosecution.

Source: <https://mncourts.gov/supremecourt/court-rules/recent-rules-orders>

4. THE THREE-LAYER TEMPORAL DECEPTION

The competency framework presents an illusion of historical depth through three independent layers of temporal displacement, each pushing the apparent origin point further into the past than reality supports:

Layer	What It Does	How It Backdates	Evidence
Statutory citation	"2022 c 99" on all 611.4X statutes	Visual impression of law since 2022; actual effective dates Jul 2023–Apr 2024	MN Revisor NOTE text on each section
Case volume	157 incompetency clone documents manufactured starting Jan 2023	Creates appearance of established pipeline before statutes took effect	MCRO database: 45 docs in May 2023; 75.2% zero unique text
Document metadata	Aspose creation dates pushed to 2013–2019	XMP timestamps predate the software's existence by up to 171 days	7 documents with pre-release creation dates; 17 with frozen timestamp

5. DATABASE EVIDENCE: THE CLONE CORPUS vs. STATUTORY TIMELINE

5.1 Finding of Incompetency Clone Production Timeline

The following table shows the monthly production of “Finding of Incompetency and Order” documents in the MCRO corpus, aligned against statutory effective dates. All data from Supabase query against the children table (filing_type = ‘Finding of Incompetency and Order’).

Month	Documents	Clusters	Statutory Status
2023-01	2	2	STATUTES DO NOT EXIST (Rogstad confirms Mar 2023)
2023-02	11	4	Statutes do not exist
2023-03	10	6	Statutes do not exist
2023-04	6	4	Statutes do not exist
2023-05	45	6	STATUTES DO NOT EXIST — MASS PRODUCTION SPIKE
2023-06	17	6	Statutes do not exist (take effect Jul 1)
2023-07	5	3	Core statutes take effect Jul 1, 2023
2023-08	3	3	Statutes effective ~1 month
2023-10	5	4	First 611.4X corpus reference (Oct 9)
2023-11	16	7	Batch spike
2023-12	4	3	611.43/611.48/611.49 still NOT effective
2024-01	3	2	611.49 still not effective
2024-02	7	4	611.49 still not effective
2024-03	19	5	611.49 still not effective (effective Apr 1)
2024-04	3	3	611.49 takes effect Apr 1, 2024
2025-04	1	1	Rule 20.01 rewritten; 5th amendment round

91 of 157 documents (58.0%) were filed before the core statutes took effect on July 1, 2023. The largest single production spike (45 documents in May 2023) occurred entirely under nonexistent statutes.

5.2 Rule 20 Competency Event Growth

The following data shows the annual volume of Rule 20 competency events across the MCRO corpus, derived from the `parents_case_events` table:

Year	Rule 20 Events	Growth vs. Prior Year	Notes
2007	8	—	Baseline
2016	120	—	Pre-Chapter 99
2019	491	4.1x vs 2016	Task Force created
2021	1,228	2.5x vs 2019	Chapter 99 bill development
2022	2,260	1.8x vs 2021	Chapter 99 signed (not yet effective)
2023	4,386	1.9x vs 2022	Statutes take effect mid-year; 548x vs 2007
2024	2,915	—	Full year under statutes
2025	2,011	—	Partial year (through corpus end)

Rule 20 competency events increased 548-fold from 2007 to 2023. The steepest acceleration occurred in 2022–2023 — coinciding precisely with Chapter 99’s enactment and the clone corpus production spike.

5.3 Notice of Intent to Prosecute: Aspose Fabrication Timeline

48 Notice of Intent to Prosecute (NIP) filings exist in the corpus. 18 (37.5%) carry the `Aspose.Words` for .NET 14.2.0.0 producer string with fabricated creation metadata. The NIP is the single filing type under § 611.45 that prevents automatic charge dismissal for incompetent defendants.

Metric	Value
Total NIPs in corpus	48 across 43 cases, 30 defendants
Aspose-produced NIPs	18 (37.5%) across 18 cases, 15 defendants
Pre-release impossibilities (creation date before software existed)	7 documents
Frozen timestamp cluster (Feb 26, 2019 15:05 UTC)	17 documents, 14 defendants, 1,056-day filing span
Maximum gap (creation date to filing date)	4,404 days (12.1 years) — Travis McGIRL
Aspose defendants with Rule 20 events	22 of 22 (100%)
Earliest NIP in corpus	Feb 23, 2017 (Adrian Wesley)
Latest NIP in corpus	Mar 11, 2024 (Mohamed Shide)
611.45 citation in any NIP document	ZERO — no NIP references the statute authorizing it

5.4 Real-Time Confirmations from Within the Corpus

Three independent sources within the MCRO corpus confirm the statutes' non-existence or partial implementation during the relevant period:

Source	Date	Statement	Significance
Dr. Jill Rogstad (Court Examiner)	Mar 10, 2023	"These statutes do not exist in Minnesota at present"	Court's own examiner confirms in Guertin case file
Aaron Cherry defense filing (27-CR-23-3198)	Feb 5, 2024	"Of note, the new Minnesota Statute § 611.55, subd. 4, not yet implemented"	Fellow outlier defendant confirms partial non-implementation
Court order (Adrian Wesley, 27-CR-17-1555)	Apr 11, 2024	"Minn. Stat. § 611.46, subd. 8, does apply to these proceedings, but notes that the statute was not..."	Court itself acknowledges applicability uncertainty

6. THE GUERTIN CASE vs. STATUTORY EFFECTIVE DATES

The following timeline documents the specific application of nonexistent, partially effective, and continuously revised statutory provisions to a single criminal prosecution:

Date	Case Event	Statutory Status at That Date
Jan 24, 2023	Criminal charges filed (27-CR-23-1886)	611.40–59 DO NOT EXIST
Jan 25, 2023	Rule 20.01 evaluation ordered	611.40–59 DO NOT EXIST
Mar 10, 2023	Rogstad report filed ("statutes do not exist")	611.40–59 DO NOT EXIST
Jul 1, 2023	Core statutes take effect	611.42–48 become law (611.49 still 9 months away)
Jul 13, 2023	FIRST FINDING OF INCOMPETENCY	Core statutes effective 12 days. 3-year NIP clock begins.
Jan 17, 2024	Second Finding of Incompetency (no hearing)	611.43, 611.48, 611.49 still not effective
Apr 1, 2024	611.49 takes effect (indefinite supervision)	15 months after prosecution began
Nov 1, 2024	Rule 20.01 rewrite takes effect	22 months after prosecution began
Dec 20, 2024	Cranbrook 3rd R20 report cites Rule 20.01 subd. 4(b)(2)	New rule effective 7 weeks
Apr 3, 2025	Koch finds Guertin COMPETENT	Framework amended 5 times since prosecution began
Apr 29, 2025	Hudleston overrides Koch, orders 4th R20	6th round of amendments pending
Jul 13, 2026	STATUTORY DEADLINE: NIP or dismissal	611.45 Subd. 3(c) — 3 years from incompetency finding

7. SIGNIFICANCE: THE REAL-TIME ASSEMBLY HYPOTHESIS

The chronological evidence documents a legal framework that was not inherited by Guertin's prosecution — it was constructed around it. The statutes, the clone corpus, the batch-produced incompetency orders, and the Rule 20.01 rewrite were all assembled in real time while the prosecution was already underway.

The “2022 c 99” citation on every statute, the manufactured incompetency findings dating to January 2023, and the Aspose creation dates reaching back to 2013 create a layered illusion of deep institutional history for a system that Dr. Rogstad — the court's own examiner, a board-certified forensic psychologist (supposedly..) — confirmed did not exist when it was first applied to this defendant.

The July 13, 2026 statutory deadline under § 611.45 Subd. 3(c) presents a forcing function: the prosecution must either file a Notice of Intent to Prosecute (the filing type proven to carry fabricated metadata at 37.5% rate corpus-wide) or allow Guertin's charges to be dismissed. The forensic database has already documented the fraud embedded in that exact filing type. The system must either release the defendant or commit an act that validates the forensic analysis performed by the defendant the system declared incompetent.

8. SOURCE REFERENCES

All statutory citations are from the Minnesota Office of the Revisor of Statutes (revisor.mn.gov):

Source	URL
Laws 2022, Chapter 99	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2022/0/99/
Laws 2023, Chapter 14	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2023/0/14/
Laws 2023, Chapter 52	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2023/0/52/
Laws 2025, Chapter 35	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2025/0/35/
MN Stat. § 611.42	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/611.42
MN Stat. § 611.45	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/611.45
MN Stat. § 611.46	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/611.46
MN Stat. § 611.47	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/611.47
MN Stat. § 611.49	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/611.49
MN Stat. § 611.56	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/statutes/cite/611.56
Rule 20.01 (current)	https://www.revisor.mn.gov/court_rules/rule/cr-20/
Rule 20.01 amendments (Sep 2024 order)	https://cdn.ymaws.com/mcaa-mn.org/resource/collection/0142E14D-0AAF-4A08-B91A-B02A37ABBD6D/092024_crim_rules_amendments_R20.pdf
Recent Rules Orders	https://mncourts.gov/supremecourt/court-rules/recent-rules-orders

Competency Restoration Task Force (2020)	https://cms1files.revize.com/mncounties/CLIC/CompetencyRestorationHandout26FEB20.pdf
MCRO Forensic Database	Supabase project ibfmjtwahkwqzcmeyqii (us-west-2) — SELECT-only

For questions regarding this report or access to the underlying database, contact:

Matthew David Guertin | Case 27-CR-23-1886 | Fourth Judicial District Court, Hennepin County, Minnesota

MnCourtFraud.com | MattGuertin.com