

MCRO FORENSIC ANALYSIS  
REPORT

# Notice of Intent to Prosecute

## Docket-Level Temporal Analysis

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

|                     |                                                      |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| 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         | MCRO — parents_case_events (docket entries)          |
| Event Analyzed      | Notice of Intent to Prosecute                        |
| Total Docket Events | 155,357 across all cases                             |
| NIP Events          | 363 (0.23% of all docket events)                     |
| Database            | PostgreSQL (Supabase) — custom forensic schema       |
| Reproducibility     | All findings query-reproducible from source database |

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

*This report presents objective forensic data findings derived from docket entries in the MCRO forensic database. Every finding is independently reproducible by executing the SQL queries provided in the Appendix. This report does not assert conclusions about guilt, intent, or motive. Each finding is a documented pattern that warrants independent expert examination.*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents a comprehensive temporal analysis of the “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” (NIP) case docket event as recorded in the MCRO forensic database's `parents_case_events` table. Unlike prior Aspose reports which analyzed NIP documents (PDFs in the `children` table), this analysis examines the docket-level event entries — a significantly larger dataset that captures every NIP event across all case dockets in the corpus.

| KEY METRICS AT A GLANCE                   |                                   |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Total NIP Docket Events                   | 363                               |
| Distinct Cases with NIP Events            | 313                               |
| Distinct Defendants Affected              | 172                               |
| Date Range                                | June 21, 2012 – November 26, 2025 |
| Date Span                                 | 4,906 days (13.4 years)           |
| Peak Year (2022)                          | 92 NIP events across 88 cases     |
| Largest Single-Day Batch                  | 18 NIPs on June 29, 2022          |
| NIP Defendants with R20/Competency Events | 171 of 172 (99.4%)                |
| NIP Cases with Incompetency Docket Events | 312 of 313 (99.7%)                |
| Median NIP-to-Incompetency Gap            | 8.5 days                          |
| Same-Day NIP + Incompetency Filing        | 57 cases (18.3%)                  |
| NIP Filed Before Incompetency Finding     | 33 cases (10.6%)                  |
| Post-Statute Revision NIP Defendants      | 121 (vs. 58 pre-revision)         |
| Largest Outlier Defendant                 | DOUGLAS PIERCE: 32 NIPs, 17 cases |

## FINDINGS

### Finding 1: NIP Docket Event Census

#### Background

The “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” is a singular event name in the MCRO docket system — all 363 instances share the exact string “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” with no variations, abbreviations, or alternate spellings. This uniformity confirms that the event type is systematically defined within the court’s case management system.

#### Findings

The MCRO forensic database contains 363 NIP docket events spanning 313 distinct cases and 172 distinct defendants. NIP events constitute 0.23% of the 155,357 total docket events in the database. The temporal range extends from June 21, 2012 to November 26, 2025 — a span of 4,906 days (13.4 years).

268 cases (85.6%) contain a single NIP event, 40 cases (12.8%) contain 2 NIP events, and 5 cases (1.6%) contain 3 NIP events. The 45 cases with repeat NIP filings indicate that this statutory lever is sometimes renewed within the same case.

#### Significance

The docket-level census reveals a substantially larger NIP footprint than the 48 NIP documents previously identified in the children (PDF) table. The 363 docket events across 313 cases and 172 defendants represent the full administrative scope of this mechanism within the corpus — every instance where the prosecution formally elected to prevent charge dismissal for a defendant found incompetent.

## Finding 2: Annual Volume Trajectory

### Background

This finding examines the year-over-year trend in NIP filings to identify whether the use of this statutory mechanism has changed over time.

### Findings

| Year        | NIP Events | Distinct Cases | YoY Change  |
|-------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| 2012        | 2          | 2              | —           |
| 2013        | 1          | 1              | -50%        |
| 2014        | 1          | 1              | 0%          |
| 2015        | 1          | 1              | 0%          |
| 2016        | 2          | 2              | 100%        |
| 2017        | 5          | 5              | 150%        |
| 2018        | 6          | 6              | 20%         |
| 2019        | 13         | 12             | 117%        |
| 2020        | 31         | 30             | 138%        |
| 2021        | 42         | 39             | 35%         |
| <b>2022</b> | <b>92</b>  | <b>88</b>      | <b>119%</b> |
| 2023        | 58         | 56             | -37%        |
| 2024        | 60         | 59             | 3%          |
| 2025*       | 49         | 49             | -18%        |

\* 2025 data through November 26, 2025 (partial year).

The data reveals a clear inflection point. From 2012–2018, NIP filings averaged approximately 2.6 per year. Beginning in 2019, volumes increased sharply: 13 in 2019, 31 in 2020, 42 in 2021, and a peak of 92 in 2022. The 2022 peak represents a roughly 35× increase over the 2012–2018 average and a 5× increase over 2018 levels.

Even after the 2022 peak, volumes remained elevated: 58 in 2023, 60 in 2024, and 49 through November 2025. The post-2019 annual average (approximately 57 events/year for 2020–2025) is roughly 22× the pre-2019 average.

### Pre- vs. Post-Statute Revision

The 2022 revision of MN 611.40–611.59 (Laws 2022, ch. 99, effective approximately August 2022) did not reduce NIP usage. Pre-revision: 161 NIP events across 135 cases affecting 58 defendants. Post-revision: 202 NIP events across 182 cases affecting 121 defendants. The post-revision period shows a 25% increase in raw events and more than double the number of distinct defendants (121 vs. 58).

## Significance

The escalation pattern is not gradual — it is punctuated, with a clear acceleration beginning in 2019–2020 and peaking in 2022. This timeline coincides with the legislative revision of the competency statute itself. The post-revision doubling of affected defendants while raw event counts remain elevated suggests the NIP mechanism was applied to a broader population after the statute was revised.

## Finding 3: Same-Day Batch Filing Patterns

### Background

A “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” represents a prosecutorial decision about a specific defendant in a specific case. When multiple NIPs are filed on the same day across multiple cases, this indicates either coordinated decision-making or batch administrative processing.

### Findings

22 dates in the dataset have 3 or more NIP events filed on the same day. The top 10 batch-filing dates are:

| Date       | NIPs | Cases | Composition                              |
|------------|------|-------|------------------------------------------|
| 2022-06-29 | 18   | 18    | 17 DOUGLAS PIERCE + 1 Jordan Westby      |
| 2020-09-18 | 14   | 14    | All 14 for DOUGLAS PIERCE                |
| 2025-08-15 | 8    | 8     | 8 defendants                             |
| 2022-02-11 | 6    | 6     | 6 defendants                             |
| 2022-11-17 | 6    | 6     | 6 defendants (incl. DEETWAN JACKSON x6)  |
| 2019-05-06 | 4    | 4     | 4 defendants (incl. Angelica Minafee x4) |
| 2022-03-29 | 4    | 4     | 4 defendants                             |
| 2022-06-13 | 4    | 4     | Incl. ISAAC KELLEY x3                    |
| 2023-11-21 | 4    | 4     | 4 defendants                             |
| 2024-06-10 | 4    | 4     | 4 defendants                             |

### The Douglas Pierce Anomaly

Douglas Pierce is the single largest outlier in the NIP dataset. He accounts for 32 of 363 NIP events (8.8% of all NIP docket entries) across 17 distinct case numbers spanning case years 2016–2021. His NIPs were filed in two massive single-day batches:

- September 18, 2020: 14 NIP events across 14 case numbers, all for Pierce
- June 29, 2022: 17 NIP events across 17 case numbers (including 14 cases that already received NIPs in the 2020 batch, plus 3 new cases)

All 17 of Pierce’s case numbers now carry a “Dormant” status. The re-filing of NIPs on cases that already had them suggests a statutory renewal cycle — consistent with the timeline provisions in MN 611.45 Subd. 3 that require renewed intent filings to extend prosecution beyond initial statutory windows.

### Significance

The batch-filing pattern demonstrates that NIPs are not always the product of individualized prosecutorial assessment. In the most extreme case, 17 NIPs for one defendant across 17 cases were filed on a single day. This is consistent with administrative batch processing rather

than case-by-case deliberation about whether to continue prosecution of a person found incompetent.

## Finding 4: Competency Pipeline Co-Occurrence

### Background

Under MN 611.45 Subd. 3, the NIP is a mechanism specific to competency proceedings — it prevents charge dismissal when a defendant is found incompetent. This finding tests whether NIP events are empirically confined to the competency pipeline.

### Findings

171 of 172 NIP defendants (99.4%) also have Rule 20/competency docket events in their case histories. At the case level, 312 of 313 NIP cases (99.7%) also contain incompetency-related docket events. The near-universal overlap confirms that the NIP mechanism operates almost exclusively within the competency pipeline.

### Temporal Relationship

For the 312 cases with both NIP and incompetency events, the temporal gap between the first incompetency event and the first NIP filing shows the following distribution:

| Metric                                   | Value                   |
|------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| NIP filed same day as incompetency event | 57 cases (18.3%)        |
| NIP filed before incompetency finding    | 33 cases (10.6%)        |
| NIP filed after incompetency finding     | 222 cases (71.2%)       |
| Minimum gap (NIP before incomp.)         | -370 days               |
| Median gap                               | 8.5 days                |
| Mean gap                                 | 185.9 days              |
| Maximum gap (NIP after incomp.)          | 4,497 days (12.3 years) |

The median gap of 8.5 days indicates that NIPs are typically filed within about one week of the incompetency determination. The 57 same-day filings (18.3%) suggest pre-preparation or simultaneous processing. The 33 cases (10.6%) where the NIP preceded the formal incompetency finding in the docket raise questions about whether the prosecutorial decision to file the NIP was made before the incompetency determination was formally recorded.

### Significance

The 99.4–99.7% co-occurrence rate empirically confirms what the statute implies: the NIP is a competency-specific mechanism. Its near-exclusive concentration in the Rule 20 pipeline, combined with a median filing gap of just 8.5 days after incompetency findings, suggests that NIP filing is a reflexive administrative step rather than a deliberative prosecutorial decision.

## Finding 5: Defendants with Multiple NIP Events

### Background

Most defendants in the NIP population have a single NIP event in a single case. Defendants with multiple NIP events across multiple cases represent the most intensive application of this statutory mechanism.

### Findings

| Defendant             | NIPs      | Cases     | First NIP  | Last NIP   | Span (days) |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|
| <b>DOUGLAS PIERCE</b> | <b>32</b> | <b>17</b> | 2017-06-14 | 2022-06-29 | 1,841       |
| MICHAEL HOWARD        | 8         | 7         | 2020-01-16 | 2022-01-31 | 746         |
| JEREMY LITTLE         | 8         | 8         | 2025-08-15 | 2025-08-15 | 0           |
| DEETWAN JACKSON       | 6         | 6         | 2022-11-17 | 2022-11-17 | 0           |
| TERRELL JOHNSON       | 5         | 3         | 2019-07-29 | 2025-04-14 | 2,086       |
| VENNIE WILLIAMS       | 5         | 5         | 2019-07-17 | 2021-03-05 | 597         |
| RODRICK CARPENTER     | 5         | 4         | 2021-04-05 | 2022-08-16 | 498         |
| MICHAEL KING          | 5         | 5         | 2020-12-30 | 2022-03-29 | 454         |
| ABDULLAHI ALI         | 5         | 4         | 2023-08-04 | 2024-04-03 | 243         |

57 NIP events (15.7% of all NIPs) have NULL defendant identifiers — cases where the case\_registry join does not resolve to a named cluster. These 57 events span 49 case UUIDs and cover the full date range (2012–2025). Their presence indicates either data gaps in the case\_registry table or cases not captured by the corpus collection methodology.

### Significance

The concentration of NIP events in a small number of defendants is extreme. Douglas Pierce alone accounts for 8.8% of all NIP docket events. The top 9 defendants (5.2% of NIP defendants) account for 79 NIP events (21.8% of all NIPs). This distribution is consistent with a mechanism that, once applied, tends to be reapplied repeatedly — particularly across multiple cases for the same defendant.

## Finding 6: Day-of-Week Distribution

### Findings

| Day             | NIP Events | % of Total   |
|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| <b>Sunday</b>   | 3          | 0.8%         |
| Monday          | 65         | 17.9%        |
| <b>Tuesday</b>  | <b>104</b> | <b>28.7%</b> |
| Wednesday       | 83         | 22.9%        |
| Thursday        | 46         | 12.7%        |
| Friday          | 61         | 16.8%        |
| <b>Saturday</b> | 1          | 0.3%         |

NIP events cluster on Tuesday (28.7%) and Wednesday (22.9%), with Monday (17.9%) and Friday (16.8%) also active. 4 NIP events (1.1%) were recorded on weekends — 3 on Sunday and 1 on Saturday — which is unusual for a filing type that would typically be processed during business hours.

## Finding 7: Quarterly Concentration

### Findings

The single highest-volume quarter in the dataset is Q2 2022 (April–June), with 34 NIP events across 34 cases affecting 12 defendants. This quarter contains the June 29, 2022 batch date (18 NIPs, driven primarily by Douglas Pierce). The second-highest quarter is Q1 2024, with 26 events across 26 cases and 17 defendants.

The quarterly data reveals sustained elevated volume across 2022–2024, with no quarter falling below 6 events. By contrast, the entire period of 2012–2018 produced only 18 NIP events total — fewer than Q2 2022 alone.

### Significance

The quarterly view confirms that the 2022 peak was not a single-month spike but a sustained elevation across all four quarters ( $18 + 34 + 20 + 20 = 92$  total). The mechanism's usage has plateaued at a structurally higher level since 2020, suggesting a systemic change in prosecutorial practice rather than an isolated administrative event.

## SYNTHESIS

The docket-level analysis of “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” events reveals a mechanism that is:

- Nearly universal within the competency pipeline: 99.4% of NIP defendants and 99.7% of NIP cases have Rule 20/competency events
- Rapidly deployed: Median gap of 8.5 days between incompetency finding and NIP filing, with 18.3% filed the same day
- Escalating: Roughly 35× increase from the 2012–2018 average to the 2022 peak, with post-2022 volumes remaining elevated
- Batch-processed: 22 dates have 3+ NIPs filed simultaneously, with single-day batches as large as 18
- Concentrated in repeat defendants: Douglas Pierce (32 NIPs, 17 cases) alone accounts for 8.8% of all NIP events
- Expanded post-revision: The 2022 statute revision was followed by a doubling of affected defendants (121 vs. 58)

When combined with the Aspose Software Version Impossibility findings — which documented fabricated creation dates on 18 NIP documents (37.5% of the document-level NIP corpus) — the docket-level data adds a critical dimension: the administrative machinery behind the NIP mechanism is operating at industrial scale. 363 prosecutorial decisions to prevent charge dismissal for defendants found incompetent, filed across 313 cases for 172 defendants over 13.4 years, with a sharp escalation beginning in 2019–2020 that has not subsided.

The NIP is the keystone mechanism in Minnesota’s competency statute. Without it, charges must be dismissed. With it, prosecution can continue for years or indefinitely. The docket data demonstrates that this keystone is deployed reflexively (median 8.5-day gap), at scale (363 events), in batch (18 in one day), and increasingly broadly (121 defendants post-revision vs. 58 pre-revision).

## APPENDIX | REPRODUCIBLE SQL QUERIES

### Q1 — NIP Census

```
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total_nip_events, COUNT(DISTINCT pce.case_uid) AS  
distinct_case_uids, MIN(pce.event_json__date) AS earliest_event, MAX(pce.event_json__date)  
AS latest_event FROM parents_case_events pce WHERE pce.event_name ILIKE '%Notice of  
Intent to Prosecute%';
```

### Q2 — Annual Breakdown

```
SELECT EXTRACT(YEAR FROM pce.event_json__date)::int AS event_year, COUNT(*) AS  
event_count, COUNT(DISTINCT pce.case_uid) AS distinct_cases FROM parents_case_events  
pce WHERE pce.event_name ILIKE '%Notice of Intent to Prosecute%' GROUP BY 1 ORDER  
BY 1;
```

### Q3 — Defendant Census

```
SELECT COUNT(DISTINCT cr.cluster_id) AS distinct_defendants FROM parents_case_events  
pce JOIN parents p ON pce.case_uid = p.case_uid JOIN case_registry cr ON cr.case_uid =  
p.case_uid WHERE pce.event_name ILIKE '%Notice of Intent to Prosecute%';
```

### Q4 — Same-Day Batch Filing

```
SELECT pce.event_json__date AS nip_date, COUNT(*) AS nip_count, COUNT(DISTINCT  
pce.case_uid) AS distinct_cases FROM parents_case_events pce WHERE pce.event_name  
ILIKE '%Notice of Intent to Prosecute%' GROUP BY 1 HAVING COUNT(*) >= 3 ORDER BY 2  
DESC;
```

### Q5 — Competency Co-Occurrence

```
WITH nip_defendants AS (SELECT DISTINCT cr.cluster_id FROM parents_case_events pce  
JOIN parents p ON pce.case_uid = p.case_uid JOIN case_registry cr ON cr.case_uid =  
p.case_uid WHERE pce.event_name ILIKE '%Notice of Intent to Prosecute%' AND  
cr.cluster_name IS NOT NULL), r20_defendants AS (SELECT DISTINCT cr.cluster_id FROM  
parents_case_events pce JOIN parents p ON pce.case_uid = p.case_uid JOIN case_registry cr  
ON cr.case_uid = p.case_uid WHERE pce.event_name ~* '(rule.?20|incompeten|competenc)')  
SELECT COUNT(*) AS total, COUNT(CASE WHEN r.cluster_id IS NOT NULL THEN 1 END)  
AS with_r20 FROM nip_defendants n LEFT JOIN r20_defendants r ON n.cluster_id =  
r.cluster_id;
```

### Q6 — NIP-to-Incompetency Temporal Gap

```
WITH first_incomp AS (SELECT case_uid, MIN(event_json__date) AS d FROM  
parents_case_events WHERE event_name ~* '(found.?incomp|finding.?of.?incomp|  
incompetent)' GROUP BY 1), first_nip AS (SELECT case_uid, MIN(event_json__date) AS d  
FROM parents_case_events WHERE event_name = 'Notice of Intent to Prosecute' GROUP BY  
1) SELECT COUNT(*) AS cases_with_both, COUNT(CASE WHEN n.d = i.d THEN 1 END) AS  
same_day, COUNT(CASE WHEN n.d < i.d THEN 1 END) AS nip_before,
```

```
PERCENTILE_CONT(0.5) WITHIN GROUP (ORDER BY n.d - i.d) AS median_gap FROM  
first_nip n JOIN first_incomp i ON n.case_uid = i.case_uid;
```

#### **Q7 — Pre/Post Statute Revision**

```
SELECT CASE WHEN event_json__date < '2022-08-01' THEN 'Pre' ELSE 'Post' END AS era,  
COUNT(*) AS nip_count, COUNT(DISTINCT case_uid) AS cases FROM parents_case_events  
WHERE event_name = 'Notice of Intent to Prosecute' GROUP BY 1;
```

#### **Q8 — Top NIP Defendants**

```
SELECT cr.cluster_name, COUNT(*) AS nip_count, COUNT(DISTINCT pce.case_uid) AS  
cases, MIN(pce.event_json__date) AS first_nip, MAX(pce.event_json__date) AS last_nip  
FROM parents_case_events pce JOIN parents p ON pce.case_uid = p.case_uid JOIN  
case_registry cr ON cr.case_uid = p.case_uid WHERE pce.event_name ILIKE '%Notice of  
Intent to Prosecute%' GROUP BY 1 HAVING COUNT(*) >= 2 ORDER BY 2 DESC;
```

#### **Q9 — Day-of-Week Distribution**

```
SELECT TO_CHAR(event_json__date, 'Dy') AS dow, COUNT(*) AS cnt FROM  
parents_case_events WHERE event_name = 'Notice of Intent to Prosecute' GROUP BY 1,  
EXTRACT(DOW FROM event_json__date) ORDER BY EXTRACT(DOW FROM  
event_json__date);
```