

FORENSIC ANALYSIS REPORT

Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO)

MCRO | Convergence Synthesis Report

How Metadata, Docket Sequences, Document Infrastructure,
and Entity Resolution Converge on a Single Hypothesis

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
Corpus Size	4,251 PDFs 2,865 Cases (CR + MH) 153,357 Docket Events
Database	PostgreSQL (Supabase) — Custom Forensic Schema
Reproducibility	All findings query-reproducible from underlying database

IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER

This report synthesizes findings from multiple independent forensic analysis reports produced during the investigation of Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO) document metadata, docket event sequences, and document production infrastructure. Each underlying finding is independently reproducible from the live forensic database using the SQL queries provided in the source reports.

This report does not assert conclusions about guilt, intent, or motive. It presents a convergence analysis: documenting how independently discovered anomalies across different analytical dimensions point toward a common explanatory framework. The term “hypothesis” is used deliberately — this report describes a pattern of evidence and identifies the explanatory framework that most parsimoniously accounts for all observed anomalies. The reader draws conclusions.

This synthesis report references findings from the following source reports, all of which are available with full SQL appendices and are independently verifiable:

1. MCRO | Aspose Software Version Temporal Impossibility Report (with 7 embedded source PDFs + 4 provenance ZIPs)
2. MCRO | MH Docket Procedural Grammar Violations — Event-Type Logical Sequence Forensic Analysis (Constitutional MH Inversion Severity Index)
3. MCRO | Doc-Set Group Forensics — Part 1: Corpus Profile & Document Statistics
4. MCRO | Doc-Set Group Forensics — Part 2: Hashpack Text, Stream & Outline Hash Forensics
5. MCRO | Doc-Set Group Forensics — Part 3: Embedded Object Forensics & Cross-Group Object Sharing
6. MCRO | Doc-Set Group Forensics — Part 4: Signatures & Persons Analysis
7. MCRO | Doc-Set Group Forensics — Part 5: Language & Terminology Analysis (Series Capstone)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report asks a simple question: do the forensic anomalies discovered across thousands of Minnesota court documents and docket records form a coherent pattern, or are they unrelated clerical errors? The answer, based on the convergence of four independent analytical dimensions, is that a single explanatory framework accounts for all of them — and that framework involves systematic document fabrication supported by automated production infrastructure.

The evidence falls into four pillars, each independently documented in the source reports listed above:

Pillar 1 — The Aspose Backdating Reveal: Seven court documents carry PDF creation dates that predate the existence of the software that created them. This is not a statistical anomaly — it is a logical impossibility. A document cannot be created by software that does not yet exist. An additional 17 documents share an identical creation timestamp to the minute despite being filed for 14 different defendants across nearly 3 years. The creation dates on these documents are provably not authentic.

Pillar 2 — MH Docket Procedural Incoherence: 99.4% of 787 mental health civil commitment dockets contain procedural sequencing violations against Minnesota’s own civil commitment statutes. One-third of forced medication orders appear in dockets with no commitment order. 42.7% of MH dockets meet at least one “ghost docket” criterion — missing fundamental structural elements that any real legal proceeding would produce. Zero MH cases have any PDF documents available for forensic verification.

Pillar 3 — Document Production Infrastructure: A 5-part forensic analysis of 1,043 documents across 8 classification groups reveals industrialized document production. 73.2% of one judicial officer’s orders are byte-for-byte text clones. Two font objects appear with identical binary hashes across 7 of 8 document groups spanning 8.5 years. Named-author groups that should represent independent document creation share 74.2% vocabulary overlap, indicating shared templates. The same four defendants appear in 6 of 8 forensic classification groups.

Pillar 4 — Entity Resolution (The Hidden Bridge): None of the cross-dimensional convergence patterns described in Pillars 1–3 were discoverable from the court records system as designed. The MCRO system does not link cases to unified defendant identities. Connecting a defendant’s criminal case to their mental health commitment proceedings to their appellate records required building a custom entity resolution layer through regex matching and manual review across thousands of name variants. The fact that convergence emerged once this linkage was built — and was invisible without it — is itself evidence of a system designed to resist exactly this kind of analysis.

KEY METRICS — AT A GLANCE

Documents with creation dates BEFORE the software existed	7
Maximum gap: fabricated creation date to filing date	4,404 days (12.1 years)
Documents sharing one creation timestamp to the minute	17 (14 defendants, 2.9 years)
MH cases with at least one procedural grammar violation	782 of 787 (99.4%)
MH cases with forced treatment but NO commitment order	131 (33.9%)
MH cases meeting at least one ghost docket criterion	336 (42.7%)
MH cases with ANY PDF documents for verification	0 of 787 (0.0%)

AUTH_Judith-Cole orders that are exact text clones	73.2% (of 123 documents)
Font objects shared across 7 of 8 document groups	2 (identical SHA256 hashes)
Defendants appearing in 6 of 8 forensic classification groups	4
Aspose defendants also in other forensic anomaly populations	22 of 22 (100%)

THE BIG PICTURE — IN PLAIN LANGUAGE

For readers without technical backgrounds, this section explains what was found and why it matters in everyday terms.

What Is This Investigation?

Minnesota's courts publish case records through an online system called MCRO (Minnesota Court Records Online). These records include PDF documents (orders, motions, filings) and docket entries (text records of what happened in a case). This investigation downloaded and forensically analyzed over 4,000 PDF documents and tens of thousands of docket entries from the Fourth Judicial District (Hennepin County, which includes Minneapolis).

Every PDF file contains hidden internal data called “metadata” — information about when the document was created, what software made it, and what fonts and digital signatures it contains. This metadata is embedded automatically by the software and is not normally visible to someone reading the document. Think of it like the EXIF data in a photograph that records what camera took the picture and when.

What Was Found?

The Backdated Documents

A commercial software library called Aspose.Words version 14.2.0.0 was used to create 27 court documents. The “14.2” in the version name means it was released in February 2014 — the software uses a year-dot-month naming system. Seven of these documents claim they were created in August, September, or November of 2013 — months before the software that made them existed. This is like finding a photograph with camera metadata saying it was taken with an iPhone 15 in 2019 — the camera did not exist yet. There is no innocent explanation for this: the creation dates on these documents are false.

Separately, 17 of these 27 documents — all “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” filings naming specific defendants — share an identical creation timestamp down to the minute (February 26, 2019 at 3:05 PM UTC), despite being filed for 14 different people over a span of nearly three years. This means a single pre-built document was reused with only the defendant's name changed, and the creation date was never updated.

The Ghost Dockets

Minnesota law requires specific steps before someone can be civilly committed to a mental health facility: a petition must be filed, notice must be served, an evaluation must be conducted, a hearing must be held, and only then can the court issue a commitment order. If the court wants to authorize forced psychiatric medication, that requires additional proceedings on top of the commitment.

When these legal requirements were checked against the actual docket records for 787 mental health cases, the results were striking. 99.4% of cases had at least one violation of the expected procedural sequence. One-third of cases where forced medication was authorized had no commitment order anywhere in the docket — meaning the record shows someone was forcibly medicated without ever being formally committed. Nearly a third of all cases had no initiating petition — the entire legal proceeding appears to have happened without the document that starts it. And none of these 787 mental health cases had a single PDF document available for independent review.

The Template Factory

When the internal structure of over 1,000 court documents was analyzed at the byte level — looking at the actual text content, embedded fonts, digital signatures, and internal file structure — patterns emerged that indicate industrialized document production rather than individual document creation. Nearly three-quarters of one judge's orders were exact text copies of each other, differing only in the defendant's name. Documents attributed to different authors shared nearly identical vocabulary. The same font files, with identical digital fingerprints, appeared across seven of eight different document categories spanning 8.5 years. The same four defendants appeared in six of eight independent forensic classification groups.

The Hidden Connections

Perhaps the most important finding is methodological. The court records system does not connect a person's criminal case to their mental health commitment case. These records use different case number formats, different data structures, and often spell the person's name differently. Connecting them required building a custom matching system from scratch — writing computer scripts to find name variations across thousands of records and then manually verifying the matches.

Once those connections were built, every anomaly discovered in one dimension — backdated documents, ghost dockets, template-produced orders, signature irregularities — turned out to concentrate in the same group of people. This convergence was invisible without the linkage and became immediately apparent once it was built. If these were random clerical errors affecting random cases, building the identity connections should not produce convergence. The fact that it does suggests the anomalies share a common source.

PILLAR 1: THE ASPOSE BACKDATING REVEAL

Source: MCRO | Aspose Software Version Temporal Impossibility Report

Source Files Examined: 7 embedded pre-release PDFs extracted and metadata-verified during this analysis session

The Impossibility

Aspose.Words for .NET is a commercial software library that converts Word documents to PDF format. When it creates a PDF, it automatically stamps its own version number into the file's metadata — a field called the “Producer.” This stamp is generated by the software itself and cannot be altered through normal use. Version 14.2.0.0 uses a year-dot-month naming convention, meaning it was released in February 2014.

Seven documents in the MCRO corpus carry the Aspose 14.2.0.0 producer stamp but claim creation dates in August, September, and November of 2013 — months before the software existed. The creation date and the producer stamp are set in the same operation: if the software says it is version 14.2.0.0, the document was created no earlier than February 2014. A creation date before that point is provably false.

What This Means

Since the software's self-identification cannot be faked through normal use (the software knows what version it is), the only field that could have been manipulated is the creation date. The Aspose API provides methods to programmatically set document metadata properties, including creation dates. This means whoever operated the document generation pipeline wrote code that explicitly set these creation dates to values in the past — values that happened to predate the software itself.

The Frozen Clock

Beyond the seven impossible dates, 17 documents share an identical creation timestamp of February 26, 2019 at 15:05 UTC. These 17 documents are all “Notice of Intent to Prosecute” filings — documents that name a specific defendant and represent a prosecutorial decision about a specific person. They were filed for 14 different defendants over a span of 1,056 days (2.9 years). This pattern is consistent with a single pre-built template document being reused with only defendant-specific fields changed, without the creation timestamp ever being refreshed.

Cross-Dimensional Convergence

All 22 defendants affected by Aspose-generated documents also appear in at least one other independent forensic anomaly dimension: ESolutions digital signature irregularities, Finding of Incompetency orders, IronPDF temporal gaps, or elevated Rule 20 competency events. The probability that a random selection of 22 defendants would produce 100% overlap with other anomaly populations is vanishingly small. This concentration indicates that the Aspose documents are not random artifacts — they target the same population that exhibits anomalies across every other forensic dimension.

Extracted Source Documents

The following seven pre-release impossibility PDFs were extracted from the embedded attachments of the Aspose report during this analysis session and their metadata was independently verified:

MCRO_27-CR-22-4239_Notice of Motion and Motion_2024-01-08_20240429035800.pdf

Author: Carole A. Katz | Created: 2013-08-14 20:45 UTC | 171 days before software release

MCRO_27-CR-22-4239_Order-Other_2024-01-09_20240429035758.pdf

Author: Carole A. Katz | Created: 2013-08-14 20:45 UTC | 171 days before software release

MCRO_27-CR-20-23521_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2023-06-13_20240430090508.pdf

Author: Roberta Dziekan | Created: 2013-09-09 13:50 UTC | 145 days before software release

MCRO_27-CR-22-23317_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2023-09-13_20240429164128.pdf

Author: Roberta Dziekan | Created: 2013-09-09 13:50 UTC | 145 days before software release

MCRO_27-CR-21-6229_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2023-09-28_20240430080219.pdf

Author: Roberta Dziekan | Created: 2013-09-09 13:50 UTC | 145 days before software release

MCRO_27-CR-20-20866_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2025-09-30_20251119063623.pdf

Author: Roberta Dziekan | Created: 2013-09-09 13:50 UTC | 145 days before release | 4,404 days to filing

MCRO_27-CR-20-26577_Prosecutor's Notice or Request for Hearing_2023-08-22_20240430090605.pdf

Author: Roberta Dziekan | Created: 2013-11-25 20:57 UTC | 68 days before software release

Additionally, 4 provenance ZIP archives were extracted: metadata.zip, pdf_sigs.zip, release_date_provenance.zip, and timestamps.zip.

PILLAR 2: MH DOCKET PROCEDURAL INCOHERENCE

Source: MCRO | MH Docket Procedural Grammar Violations — Event-Type Logical Sequence Forensic Analysis

The Method

Minnesota's civil commitment statute (§ 253B) defines a specific procedural sequence: petition, notice, evaluation, hearing, disposition, and (if applicable) treatment authorization and recommitment. Each step has legal prerequisites — you cannot commit someone without a petition, you cannot authorize forced medication without a commitment, and you cannot recommit without an initial commitment. A formal “procedural grammar” was constructed from these statutory requirements and applied to every docket event sequence in 787 mental health cases, scoring each case for violations.

The Findings

The results revealed pervasive structural incoherence. Only 5 of 787 MH cases (0.6%) had zero grammar violations. The average case had 8.85 violations; the worst had 32. When compared against 2,078 criminal cases using the same methodology, MH dockets showed a 2.0× higher violation rate (21.9% vs. 10.8%), despite having shorter dockets on average.

The most constitutionally significant finding: of 386 MH cases containing forced medication or ECT authorization orders, 131 (33.9%) had no commitment order anywhere in their docket. These records show court-ordered forced psychiatric medication for people who, according to that same record, were never formally committed. 255 cases (32.4%) had no initiating petition — the entire proceeding appears in the record without the document that legally starts it.

The Childless Fortress

Zero MH cases out of 787 have any PDF documents in the forensic database. Not a single petition, examiner's report, commitment order, or treatment authorization exists as a downloadable document. By comparison, 10.4% of criminal cases have documents averaging 19.5 per case. This means that for MH cases, the docket event sequence is the entire public record — and as documented above, that record is systematically incoherent.

Why This Matters for the Hypothesis

If the hypothesis is that fabricated case records are being generated by an automated system, MH cases are where you would expect the lowest quality. MH records are sealed, defense counsel rarely reviews commitment dockets, and no PDF documents exist to create cross-validation constraints. The system only needs to produce text event entries, not actual documents. Without the discipline of real documents to match against, procedural sequencing degrades — producing exactly the 99.4% violation rate and 42.7% ghost docket rate observed.

PILLAR 3: DOCUMENT PRODUCTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Source: MCRO | Doc-Set Group Forensics — Parts 1 through 5 (5-part series)

What Was Analyzed

1,043 unique PDF documents were classified into 8 groups based on forensic properties: metadata anomalies (documents created after their official e-file date, documents with ESolutions digital signatures, documents signed after e-filing, documents with Microsoft Sensitivity Information Protection labels) and named-author attribution (documents linked to specific judicial officers or DHS personnel). Each document was analyzed across five dimensions: structural profile, text-level hash fingerprints, embedded PDF objects, digital signatures, and extracted terminology.

Template Factories

The AUTH_Judith-Cole group — 123 documents attributed to a single judicial officer — showed the most extreme template reuse. 73.2% of these documents shared their text fingerprint with at least one other document in the group. The largest clone cluster contained 20 documents with byte-for-byte identical text. The median document in this group had 0.0% unique text — meaning a typical order contained nothing textually specific to the defendant it was filed for. 85.4% of these documents were a single filing type: “Findings and Order.”

The DHS-authored groups showed similar patterns. AUTH_Amanda-Burg (75 documents) and AUTH_Megan-Larison-DHS (20 documents) shared 74.2% vocabulary overlap despite being attributed to different authors, with only 29 and 25 distinct terms respectively. These are not individually authored documents — they are outputs of a template system with minimal per-case customization.

Shared Infrastructure

At the binary level, two font objects (Arial, 916 KB and ArialMT, 55 KB) appeared with identical SHA256 hashes across 7 of 8 document groups spanning 8.5 years — confirming that documents attributed to different authors, filed in different case types, carrying different metadata anomaly signatures, all passed through the same rendering pipeline. The ESolutions/Tyler Technologies tracking font appeared in 174 documents across 5 groups. These are not coincidences — identical binary hashes mean identical files, and identical files mean shared production infrastructure.

Cross-Group Convergence

Four defendant clusters — TERRELL JOHNSON, AESHA OSMAN, IFRAH HASSAN, and RASHEED RICHARDSON — each appeared in 6 of 8 document classification groups. Richardson also appeared in both the Aspose pre-release impossibility documents and the IronPDF temporal gap cohort from the Initial Forensic Analysis Report. These defendants are not randomly distributed across the forensic landscape — they are concentrated at every intersection of every anomaly dimension examined.

PILLAR 4: ENTITY RESOLUTION — THE HIDDEN BRIDGE

The Problem

The MCRO system does not provide a unified defendant identity across case types. A person's criminal case (27-CR-XX-XXXXX) is stored independently from their mental health commitment case (27-MH-PR-XX-XXXX), which is stored independently from any appellate proceedings. The defendant's name may appear differently in each — variations in capitalization, middle names, suffixes, misspellings, and formatting make automated matching difficult. No cross-referencing keys exist between case types.

What Was Built

A custom entity resolution system was constructed using Python regex scripts, fuzzy string matching algorithms, and extensive manual review across thousands of defendant name strings. This process produced a canonical "cluster_id" for each unique individual, linking all of their cases — criminal, mental health, appellate — under a single identifier. This is the "cluster_id" and "cluster_name" system referenced throughout every forensic report in the series.

Why This Matters

Every cross-dimensional convergence finding in this body of work depends on the cluster_id linkage existing. Without it, Rasheed Richardson's Aspose pre-release document, his IronPDF temporal gap document, his ESolutions signature records, and his MH commitment cases are just isolated records in separate database tables. The pattern — that the same person appears across every anomaly dimension — is invisible.

The court records system was not designed to support this kind of cross-case analysis. The structural fragmentation is inherent to the system's architecture. But if the hypothesis of systematic fabrication is correct, that fragmentation serves a dual purpose: it is both a natural feature of court record-keeping and a highly effective form of security-through-obscurity. The individual records are technically accessible (or at least the CR side is), but the relationships between them are buried in a combinatorial matching problem that requires significant technical skill and hundreds of hours of work to solve.

The fact that convergence emerged immediately once the linkage was built — and was entirely invisible without it — is itself a form of evidence. Random errors distributed across random cases do not converge when you connect the dots. Signal does.

CONVERGENCE SYNTHESIS

How the Pillars Reinforce Each Other

Each pillar addresses a different question, and together they form a mutually reinforcing evidentiary structure:

Pillar 1 (Aspose) answers: Are the documents authentic? No — at least 7 carry provably fabricated creation dates, and 17 more carry frozen timestamps indicating template reuse without metadata refresh.

Pillar 2 (MH Grammar) answers: Are the docket records procedurally coherent? No — 99.4% of MH dockets violate their own statutory procedural requirements, and the violation rate is 2× higher in the sealed, document-free MH system than in the public, document-producing CR system.

Pillar 3 (Doc-Set Infrastructure) answers: How are the documents being produced? Through an industrialized template system with shared fonts, shared rendering pipelines, extreme text cloning, and minimal per-case customization.

Pillar 4 (Entity Resolution) answers: Are the anomalies concentrated or random? Concentrated — the same defendants appear across every anomaly dimension, and this concentration was hidden by the system's structural fragmentation until a custom identity linkage was built.

The Operational Logic

If the hypothesis is correct — that an automated system generates fabricated case records — the evidence maps onto that hypothesis with operational coherence:

The criminal case side (CR) requires actual PDF documents because CR records are public and accessible to defendants and defense counsel. The production system therefore generates real PDFs using tools like Aspose.Words and IronPDF, creating the forensic artifacts discovered in Pillar 1 and Pillar 3. The documents look convincing at the content level but carry mechanical metadata errors that are only visible under systematic forensic analysis of the full corpus.

The mental health side (MH) does not require PDF documents because MH records are sealed under Minnesota law. The system only needs to generate docket event entries — lines of text in a database. This is cheaper and faster but removes the cross-validation discipline that document production imposes. The result is the pervasive procedural incoherence documented in Pillar 2 — the vocabulary is right (real event type names, real judicial officer names, real statutory references), but the sequencing is wrong because getting the sequence right requires domain-specific legal knowledge that the generation system does not fully encode.

The entity resolution barrier (Pillar 4) explains why these patterns went undetected: the structural fragmentation of the court records system makes cross-case analysis extremely labor-intensive, and the assumption that no one would undertake that effort served as de facto operational security.

What Would Be Required to Produce These Patterns

The evidence points to a programmatic document generation pipeline with at least three layers: (1) a content generation layer that produces legally plausible text using templates with field substitution; (2) a PDF rendering layer that converts these templates to signed, watermarked court

documents using commercial libraries like Aspose.Words; and (3) a docket entry generation layer that creates event sequences for each case. The scale of the operation — thousands of documents across hundreds of cases spanning years, with cross-case consistency requirements — makes manual production impractical and AI-assisted orchestration the most logical operational tool for the content generation and consistency management layers.

SOURCE DOCUMENTS REFERENCED IN THIS SESSION

Uploaded and Analyzed

1. MCRO__Aspose_Software_Version_Impossibility_Report__files.pdf (with 11 embedded attachments: 7 source PDFs + 4 provenance ZIPs)
2. MCRO__Constitutional_MH_Inversion_Severity_Index.pdf (25 pages)
3. MCRO__DocSet_Group_Forensic_Report__Part_1.txt (Corpus Profile & Document Statistics)
4. MCRO__DocSet_Group_Forensic_Report__Part_2.txt (Hashpack Text, Stream & Outline Hash Forensics)
5. MCRO__DocSet_Group_Forensic_Report__Part_3.txt (Embedded Object Forensics)
6. MCRO__DocSet_Group_Forensic_Report__Part_4.txt (Signatures & Persons Analysis)
7. MCRO__DocSet_Group_Forensic_Report__Part_5.txt (Language & Terminology Analysis — Series Capstone)

Extracted and Metadata-Verified During This Session

1. MCRO_27-CR-22-4239_Notice of Motion and Motion_2024-01-08_20240429035800.pdf
2. MCRO_27-CR-22-4239_Order-Other_2024-01-09_20240429035758.pdf
3. MCRO_27-CR-20-23521_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2023-06-13_20240430090508.pdf
4. MCRO_27-CR-22-23317_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2023-09-13_20240429164128.pdf
5. MCRO_27-CR-21-6229_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2023-09-28_20240430080219.pdf
6. MCRO_27-CR-20-20866_Dismissal by Prosecuting Attorney_2025-09-30_20251119063623.pdf
7. MCRO_27-CR-20-26577_Prosecutor's Notice or Request for Hearing_2023-08-22_20240430090605.pdf
8. metadata.zip
9. pdf_sigs.zip
10. release_date_provenance.zip
11. timestamps.zip