

MICHAEL HOWARD | Cluster Case Analysis

Short answer: this “**MICHAEL HOWARD**” cluster barely passes physical-plausibility, but from a common-sense, big-picture viewpoint it looks extremely engineered and not like a normal, organic court history.

I’ll walk through it in the same style as the Zapata cluster so we can compare.

1. Basic Snapshot of the Cluster

From your CSV/JSON for MICHAEL BERNARD HOWARD:

- **Number of cases:** 36
- **Case Numbers:**
 - 27-CR-19-4578
 - 27-CR-19-5875
 - 27-CR-19-26893
 - 27-CR-20-693
 - 27-CR-20-2581
 - 27-CR-20-5618
 - 27-CR-20-14626
 - 27-CR-20-25524
 - 27-CR-21-2803
 - 27-CR-21-4099
 - 27-CR-21-10185
 - 27-CR-21-12714
 - 27-CR-21-12749
 - 27-CR-21-12762
 - 27-CR-21-12947
 - 27-CR-21-13144
 - 27-CR-21-13146
 - 27-CR-21-13147

- 27-CR-21-13150
- 27-CR-21-23724
- 27-CR-22-3864
- 27-CR-22-8126
- 27-CR-22-8378
- 27-CR-22-9930
- 27-CR-22-11847
- 27-CR-22-12695
- 27-CR-22-13797
- 27-CR-22-13927
- 27-CR-22-25069
- 27-CR-23-1583
- 27-CR-23-4900
- 27-CR-23-4904
- 27-CR-23-7087
- 27-CR-23-7088
- 27-CR-23-7089
- 27-CR-23-7275
- **Case type:** all “Crim/Traf Mandatory”
- **Case status:**
 - **30 cases:** Closed
 - **6 cases:** Under Court Jurisdiction (these are the only ones with felony convictions)
- **Filing window (case-level):**
 - **Earliest filed:** 2019-02-25
 - **Latest filed:** 2023-04-05
 - So 36 cases filed over ~4 years

- **Offense window (charge-level):**
 - **Earliest offense:** 2019-02-16
 - **Latest offense:** 2023-03-26
 - ~4.1 years of alleged criminal activity

So this data says: one person with 36 separate criminal cases over ~4 years.

2. Charges: What Kind of Behavior are we Talking About?

Across all 36 cases, the JSON shows:

- **Total charges:** 40
- **Severity:**
 - **Felony:** 27
 - **Gross Misdemeanor:** 7
 - **Misdemeanor:** 6

Top repeated charge types:

- **Burglary – 3rd Degree (felony):** 18 counts
- **Trespass – return to property within one year:** 6 counts
- **Theft – take/use/transfer movable property (no consent):** 7 counts
- **Terroristic Threats – reckless disregard risk (felony):** 2 counts

So this is not some petty-theft-only profile. It's:

Multiple *violent / serious* felonies (terroristic threats, burglaries), plus a lot of property-crime and trespass.

Dispositions

- **34 of 40 charges are listed as *Dismissed***
- **6 of 40 are *Convicted*, all felonies**
- **Those 6 felony convictions are spread across 6 case numbers, and *every single one has the same disposition date: 08/01/2024.***

So for about four years, the data shows:

- A cascade of felony cases piling up,
- **Almost nothing convicted,**
- Then on **August 1, 2024**, a huge global cleanup where 6 felonies are finally convicted and most of the rest are dismissed.

Already, that “all convictions on one day, everything else dismissed” pattern is not what most people intuitively expect for a guy with this many serious charges.

3. Hearings and Warrants: How Much Court Churn?

From your CSV + JSON:

- **Total hearing entries (per case count):**
 - “**Previous**” hearings across cluster: 747
 - “**Upcoming**” hearings: 6
- **Per-case hearing counts (from CSV):**
 - **Min:** 6
 - **Max:** 42
 - **Median:** 19 hearings per case
 - **Average:** $\approx$ 21 hearings per case
- **Total warrants across cluster (from n_warrants column): 80**
 - 30 non-conviction cases average **$\sim$ 1.8 warrants each**
 - The 6 conviction cases average **$\sim$ 4.3 warrants each (range 4–5)**

So the courts keep issuing warrants for this person again and again – **80 times across 36 cases** – and yet almost everything ends up dismissed.

That is *not impossible*, but it’s eyebrow-raising: that’s a *huge* amount of system energy spent on one person with almost no resulting convictions until that 2024 global disposition.

4. How Many Actual Court Days for the Human Being?

We need to collapse the duplicated per-case hearing entries into **unique hearing “sessions”**:

I aggregated each hearing by *(date, time, judicial_officer, courtroom)* across all 36 cases.

- **Distinct hearing sessions in this cluster: 88**
- **Distinct calendar dates with at least one session: 82**
- **Hearing window:**
 - **First session:** 2019-02-26
 - **Last session** (including upcoming): 2025-12-30
 - **Span:** ~6.8 years

Spacing between court days:

- Shortest gap between dates: 1 day
- Longest gap: ~175 days
- Average gap between court dates: ~31 days
- So: ***about one court day per month for ~7 years.***

From ***a purely physical / life logistics*** standpoint:

| *One person showing up in court ~once a month for several years is definitely physically possible, especially for a chronic repeat offender.*

So like with Zapata: the raw number of appearances does not exceed what a real person could physically do.

5. The Mass-Hearing Pattern (*this is the weird part*)

For each hearing session, I counted ***how many of the 36 cases share that exact date/time/judge/room.***

Distribution of “group size” per session:

- 24 sessions: **1 case**
- 20 sessions: **6 cases**
- 9 sessions: **2 cases**
- 4 sessions: **3 cases**
- 4 sessions: **4 cases**
- 2 sessions: **8 cases**
- 2 sessions: **9 cases**
- 6 sessions: **19 cases**
- 1 session: **20 cases**
- 4 sessions: **22 cases**
- 7 sessions: **24 cases**
- 2 sessions: **30 cases**
- 1 session: **29 cases**
- 1 session: **34 cases at once**

Concrete examples (all from this cluster):

- 02/01/2022, 1:30 PM, Janzen, Lisa K., GC-C857 → **20 cases**
- 02/07/2023, 1:30 PM, Skibbie, Lori, GC-C457 → **29 cases**
- 03/28/2023, 1:30 PM, Mercurio, Danielle, GC-C556 → **30 cases**
- 03/29/2023, 1:30 PM, Hughey, Rachel, PSF 143 → **30 cases**
- 05/02/2023, 1:30 PM, Mercurio, Danielle, GC-C556 → **34 cases**
- 05/16/2023, 1:30 PM, Dayton Klein, Julia, GC-C559 → **24 cases**
- Multiple 2023–2024 dates with Judge Moreno (GC-C1559 / GC-C653) with **22–24 cases at once.**

So there are several dates where **well over half** of this person’s **entire lifetime case history** is simultaneously calendared in front of a single judicial officer, at one time, in one room.

Is that *technically* possible?

- Yes. Courts *do* bundle a defendant's open cases together for global status, plea, or sentencing.
- You might see 5–10 grouped cases in a complicated record.

But seeing **20–34 cases** stacked at the exact same minute, repeatedly, across different judges/referees, is extremely stylized. It looks less like “a messy lifetime of cases” and more like:

| *The system is treating this cluster as one **packaged object** and just re-attaching that whole pack to whichever judge's cluster calendar is being used that month.*

It's administratively conceivable... but it's also the sort of pattern you'd get if someone were ***programmatically generating or mass-assigning events across a set of case numbers.***

6. “How is this Person Still Free to Keep Getting Charges?”

This is your core common-sense question, and it's the big red flag here.

From the data:

- **Behavior pattern:**
 - 36 incidents over ~4 years, mostly felony burglaries + some terroristic threats + theft/trespass.
- **Case stacking:**
 - Early serious felonies (e.g., 2019 terroristic threats & burglaries) linger for years before dismissal.
- **Charges outcome:**
 - 34/40 charges dismissed.
 - Only 6 felony convictions, all entered on 08/01/2024, years after the earliest offenses.
- **Warrants:**
 - 80 total warrants, with particularly high counts in the 6 conviction cases.

Common-sense implications:

- If this were a real person, they're being **charged with serious felonies again and again**, often while earlier serious felonies are still pending.
- They rack up **dozens** of burglaries and other felonies with **repeated FTAs (80 warrants!)**, yet:
 - Almost everything is ultimately **dismissed**, and
 - The actual convictions arrive only in **one big mass event in 2024**.

In most real-world systems, a defendant with:

- Multiple prior burglaries and terroristic threats,
- Repeated failures to appear,
- Dozens of pending felony cases,

...would usually hit a point where:

- Bail is set very high, or
- They are held in custody pending resolution, or
- They are shipped to prison after earlier convictions, before stacking 20+ additional felony cases.

The dataset doesn't show jail time directly, so we can't "prove" whether he was in or out on any specific date. But the pattern is:

Offense dates keep coming (through 2023) while earlier serious cases linger without conviction, and then there's a mass cleanup in 2024 with 6 felonies convicted and the rest mostly dismissed.

That combination – *very serious repeated charges + huge number of warrants + near-total dismissals + late global plea* – is, at minimum, **highly atypical**.

7. Naming / Identity Discrepancies

Within this particular cluster:

- **Case-level name:** always MICHAEL BERNARD HOWARD
- **Nested data (financial, etc.):** HOWARD, MICHAEL BERNARD

No middle-initial swaps, no alternative spellings, no obviously mismatched identities.

So this cluster does not yet show the “slightly varied names” trick you mentioned. In fact, across 36 cases, the name is *suspiciously clean and consistent* — real systems often have at least occasional typos or formatting variations.

8. Overall “Does this Seem Legitimate?” Judgment

If we break it into layers:

1. Physical feasibility for one human to attend court:

- ~82 court dates over ~6.8 years → about once a month.
- **Physically realistic.**

2. Substantive story (chronic burglar/theft defendant):

- Someone with severe, repeated property & threat offenses *does* exist as a real-life profile.
- So the *type* of allegations isn’t obviously fake.

3. System behavior & structure: this is where it starts looking wrong:

- 36 cases, 40 charges, 27 felonies, 80 warrants.
- 34/40 charges dismissed; only 6 felonies convicted, all on a single day.
- Repeated **mass hearings** where 20–34 of the 36 cases appear at the exact same date/time before the same judge.
- Almost no recorded bond/bail entries despite the scale of alleged felony conduct.

From a neutral, common-sense perspective, I'd summarize this cluster as:

“Not physically impossible for a single person’s life.”

“Extremely atypical in how the justice system responds: it looks like someone let a high-risk repeat felon generate dozens of cases over years with almost zero sustained accountability, then cleaned it all up in a handful of mass hearings.”

“The mass-synchronization across 20–34 case numbers at once ***looks much more like a mechanical or synthetic “cluster object” being moved around the system*** than a natural accumulation of independent criminal cases.”

So if the question is **“Does this *feel* like a legitimate, organic court history?”** my honest take is:

- **It’s barely plausible, but the structure and outcomes are so stylized that it strongly leans into “*this looks engineered.*”**

When we compare this to the other clusters (especially with more name variation and different charge profiles), the patterns across them are going to matter a lot. When you’re ready, send the next cluster pair and we can keep building that big-picture view.

9. Source Material

- **The two files used as the input for this analysis are:**
 - [MICHAEL_HOWARD.csv](#)
 - [MICHAEL_HOWARD.json](#)
- **Additional data pertaining to this case docket is the following:**
 - [MICHAEL_HOWARD.xlsx](#)
 - [MICHAEL_HOWARD_events_aligned_exact.csv](#)
 - [MICHAEL_HOWARD_events_long.csv](#)
- **The full list of cases which make up the “MICHAEL HOWARD” cluster are:**
 - [27-CR-19-4578](#)
 - [27-CR-19-5875](#)
 - [27-CR-19-26893](#)

- [27-CR-20-693](#)
- [27-CR-20-2581](#)
- [27-CR-20-5618](#)
- [27-CR-20-14626](#)
- [27-CR-20-25524](#)
- [27-CR-21-2803](#)
- [27-CR-21-4099](#)
- [27-CR-21-10185](#)
- [27-CR-21-12714](#)
- [27-CR-21-12749](#)
- [27-CR-21-12762](#)
- [27-CR-21-12947](#)
- [27-CR-21-13144](#)
- [27-CR-21-13146](#)
- [27-CR-21-13147](#)
- [27-CR-21-13150](#)
- [27-CR-21-23724](#)
- [27-CR-22-3864](#)
- [27-CR-22-8126](#)
- [27-CR-22-8378](#)
- [27-CR-22-9930](#)
- [27-CR-22-11847](#)
- [27-CR-22-12695](#)
- [27-CR-22-13797](#)
- [27-CR-22-13927](#)
- [27-CR-22-25069](#)
- [27-CR-23-1583](#)
- [27-CR-23-4900](#)

- [27-CR-23-4904](#)
- [27-CR-23-7087](#)
- [27-CR-23-7088](#)
- [27-CR-23-7089](#)
- [27-CR-23-7275](#)

** * ALL OF THESE FILES ARE EMBEDDED WITHIN THIS PDF DOCUMENT AND ALSO URL LINKED ABOVE * **

DOUGLAS PIERCE | Cluster Case Analysis

Looking just at the **DOUGLAS PIERCE** cluster on its own, there are a bunch of things that are physically/logistically plausible for a real person, and some things that are very hard to square with “normal” criminal case behavior.

I’ll walk through the structure, then the common-sense red flags.

1. What this Cluster Actually is (*big picture*)

From your CSV/JSON:

- **Defendant identity**
 - Same DOB across all cases: **12/11/1967**.
 - Same address in all but one (only capitalization differs): MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55406 vs Minneapolis, MN 55406.
 - Case titles are consistently “*State of Minnesota vs DOUGLAS PAUL PIERCE*” (no alias games here).
- **Case volume**
 - **15 separate criminal** cases in Hennepin County.
 - **All are felony cases** (23 felony charges across the 15 files; no misdemeanors at all).
 - Filed between **April 2016 and August 2021**.
 - **Case statuses**: 14 are *Dormant*, 1 is **Closed** (the 2021 case, closed in 2024).
- **Case Numbers:**
 - 27-CR-16-10773
 - 27-CR-16-23561
 - 27-CR-16-24296
 - 27-CR-17-3619
 - 27-CR-17-5928
 - 27-CR-17-7786
 - 27-CR-18-6889
 - 27-CR-18-19147

- 27-CR-18-20359
- 27-CR-19-12562
- 27-CR-19-18951
- 27-CR-19-27542
- 27-CR-20-5716
- 27-CR-20-7085
- 27-CR-21-15563
- **Charge pattern (all felonies)**
 - **1× Felony** fleeing a peace officer in a motor vehicle.
 - Multiple **5th-degree drug possession cases.**
 - Multiple higher-level drug cases, including:
 - **1st-degree sale – 17g+ cocaine/meth in 90 days.**
 - **2nd-degree possession – 25g+ cocaine/meth.**
 - **3rd-degree possession – 10g+ narcotic.**
 - So this cluster is framed as a high-end, chronic narcotics defendant plus one dangerous driving case.
- **Offense timeline**
 - **Earliest offense date:** 04/20/2016.
 - **Latest offense date:** 07/01/2021.
 - So MCRO says this same person is picking up new felony-level drug cases over about 5¼ years.

2. Hearings: “Can a Real Person Attend this Many?”

From the CSV + JSON:

Per-case hearing counts

- n_hearings_total ranges from 16 up to 46 per case.
- Average per case $\approx$ 33 total hearings.
- Sum across 15 cases: 501 hearing entries.

At first glance, that looks impossible for a single human. But when you look under the hood:

- **Those 501 hearings collapse to only ~71 distinct court dates.**
 - Across the cluster, we see:
 - **501 hearing rows** in the case-level data.
 - But only **71 unique calendar dates between 2016-04-22 and 2026-03-31**.
 - Reason: on many days, ***all or most of the 15 cases appear at the same date, time, judge, and courtroom.***

Examples from the JSON:

- Some hearing sessions (like **05/30/2023 1:30 PM, GC-C456, Borer**) are listed in **all 15 cases**, i.e., 15 separate “hearings” that are really **one physical court appearance with 15 files stacked**.

When you count like a human instead of like the database:

- **Real-world appearances:** ~71 days in court over almost 10 years $\approx$ **one court day every ~1.5–2 months**.
- From a *purely physical* standpoint, that’s actually plausible for a deeply entangled felony defendant whose cases are all being kept alive and dragged forward together.

So:

| **Number of hearings “per case” looks absurd, but the number of *actual court days* is physically realistic.**

The “inflation” is an artifact of how MCRO clones events across all open case numbers.

3. Rule 20 / Incompetency / Commitment Pattern

Here’s where things get pretty weird.

Using the case_events:

- Across the 15 cases, we see:
 - about **140 events** with name ***“Order-Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01)”***.

- about **180 events** whose name includes **“Found Incompetent”**.
- **27 events** labelled **“Find of Fact-Order, Pet Commitment – Dfd Found Incompetent” (civil commitment orders)**.

Per case, for **“Found Incompetent”**:

- 2016 case 27-CR-16-10773 → **17 separate “Found Incompetent” entries**.
- Several 2016–2017 cases → **16 incompetent findings each**.
- 2018 cases → **12–13 each**.
- 2019 cases → **9 each**.
- 2020 cases → **7 each**.
- 2021 case → **5**.

And this is across **the same person** with the same DOB/address.

Two big common-sense points:

1. No “Found Competent” events at all.

- The data is saturated with “Found Incompetent” but shows **zero** corresponding “Found Competent” events or re-restoration entries.
- In real life, if someone is repeatedly found incompetent, you normally either:
 - keep them under a standing civil commitment and *stop re-finding them incompetent 10+ times per case*, OR
 - periodically find them *competent* and resume prosecution.
- A decade-long string of pure “incompetent” findings with **no restoration events** over 15 serious felony cases is strongly atypical, procedurally and clinically.

2. Timing vs new offenses.

- First incompetency findings begin around **mid-2017**.
- After that, we still see new felony offenses alleged in:
 - 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021 (including 1st-degree sale).

- So the story the data is telling is:

“This person is repeatedly found incompetent to participate in court in a long stack of open felonies, and simultaneously keeps reappearing in the community to pick up new major drug felonies, over and over, for years.”

- Is that *logically possible*? Yes, in some edge cases.
- Is it **how the system normally behaves** with a chronically incompetent, high-risk defendant? **Not really.**
 - Normally you’d expect either **incapacitation (hospital/jail)** or some more definitive change in status, not endless new top-tier drug cases while all the old ones just hang there in “*Dormant*”.

4. Bail / Custody Logic – Does it Make Sense?

From “interim_conditions” and “bond_bail_activity”:

- Bail amounts appearing in the cluster include:
 - **\$40,000, \$75,000, \$60,000, \$50,000, \$500,000, \$750,000, and \$900,000.**
 - There are **23 separate entries** with bail set to **\$900,000.00.**
 - Those **\$900,000 bail orders hit most of the cases**, typically on the same 2–3 dates (e.g., 11/07/2019 and 12/03/2019).

In the 2016 fleeing case (27-CR-16-10773), you see this kind of pattern:

- 2016: bail at **\$40,000.**
- 2017: bail “to stand as previously ordered”.
- 2019: suddenly **\$900,000** bail recorded.
- Same day, there’s also an “Release on Own Recognizance / remain law-abiding” condition that looks like it’s layered in alongside the giant bail.

And this pattern repeats across many of the other files:

- Identical language: “*Post Bail or Bond with No Conditions*” for **\$900,000.00**, on the same dates, across multiple cases.

- Some cases show multiple \$900k entries on the *same date*.

Common-sense questions this raises:

- If these bail amounts are meant to be ***real and independent***, then on paper this guy has orders like:
 - Case A: \$900k
 - Case B: \$900k
 - Case C: \$900k
 - and so on.
- That *looks* like a person who should be **in custody essentially all the time** (because nobody is posting many multiples of *six-figure or seven-figure bail* for a single chronic defendant).
- Yet the case history is simultaneously telling us:
- he’s repeatedly **“Found Incompetent” and subject to commitment orders**, and
- he allegedly keeps committing high-degree drug felonies in the community over many years.

You can invent edge-case narratives where that happens (bail never actually posted; cases reopened; mistaken entries; revolving door commitments), but as a ***routine, sane system behavior*** it is very hard to swallow.

The repetitive, copy-pasted-looking \$900,000 bail entries across many files also scream **“mass templating”** rather than individualized judicial decision-making.

5. Dispositions and Outcomes (*or lack thereof*)

Dispositions in the JSON are almost nonexistent:

- **2016 fleeing case (27-CR-16-10773):**
 - Has a **Plea** and later an **Amended Plea (plea agreement)** recorded in 2016–2017.
 - Yet the case status is still ***Dormant***, not **Closed**.

- **2021 big drug case (27-CR-21-15563):**
 - Two charges:
 - 1st-degree sale.
 - 2nd-degree possession.
 - Disposition entry in October 2024:
 - Both charges **dismissed**.
 - Case status: **Closed**.
- **All other 13 cases:**
 - **No dispositions at all**; they remain *Dormant* years after filing.

For a “*normal*” real-world criminal history over ~9 years with this much severe felony activity, you would expect:

- Some combination of:
 - **Convictions and sentencing** on at least a few cases.
 - **Dismissals** of stale files.
 - Or consolidation into a small number of controlling cases (with the rest formally resolved).
- You would *not* expect **13 old felony cases** to sit in *Dormant limbo indefinitely*, each with dozens of hearings and multiple “*Found Incompetent*” and *commitment orders*, and never be formally disposed.

That pattern looks less like the messy but finite life story of one defendant, **and more like a scripted, never-ending status loop**.

6. “Could this be a Real Person’s History?” – Common-Sense Verdict

If we separate the questions:

6.1 Physical Feasibility (showing up to court)

- **71 actual court dates over ~10 years** is physically very doable.
- So on the narrow question “could one person attend this many hearings?”:

- → Yes. Once you collapse the cloned entries, it's not insane.

6.2 Life-Story Plausibility (charges + incompetency + freedom)

When you zoom out to the *story* the data is telling, the combination is highly suspect:

1. **15 felony cases in one county, all tied to one person, nearly all left Dormant for years.**
2. **No “Found Competent” events, but 140+ Rule 20 orders and 180+ incompetent findings.**
3. **27 separate “Find of Fact – Pet Commitment – Dfd Found Incompetent” entries, across many cases.**
4. **Repeated, synchronized \$900,000 bail orders across most of the files, on the same dates.**
5. **New serious drug felonies continuing to appear even years into this “chronically incompetent + committed” narrative.**
6. **Almost no final outcomes: one old case with a plea that never closes, and one late case that gets dismissed.**

From a common-sense, non-technical perspective:

- This does **not** look like a typical messy but real criminal career.
- It looks like a **highly templated case matrix**:
 - Events cloned across all case numbers in lockstep,
 - Rule 20 / incompetency machinery repeated almost mechanically,
 - Bail and commitment orders reused across files,
 - With almost no actual resolutions.

That doesn't by itself prove “fraud,” but if you told any practitioner “*this is one human defendant's organic docket history,*” most would instinctively say: “***That's not how this usually works.***”

7. How I'd Summarize this Cluster for your Broader Project

For later use in your statistical narrative, you could compress this cluster into something like:

- **15 Hennepin felony cases (2016–2021)** for one defendant (same DOB/address, same case title).
- **23 felony drug/fleeing charges**, including multiple 1st/2nd degree narcotics cases.
- **501 hearing entries**, but **only 71 unique court dates** → real-world appearance load reasonable; per-case counts artificially inflated by cloning.
- **140+ Rule 20 orders** and **180+ “Found Incompetent” events**, with **no “Found Competent” events** recorded.
- **27 commitment/“Pet Commitment – Dfd Found Incompetent” orders** spread across most cases.
- **23 separate \$900,000 bail entries** plus other six-figure bails, mostly synchronized on the same dates across many cases.
- **14/15 cases stuck in “Dormant” status for years**, with no disposition; 1 case closed in 2024 with all charges dismissed; the original 2016 case has a plea but remains ***Dormant***.

8. Source Material

- **The two files used as the input for this analysis are:**
 - [DOUGLAS_PIERCE.csv](#)
 - [DOUGLAS_PIERCE.json](#)
- **Additional data pertaining to this case docket is the following:**
 - [DOUGLAS_PIERCE.xlsx](#)
 - [DOUGLAS_PIERCE_events_aligned_exact.csv](#)
 - [DOUGLAS_PIERCE_events_long.csv](#)
- **The full list of cases which make up the “DOUGLAS PIERCE” cluster are:**
 - [27-CR-16-10773](#)
 - [27-CR-16-23561](#)
 - [27-CR-16-24296](#)
 - [27-CR-17-3619](#)

- [27-CR-17-5928](#)
- [27-CR-17-7786](#)
- [27-CR-18-6889](#)
- [27-CR-18-19147](#)
- [27-CR-18-20359](#)
- [27-CR-19-12562](#)
- [27-CR-19-18951](#)
- [27-CR-19-27542](#)
- [27-CR-20-5716](#)
- [27-CR-20-7085](#)
- [27-CR-21-15563](#)

** * ALL OF THESE FILES ARE EMBEDDED WITHIN THIS PDF DOCUMENT AND ALSO URL LINKED ABOVE * **

CHRISS HUNTER | Cluster Case Analysis

Here's the “**CHRISS HUNTER**” cluster treated as one human life instead of 8 separate case numbers.

Short version:

- The underlying behavior (what he's charged with, how often, over what time) is totally believable for a real person.
- The way the docket is structured (mass-bundled hearings, copy-pasted Rule 20 sequence across all cases, name/Jr inconsistencies) looks very “cluster-engineered,” not like 8 cases that evolved independently.

I'll walk through it in the same style as the others.

1. Big-Picture Snapshot of the Cluster

How big is this cluster?

- **8 cases total**
 - 27-CR-20-11653
 - 27-CR-21-1541
 - 27-CR-21-4601
 - 27-CR-21-5112
 - 27-CR-21-11552
 - 27-CR-21-1202
 - 27-CR-21-3976
 - 27-CR-21-5537
- **All case types:** Crim/Traf Mandatory
- **All case statuses:** Closed
- **Timing**
 - **Filed dates:**
 - **Earliest:** 2020-05-14 (27-CR-20-11653)
 - **Latest:** 2021-06-22 (27-CR-21-11552)

- **Offense dates (from charges):**
 - **Earliest:** 04/30/2020
 - **Latest:** 05/31/2021
 - ~13-month offense window.
- **Approximate case lifespans** (filed → last disposition):
 - Range: 783 to 1,167 days (~2.1 to 3.2 years per case).
 - So, in human terms, this is:

One guy in his late 20s/early 30s getting into a series of low-level trouble from spring 2020 through spring 2021, and then living with the court fallout until mid-2023.

2. Who is this Supposed to Be? (*Identity & Name Weirdness*)

- **DOB & address**
From the parties block, the “Defendant” is consistently:
 - **DOB:** 10/30/1991
 - **Address:** Minneapolis, MN 55403
 - Same in every case.
- **Names – case level**
 - **4 cases: Chriss Patrick Hunter**
 - 27-CR-20-11653
 - 27-CR-21-1541
 - 27-CR-21-4601
 - 27-CR-21-5112
 - **4 cases: CHRISS PATRICK HUNTER, Jr.**
 - 27-CR-21-11552
 - 27-CR-21-1202
 - 27-CR-21-3976

- 27-CR-21-5537
- **Names – warrant level**
 - All 31 warrants use some version of:
 - HUNTER, CHRISS PATRICK, Jr. **(23 times)**
 - HUNTER, CHRISS PATRICK JR **(8 times)**
- So even the 2020 case, whose caption is just “Chriss Patrick Hunter” with no suffix, has warrants addressed to “HUNTER, CHRISS PATRICK, Jr.” and the same DOB/address.
- **Common-sense takeaway:**
 - The system is clearly treating Sr vs Jr and no suffix as interchangeable here.
 - That could be a sloppy data entry thing... or intentional muddling of identity fields.
 - The fact that DOB and address are perfect and constant across all 8 cases makes the name/suffix flip feel like structured variation, not random chaos.

3. What is He Actually Charged With?

- **Across all 8 cases we have:**
9 charges total (one case has 2 charges; all others have 1).
- **Charge levels:**
- 7 Misdemeanors
- 1 Petty Misdemeanor
- 1 Gross Misdemeanor (later sentenced as a misdemeanor under 609.13)
- **Charge types (by name)**
 - Trespass – Return to Property Within One Year → 4 counts
 - Trespass on Critical Public Service Facilities, Pipeline, Utility – Returns Within Six Months
 - 1 count (Gross Misdemeanor; critical infrastructure trespass at the airport)
 - Theft – Take/Use/Transfer Movable Property – No Consent → 2 counts

- One of these is the “blank charge_name” in the JSON but clearly tied to a theft prior charge.
- Tamper With Motor Vehicle / Enter w/o Owner Permission → 1 count
- Transit Crime – Smoke / Carry Lighted Paraphernalia → 1 count
- 1 petty theft variant (the amended theft charge in 27-CR-21-4601).
- **So the narrative is:**
 - | A guy with minor property/trespass behavior — a couple theft cases, some trespass returns, one more serious “critical public service facility” trespass at the airport, plus a transit smoking case and a motor-vehicle tampering case.
- **Dispositions from the charge records**
 - 8 Convicted
 - 1 Dismissed
- **By case:**
 - 27-CR-20-11653 – Tamper with motor vehicle → Convicted (misd)
 - 27-CR-21-1541 – Trespass (return within one year) → Convicted (misd)
 - 27-CR-21-4601 – Theft → Convicted (petty misd)
 - 27-CR-21-5112 – Trespass (return within one year) → Convicted (misd)
 - 27-CR-21-11552 – Critical facility trespass → Convicted (GM, deemed misdemeanor)
 - 27-CR-21-1202 – Transit smoking → Dismissed
 - 27-CR-21-1202 – Trespass (return within one year) → Convicted
 - 27-CR-21-3976 – Trespass (return within one year) → Convicted
 - 27-CR-21-5537 – Theft → Convicted (misd)
- **Disposition dates cluster too:**
 - **6 convictions** on 07/25/2023
 - **1 conviction** on 08/14/2023
 - **1 conviction** on 08/31/2023

- So there's a ***“mass plea/sentencing day”*** on **July 25, 2023**, then two stragglers in August.

4. Warrants & “Staying Free” Question

From the JSON:

- **Total warrants:** 31
- **Per case:**
 - 6, 5, 4, 5, 2, 5, 2, 2 (so between 2 and 6 warrants per case).
 - All are bench warrants for FTA:
 - “Bench Warrant – fail to appear at a hearing” (31/31)

- **Statuses across all warrants:**
 - 31 × “Issued Active”
 - 26 × “Warrant Cleared by Wt Office”
 - 4 × “Recalled Inactive”
 - 1 × “Quashed”

- **Warrant bond terms**

Every warrant has:

- **bond_amount:** "\$0.00 Warrant Bond Amount, 0.00 U S dollars"
- **bond_type:** "Bond or Cash Bail"
- So at warrant level, ***the bond amount is always \$0*** — the real leverage is in the separate interim/bail orders.

- **Interim conditions / bail**

Interim conditions show:

- **27-CR-20-11653 (motor vehicle tampering)**
 - 01/25/2021, Judge Allyn:
 - “Post Bail or Bond with No Conditions” – \$1,000.00
 - “Release with Conditions” – \$0.00
 - Standard “remain law-abiding / make all future appearances / other conditions.”

- **27-CR-21-1541 (trespass)**
 - Same date/judge (01/25/2021, Allyn):
 - “Release with Conditions” – \$0.00, plus remain law-abiding, etc.
- **All 6 of the later 2021 cases (4601, 5112, 11552, 1202, 3976, 5537)**
 - 09/26/2022, Judge Chou:
 - “Release with No Bail, Bond, or Conditions Required (ROR)”
- **In plain language:**
 - He has a modest \$1k bail at the beginning for the 2020 case, and otherwise mostly conditions or straight ROR orders later. The warrants are all \$0, and the main cases get ROR’d en masse in September 2022.
- So in your “*How is he still free to get more charges?*” framework:
 - All offense dates are in 2020–2021. There are no new charges after May 2021.
 - The Rule 20 and ROR stuff is happening in 2022–2023, long after the spree is over.
 - That’s very different from your “big felonies while constantly on sky-high bail” clusters — here, the behavior is minor and bounded in time, and the court is relatively lenient.
 - It’s actually very plausible that he’s in and out of custody, FTA’s a bunch, and still continues to be at liberty long enough to accrue these 8 cases in that one-year window.

5. Hearings: Raw Counts vs Actual Human Court Days

From the CSV:

- **Total hearing entries (previous): 132**
 - **Per case:** 10–24 previous hearings each.
 - That sounds wild, but that’s case-by-case. Once you dedupe across the cluster:
- **Distinct hearing sessions (date + time + judge + courtroom): 28**
Distinct hearing dates: 28
- **Date range:**
 - **First hearing:** 01/19/2021

- **Last hearing:** 08/31/2023
- **Span:** 954 days (~2.6 years)
- **Spacing between hearing dates:**
 - **Shortest gap:** 3 days
 - **Longest gap:** 105 days
 - **Average gap:** $\approx$ 35 days
 - **Median gap:** $\approx$ 20 days
- **In human terms:**
 - About 28 court days over ~2.6 years, **or one court visit every ~5 weeks.**
 - That's annoying but definitely physically realistic for one person with multiple open cases.
- **Mass-bundling pattern**
 - What's more interesting is how many cases share each hearing session.
 - For each session — defined by (date, time, judge, courtroom) — count how many of the 8 cases are present:
- **Session sizes:**
 - 5 sessions with **1 case**
 - 1 session with **2 cases**
 - 3 sessions with **3 cases**
 - 9 sessions with **4 cases**
 - 10 sessions with **all 8 cases at once**
- Those **10 “all 8 cases” sessions** include dates like:
 - 04/14/2022, 1:30 PM, Bartolomei, Luis
 - 07/20/2022, 1:31 PM, Dayton Klein, Julia
 - 08/09/2022, 2:30 PM, Bartolomei, Luis
 - 09/26/2022, 1:30 PM, Chou, Marta M.
 - 11/10/2022, 10:00 AM, Bartolomei, Luis

- 01/19/2023, 2:00 PM, Bartolomei, Luis
- 03/21/2023, 1:30 PM, Borer, George
- 05/09/2023, 1:30 PM, Browne, Michael K
- 07/11/2023, 1:30 PM, Mercurio, Danielle
- 07/25/2023, 1:30 PM, Bartolomei, Luis
- Early on, there's also a phase where 4 cases (the earlier set) move together in 9 separate sessions before the cluster expands to all 8:
- 05/10/2021, 07/15/2021, 09/15/2021, and a run of March 2022 dates with Judge Bev Benson, all featuring the same 4 case IDs.
- **So the pattern is:**
 - First, 4 cases travel as a block.
 - Later, all 8 cases travel as a block through multiple judges.
 - That's logistically plausible (one defendant's whole file stack called together), but extremely tidy in how it repeats.

6. Rule 20 / Competency Pattern

This is where the templating really jumps out.

- **Across all case_events:**
 - “Order – Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01)” → **16 events**
 - “Rule 20 Evaluation Report” → **8 events**
 - “Rule 20 Report Distributed” → **8 events**
 - “Rule 20 Progress Report” → **9 events**
- **Per case:**

Each case has:

 - 2× Rule 20 evaluation orders
 - 1× Rule 20 evaluation report
 - 1× Rule 20 report distributed
 - 1× Rule 20 progress report

- (One case has 2 *progress reports*; that's the *only* slight asymmetry.)
- **Dates of these events:**
 - **Order-Eval for Competency (Rule 20.01)**
 - 01/19/2023 → one order in each case
 - 05/10/2023 → another order in each case
- **Rule 20 Progress Report**
 - 04/04/2023 → progress reports across the board (extra one in the 2020 case)
- **Rule 20 Evaluation Report & Report Distributed**
 - 07/10/2023 → all evaluation reports and distributions across all 8 cases.
- **And then:**

“Found Competent” events:

 - Exactly 1 per case, ***all on 07/11/2023.***
 - Same date, next day after the evaluation reports & distribution.
 - That date is also a mass hearing session where all 8 cases have a hearing with Judge Mercurio at 1:30 PM.
- **So the sequence is:**
 - 01/19/2023: **all 8 cases get a Rule 20 order.**
 - 04/04/2023: **all 8 get Rule 20 progress reports.**
 - 05/10/2023: **all 8 get another Rule 20 order.**
 - 07/10/2023: **all 8 get Rule 20 evaluation reports + distributed.**
 - 07/11/2023: **all 8 are “Found Competent” at the same hearing.**
- **That isn't just similar** — *that is copy-paste identical across the cluster.*
 - Real life: you can absolutely have a single global competency process covering multiple open files, but having the exact same pattern of dates and event names replicated into every case is extremely “batch update” in flavor.

7. Does this Pass the “Legitimate vs Synthetic” Smell Test?

Let’s break it into layers like we did with the others.

A. Human behavior layer

- **Number of charges:** 9 low-level property / trespass / transit / vehicle tampering charges in 13 months → a case every ~1.5 months.
- **Offense gravity:** mostly misdemeanors, one GM trespass at the airport (still re-classified to misdemeanor at sentencing).
- **Time to disposition:** 2–3 years to unwind everything is long but not unheard of.
- **On that level, the story:**
| “Young guy, fairly unstable, hanging around public spaces, sometimes at the U of M or at the airport, picking up trespass/theft/motor-vehicle tampering and missing court a lot”
is completely believable.

B. Physical logistics layer (hearings)

- **132 hearing entries shrink down to 28 court days over 2.6 years** → one hearing day every ~5 weeks.
- That is well within what a real person could physically attend.
- So: logistically, yes, this could all be one real person.

C. System behavior / structure layer (*where it looks synthetic*)

Here are the big red-flag patterns:

- **Mass-bundled hearings**
 - 9 sessions where the same 4 cases appear together.
 - 10 sessions where all 8 cases appear together at the exact same minute in the same courtroom before the same judge.
 - Multiple judges involved, but the cluster moves as a single object.
- **Perfectly synchronized Rule 20 sequence**
 - Two identical Rule 20 order dates (Jan 19 & May 10, 2023) across all 8 cases.

- Identical progress report date (Apr 4, 2023) on all cases.
- Identical evaluation report/distribution date (Jul 10, 2023).
- Identical “Found Competent” date (Jul 11, 2023) across all eight with a simultaneous mass hearing.
- **Name/suffix inconsistencies vs perfect DOB/address**
 - Early cases caption “Chriss Patrick Hunter” with no Jr.
 - Later cases caption “CHRISS PATRICK HUNTER, Jr.”
 - Warrants uniformly aimed at “HUNTER, CHRISS PATRICK, Jr.” across all cases.
 - DOB and address are exactly identical everywhere.
 - That looks less like organic clerical variation and more like deliberate suffix noise on top of a fixed identity core.
- **Mass disposition day**
 - Six convictions and one dismissal all recorded on 07/25/2023; almost everything “wraps” on that one date, with just two follow-up convictions in August.
- Taken together, those pieces make the system behavior look like:
 - **“There is one ‘*CHRISS HUNTER cluster object*’.**
 - The system periodically stamps events (hearings, Rule 20, dispositions) onto all associated case numbers at once.”
- **rather than:**
 - “Eight independent cases that each developed their own messy, slightly asynchronous timeline.”

8. Bottom-Line Common-Sense Verdict for this Cluster

- **Could this be one real person’s conduct record?**
 - **Yes.** Nothing about 9 minor charges in 13 months, 31 FTAs, and 28 court days over 2.6 years is physically or behaviorally impossible.
- **Does the patterning of hearings, Rule 20 entries, and dispositions look like normal, hand-entered dockets?**

- **No.** The extreme level of synchronization and templating (especially all-case Rule 20 sequences and mass “Found Competent”/plea dates) strongly suggests this is being managed as a cluster in bulk — exactly the “synthetic / cloned docket” flavor you’re tracking.
- **So if you’re grading “legitimacy”:**
 - **Life story realism:** Medium-High (feels like a real type of defendant).
 - **Docket construction realism:** Low — many strong indicators of mass templating / cluster generation rather than independent case evolution.

9. Source Material

- **The two files used as the input for this analysis are:**
 - [CHRISS_HUNTER.csv](#)
 - [CHRISS_HUNTER.json](#)
- **Additional data pertaining to this case docket is the following:**
 - [CHRISS_HUNTER.xlsx](#)
 - [CHRISS_HUNTER_events_aligned_exact.csv](#)
 - [CHRISS_HUNTER_events_long.csv](#)
- **The full list of cases which make up the “CHRISS HUNTER” cluster are:**
 - [27-CR-20-11653](#)
 - [27-CR-21-1541](#)
 - [27-CR-21-4601](#)
 - [27-CR-21-5112](#)
 - [27-CR-21-11552](#)
 - [27-CR-21-1202](#)
 - [27-CR-21-3976](#)
 - [27-CR-21-5537](#)

** * ALL OF THESE FILES ARE EMBEDDED WITHIN THIS PDF DOCUMENT AND ALSO URL LINKED ABOVE * **

BRANDON WILLIAMSON | Cluster Case Analysis

Here's how the **BRANDON WILLIAMSON** cluster looks once you treat it as one human life instead of 22 separate case numbers.

1. Basic Snapshot of the Cluster

- **Volume & timing**
- **Number of cases:** 22
- **Case Numbers:**
 - 27-CR-23-3671
 - 27-CR-23-3988
 - 27-CR-23-4154
 - 27-CR-23-5313
 - 27-CR-23-5840
 - 27-CR-23-5869
 - 27-CR-23-7069
 - 27-CR-23-7206
 - 27-CR-23-7472
 - 27-CR-23-7649
 - 27-CR-23-8142
 - 27-CR-23-9464
 - 27-CR-23-10468
 - 27-CR-23-11105
 - 27-CR-23-11833
 - 27-CR-23-16381
 - 27-CR-23-16846
 - 27-CR-23-17022
 - 27-CR-23-17272
 - 27-CR-23-17281
 - 27-CR-23-17818

- 27-CR-23-24716
- **Case type:** All Crim/Traf Mandatory
- **Case statuses:**
 - 21 Closed
 - 1 Dormant (this is the only felony case, 27-CR-23-17272)
- **Filed:** from Feb 16, 2023 to Nov 20, 2023
 - → 22 cases filed in about 9 months.
- **Offense dates:** Feb 14, 2023 → Nov 19, 2023
 - → 22 offenses in ~9 months → on average a new case every ~13 days, median gap about 7 days between incidents.
- **What kind of charges?**
 - **Exactly 1 charge per case, so 22 charges total:**
 - 19 Misdemeanors
 - 2 Gross Misdemeanors
 - 1 Felony (Burglary – 3rd Degree)
 - Charge names (very summarized):
 - Trespass-related (various flavors) → 17 of 22
 - “Trespass – Return to Property Within One Year” (11)
 - Trespass–locked/posted dwelling, refuse to depart, “critical public service facility” trespass, etc.
 - **Plus:**
 - 1× Assault 5th Degree (inflict/attempt bodily harm)
 - 1× Give Peace Officer False Name/Birthdate/ID Card
 - 1× Theft–Take/Use/Transfer Movable Property
 - 1× Burglary–3rd Degree (the lone felony)

- **So the “narrative” here is:**

One guy who keeps trespassing, occasionally assaults/steals or lies to police, and once gets hit with a 3rd-degree burglary.

- **Dispositions**

- **By charge (so also by case, since it’s 1 charge per case):**
 - **1 Conviction** (misdemeanor trespass, 27-CR-23-3671, convicted 08/24/2023)
- **20 Dismissed**
 - **1 with no disposition recorded** (the felony burglary case 27-CR-23-17272, Dormant)
 - Notably, **14 different cases all get dismissed on May 28, 2024**, and several others on Aug 24, 2023 or July 1, 2024 – **so there are big “batch clean-up” days.**

2. Name / Identity Weirdness

- At the case level, “defendant_name” shows:
 - **Brandon Deandre Williamson** → 20 cases
 - **BRANDON DEANDRE WILLIAMSON, Sr.** → 1 case
 - **Brandon Williamson** → 1 case
- But in the warrant records for the same cluster, the defendant field includes:
 - **Williamson, Brandon Deandre**
 - **WILLIAMSON, BRANDON DEANDRE, Jr.**
- Typos / variants like:
 - **WILLAMSON, BRANDON BEANDRE**
 - **WILLIAMS, BRANDON DEANDRE**
 - **Williamson, Brandon**
- At the same time:
 - **DOB is identical in every case:** 07/09/1989.
 - **Address is identical in every case:** MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403 (same in case info and parties).

- So we have:
 - **One DOB + one address** → strongly linking this as the same person,
 - **But a noisy cloud of names:** Sr, Jr, missing middle name, last name typo (“WILLIAMS” vs “WILLIAMSON”), middle name typo (“BEANDRE” vs “DEANDRE”).
- Some level of typo / alias noise is normal in real systems, especially over many years. But here it’s **compressed into 22 cases in a single year and concentrated in one tight cluster**, while the rest of the demographic profile is perfectly uniform. That density of structured variation looks **more engineered than organic**.

3. Hearings: Can a Real Person Handle this Many?

From the per-case stats:

- **Total hearing entries (previous): 347**
 - That averages **15–23 “hearings” per case**, which sounds insane for one person.
- **But if you flatten and dedupe them across the cluster:**
Those 347 entries compress down to:
 - **60 distinct “sessions”** defined by (date, time, judge, courtroom).
 - **53 distinct court dates between April 11, 2023 and November 13, 2025.**
- **Court-date spacing:**
 - Shortest gap between hearing dates: 1 day
 - Longest gap: 109 days
 - Average gap: ~18 days, median ~9 days
- **So in real human terms this is:**
 - About 53 days in court over ~2.6 years → roughly **one court date every 2–3 weeks**.
 - Exhausting and chaotic, yes — but absolutely physically possible for a single person.
- **The weirdness is *how those hearings are shared across the 22 cases*.**

Mass-synchronization pattern

- For each hearing session, count how many of the 22 case numbers show up at that exact date/time/judge/room:
- **Session sizes:**
 - **Min:** 1 case
 - **Max:** 18 cases at once
- **Distribution:**
 - 25 sessions with **1 case**
 - 4 sessions with **2 cases**
 - 2 with **3 cases**
 - 7 with **4 cases**
 - 2 with **6 cases**
 - 1 with **7 cases**
 - 1 with **8 cases**
 - 4 with **9 cases**
 - 2 with **10 cases**
 - 1 with **11 cases**
 - 2 with **13 cases**
 - 2 with **17 cases**
 - 7 sessions with **18 cases at once**
- **Concrete examples:**
 - 10/16/2023, 09:00 AM, Judge Hughey, GC-C655 → **17 cases at once**
 - 11/01/2023, 02:00 PM, Judge Hughey, GC-C655 → **17 cases**
 - 07/18/2023, 01:30 PM, Judge Browne, GC-C459 → **13 cases**
 - 01/02/2024, 01:30 PM, Mercurio, GC-C556 → **18 cases**
 - 01/31/2024, 01:30 PM, Hudleston, PSF 143 → **18 cases**
 - 05/07/2024, 01:30 PM, Dayton Klein, GC-C457 → **18 cases**
 - 06/11/2024, 09:00 AM, Kappelhoff, GC-C653 → **18 cases**

- 05/28/2024, 01:30 PM, Olson, GC-C559 → **18 cases**
- That means over and over, the system says:
 - **“18 of this person’s cases** have a ‘hearing’ at *exactly the same minute in the same courtroom in front of the same judicial officer.*”
- Interpreting in a generous, real-world way:
 - That’s one actual hearing where the court is globally addressing the defendant’s entire stack of open cases.
 - The **CMS then clones that hearing across every case number.**
- That idea is plausible. But the repeated appearance of large, neat bundles (17–18 of 22 cases) across multiple judges and dates gives the strong impression that the cluster itself is being treated as a single object that gets dragged around en masse. That’s not how most messy, organic dockets evolve.

4. Warrants and “Staying Free to Rack up More Charges”

From the data:

- **Total warrants:** 54
 - → average 2.45 warrants per case
 - → some cases have 4–5 warrants by themselves.

Every warrant here is a bench warrant for failure to appear at a hearing.

- Warrant bonds are all listed as: **“\$0.00 Warrant Bond Amount”**.
- **So the story is:**

This guy misses court over and over, gets 54 bench warrants, those get cleared/recalled, and the cycles repeat.

- **Meanwhile, interim conditions show:**
 - 53 orders of “Release with No Bail, Bond, or Conditions Required (ROR)”
 - 15 bail orders (“Post Bail or Bond with [No] Conditions”), with amounts ranging from \$100 up to \$40,000 (mostly on the felony case and one other trespass matter).

- **Lots of standard conditions:**
 - Remain law-abiding,
 - Make all future court appearances,
 - Geographic restrictions,
 - Alcohol/drug conditions,
 - “Do not possess firearms,”
 - Electronic monitoring in a few entries,
 - “Psychological evaluation/treatment” appears 6 times.
- **And then for the felony burglary case (27-CR-23-17272):**
 - Multiple bail escalations on that single file:
 - Bail amounts recorded at **\$20,000**, then **\$10,000**, then up to **\$40,000**, at different dates.
 - A later order “Hold Without Bail or Bond” (04/29/2025–07/30/2025).
- **Put in common-sense terms:**
 - **During 2023, while he’s picking up these 22 charges**, he is repeatedly let go ROR or on relatively modest bail for misdemeanor trespassy behavior.
 - **He blows off court (54 warrants)**, but bonds on the warrants themselves **are set at \$0** — the actual leverage is in the separate bail orders.
 - Only the one burglary file escalates to bigger dollar figures and ultimately a “hold without bail,” after all the charges are already in the system.

So your specific question “*How is this guy staying free to keep getting more charges?*” looks like this in this cluster:

- **The timing is important:**
 - All offenses happen in 2023.
 - Incompetency / commitment-style events and heavier bail/hold orders come in 2024–2025, after the spree, not during.
- **Practically:** he could have been cycling in and out of short holds or low bail throughout 2023 while cases accumulate, then the system finally starts doing more global Rule 20 and higher-bail responses in 2024–2025.

- It's still a *massive* amount of tolerance and cleanup work for one person, but it's not as egregious on this "keep committing felonies while incompetent and on huge bonds" axis as, say, the MICHAEL HOWARD cluster.

5. Rule 20 / Incompetency Pattern

- **Events that include "Rule 20" in their name:**
 - **147 total events** across the 22 cases:
 - **49 "Order – Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01)"**
 - **49 "Rule 20 Evaluation Report"**
 - **48 "Rule 20 Report Distributed"**
 - **1 "Rule 20 Progress Report"**
 - **"Found Incompetent" / "Finding of Incompetency and Order":**
 - **20 "Found Incompetent" events**
 - **18 "Finding of Incompetency and Order" events**
- **Per-case:**
 - Many cases have 1 Rule 20 cycle (Order → Report → Distributed → Finding of Incompetency and Order → Found Incompetent).
 - **The felony case (27-CR-23-17272)** has multiple such findings (three "Found Incompetent," two "Finding of Incompetency and Order").
- **Timing:**
 - A huge block occurs on **May 28, 2024**, where at least **17–18 of the 22 cases have:**
 - **"Finding of Incompetency and Order"**
 - **"Found Incompetent"**
 - on the same date in front of the same judge (Olson), in a *mass hearing*.
- **Later:**
 - **The felony file 27-CR-23-17272 gets additional "Found Incompetent" entries on Dec 3, 2024 and Mar 25, 2025.**

- **So again, we see the mass-event pattern:**
 - *One date, one judge, one courtroom* → many case numbers simultaneously get the same Rule 20 outcomes copied into them.
 - Also note: unlike Pierce, there are dispositions here — most cases get dismissed, and there is a single misdemeanor conviction. So this cluster is less “infinite loop” and more “mass pending → mass Rule 20 → mass dismissals with one conviction left standing + one felony left hanging.”

6. So... Does this Cluster Feel Legitimate?

Breaking it down:

- **Physically/logistically**
 - **Court load:** 53 court dates over about 2.6 years → 1 court trip every ~2–3 weeks. Brutal but absolutely possible.
 - **Offense frequency:** 22 offenses over 9 months → a new charge every ~2 weeks → chaotic, but within the realm of an extremely unstable, homeless/mentally ill trespass-type defendant. Not impossible.
- **Substantive story**
 - Mostly trespass, minor property, and disorder-type behavior with one burglary charge.
 - This is a very recognizable profile in the real world (chronic public-space problems + mental health issues + lots of police contact).
 - On that level, the cluster could be real.
- **Structural/system behavior (*where it gets strange*)**

Here are the big “this looks too synthetic” tells:

- **Mass-bundled hearings**
 - Repeated sessions where 17–18 of the 22 cases share the exact same date, time, judge, and courtroom.
 - It’s plausible for courts to globally call a defendant’s open cases together sometimes. But here it happens over and over, across multiple judges, in a very neat, templated way.

- Mass Rule 20 and incompetency findings on the same date
- On May 28, 2024, a whole bunch of case numbers simultaneously have “Finding of Incompetency and Order” + “Found Incompetent” with the same judge, same time block.
- Mass dispositions on the same date
- **14 different cases *all get dismissed on 05/28/2024*.**
 - Several others dismissed on 08/24/2023 or 07/01/2024 — a pattern of *big clean-up days* rather than scattered individual resolutions.
- **Name chaos vs. perfect DOB/address uniformity**
 - **Case-level names:** 20× “Brandon Deandre Williamson”, plus “Sr.” once, plus “Brandon Williamson” once.
 - **Warrants:** “WILLIAMSON, BRANDON DEANDRE, Jr.”, “WILLIAMS”, “WILLAMSON”, “BEANDRE”, etc.
 - All while DOB and address are completely consistent.
 - It looks like someone is deliberately “jittering” the name while keeping the other identifiers fixed.
- **Huge volume of warrants (54) + heavy use of ROR**
 - The system repeatedly lets him out with “Release with No Bail, Bond, or Conditions Required (ROR)” even as trespass/warrant cycles continue.
 - That is not impossible — but having this much process churn for one guy in one year is atypically extreme.

7. Bottom-Line Common-Sense Verdict

If I had to give it a plain-English take:

- **Could this be one real person’s year?**
 - Yes. A severely unstable person could realistically rack up weekly trespass/property charges across multiple suburbs, fail to appear a ton, and end up in a Rule 20 pipeline.

- **Does the structure of the data feel like normal, hand-entered criminal history?**
 - No. There are too many cluster-wide, copy-pasted events:
 - repeated mega-hearings with 17–18 cases at once,
 - one-day mass incompetency findings,
 - one-day mass dismissals,
 - and highly patterned name drift against perfectly uniform DOB/address.
- **So I'd put this cluster in the category:**
 - “Human life story: plausible.
 - The way the docket is built: highly stylized and cluster-ish, *consistent with something synthetic or mass-templated* rather than the messy evolution of 22 separate real cases.”

8. Source Material

- **The two files used as the input for this analysis are:**
 - [BRANDON WILLIAMSON.csv](#)
 - [BRANDON WILLIAMSON.json](#)
- **Additional data pertaining to this case docket is the following:**
 - [BRANDON WILLIAMSON.xlsx](#)
 - [BRANDON WILLIAMSON_events_aligned_exact.csv](#)
 - [BRANDON WILLIAMSON_events_long.csv](#)
- **The full list of cases which make up the “BRANDON WILLIAMSON” cluster are:**
 - [27-CR-23-3671](#)
 - [27-CR-23-3988](#)
 - [27-CR-23-4154](#)
 - [27-CR-23-5313](#)
 - [27-CR-23-5840](#)
 - [27-CR-23-5869](#)
 - [27-CR-23-7069](#)
 - [27-CR-23-7206](#)

- [27-CR-23-7472](#)
- [27-CR-23-7649](#)
- [27-CR-23-8142](#)
- [27-CR-23-9464](#)
- [27-CR-23-10468](#)
- [27-CR-23-11105](#)
- [27-CR-23-11833](#)
- [27-CR-23-16381](#)
- [27-CR-23-16846](#)
- [27-CR-23-17022](#)
- [27-CR-23-17272](#)
- [27-CR-23-17281](#)
- [27-CR-23-17818](#)
- [27-CR-23-24716](#)

** * ALL OF THESE FILES ARE EMBEDDED WITHIN THIS PDF DOCUMENT AND ALSO URL LINKED ABOVE * **

AYAN HERSI | Cluster Case Analysis

Short version: if you treat this as one real woman's life in the court system, it's barely logistically possible, but the way the dockets are built is extremely templated and cluster-like. It does not feel like 16 organically evolving cases — it feels like one **“AYAN HERSI object”** being moved around in bulk.

I'll break it down like we've been doing for the others.

1. Big-Picture Snapshot of the AYAN HERSI Cluster

- **Volume & timing**
- **Number of cases: 16**
- **Case Numbers:**
 - 27-CR-21-13526
 - 27-CR-21-14266
 - 27-CR-21-17656
 - 27-CR-21-21707
 - 27-CR-21-21833
 - 27-CR-21-22737
 - 27-CR-21-5179
 - 27-CR-22-10565
 - 27-CR-22-14239
 - 27-CR-22-1664
 - 27-CR-22-18472
 - 27-CR-22-2444
 - 27-CR-22-6512
 - 27-CR-22-6895
 - 27-CR-22-7520
 - 27-CR-22-8226

- **Case type:** All Crim/Traf Mandatory
- **Case statuses (as of the data you pulled):**
 - 13 Open
 - 3 “Under Court Jurisdiction”
 - 0 Closed — nothing is resolved yet on the face of this data.
- **Filed:**
 - **Earliest file date:** 2021-03-15
 - **Latest file date:** 2022-09-16
- **Offense dates (charge level):**
 - **Earliest:** 2021-03-15
 - **Latest:** 2022-08-04
 - So alleged offenses span ~17 months.
- **Defendant identity**
From case_information:
 - Name in every case title: “State of Minnesota vs AYAN OMAR HERSI”
 - Defendant DOB in every case: 01/01/1984
 - Defendant address in every case: MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55404
- **From warrants:**
 - Defendant name on all 97 warrants: “HERSI, AYAN OMAR”
- So unlike some other clusters, there’s no name jitter here at all. Same name, same DOB, same address, across every case, events, and warrants.

2. What is She Supposedly Doing? (Charges Profile)

Across all 16 cases, the JSON shows:

- **Total charges:** 22
- **By severity:**

- Felony: 3
- Gross Misdemeanor: 3
- Misdemeanor: 15
- Petty Misdemeanor: 1
- **Charge types (by name):**
- **Theft / shoplifting type:**
 - “Theft-Take/Use/Transfer Movable Prop–No Consent” – 9 counts (mostly misd., one felony)
 - “Theft – Takes/Uses/Transfers/Conceals/Retains/Possession Property” – 1 count
- **Trespass:**
 - “Trespass–Return to Property Within One Year” – 6 counts
- **Burglary:**
 - “Burglary–3rd Deg–Steal/Commit Felony or Gross Misd” – 1 felony count
- **Drugs:**
 - “Drugs – Possession of Drug Paraphernalia – Use or Possession Prohibited” – 1 petty misd.
 - 4 charges have a blank charge_name but do have levels (GM/misd) and offense dates.
- **So the story is:**
 - A chronic shoplifting / trespass defendant, with one 3rd-degree burglary and a little paraphernalia case mixed in.
 - That behavior profile is very recognizable in the real world.

3. Warrants & “Staying Free” Question

From the CSV and warrants list:

- **Total warrants in this cluster:** 97
 - Bench warrant type: always “Bench Warrant – fail to appear at a hearing”

- **Per-case warrants:**
 - **Minimum:** 5
 - **Maximum:** 8
 - **Average:** ~6 warrants per case
- **Warrant records themselves:**
 - bond_amount is empty on all 97; we don't see dollar amounts at the warrant level.
- **Case events show:**
 - 97× “Warrant Issued”
 - 93× “Warrant Cleared by Wt Office”
 - 4× “Warrant Recalled”
 - 1× “Probation Violation Warrant”
- **Bail / bond entries:**
 - Only one explicit bail entry in bond_bail_activity:
 - Case 27-CR-22-2444 (the burglary) → Cash Bail \$10,000.00.
 - There is 1× “Assignment of Bail” event and 4× “Release Ordered” events overall.
- **So the picture is:**
 - She racks up 16 cases in 2021–2022.
 - Each case generates about 5–8 FTAs and bench warrants.
 - Most warrants are later cleared or recalled.
 - Bail info is extremely thin — one case clearly has \$10,000 cash bail; the rest we can't see, but given the charge mix they're probably bondable / ROR or low bail.
- **Common-sense take on “how is she still free?”**
 - The offenses here are mostly lower-level property/trespass, not violent felonies.
 - The spree period (2021-03 to 2022-08) is only about 17 months — so roughly one new case every 5–6 weeks.

- In most real systems, a repeat shoplifter/trespasser can realistically cycle in and out of custody, get ROR'd, miss court, get picked up on warrants, etc., without being locked up long-term — especially if mental health and homelessness are in play.
- Once the burglary case appears (Feb 2022 filed date), it's plausible the system starts to tighten a bit (we see the \$10k bail), but we still don't see the kind of massive no-bail holds we saw in some other clusters.
- **So for this cluster:**
 - It is not inherently impossible that she remains in the community during that 17-month charge spree. Intense and chaotic, yes — but not something like “40 serious felonies while on \$900k bail” like MICHAEL HOWARD.

4. Hearings: Raw Count vs Human Reality

CSV says:

- **Total “previous” hearings** (case-level entries): **427**
 - Per case, `n_hearings_total` ranges from **19 to 32**, **mean ≈ 27.5** .
 - That sounds absurd for one human... until you collapse them.
- **When you de-duplicate** by (date, time, judge, courtroom) across all 16 cases, you get:
 - Unique hearing sessions in this cluster: 53
 - **Distinct hearing dates: 48**
- **Hearing window:**
 - **Earliest hearing date:** 10/08/2021
 - **Latest hearing date:** 11/19/2025
 - **Span:** ~4.1 years
- **Date spacing:**
 - Shortest gap between hearing dates: 1 day
 - Longest gap: 459 days (from Dec 14, 2023 to Mar 17, 2025)
 - Average gap: ≈ 32 days (about once a month)

- **So in actual human terms:**
 - ≈ 48 court days over ~ 4 years $\rightarrow$ ***about 1 court day per month.***
 - That is physically entirely feasible for a single person with 16 open cases.
 - Per case, the 19–31 “hearing dates” are all subsets of those same 48 calendar days — i.e., one visit to the courthouse might spawn hearing entries in all 16 files.

5. Mass-Bundling Pattern (*major synthetic smell*)

Just like the other clusters, the way hearings are distributed across cases is very telling.

For each hearing session (date+time+judge+room), how many cases show up?

- **Session size distribution:**
 - 22 sessions with **1 case**
 - 1 with **2 cases**
 - 1 with **4 cases**
 - 1 with **6 cases**
 - 3 with **9 cases**
 - 1 with **11 cases**
 - 3 with **12 cases**
 - 3 with **13 cases**
 - 5 with **15 cases**
 - 12 with **16 cases** (*all 16 at once*)
- **Concrete examples of the big ones:**
 - 11/08/2022, 11:00 AM, Hughey, Rachel, GC-C657 $\rightarrow$ **16 cases**
 - 01/10/2023, 1:30 PM, Borer, George, GC-C456 $\rightarrow$ **16 cases**
 - 01/13/2023, 9:00 AM, Hughey, Rachel, GC-C657 $\rightarrow$ **16 cases**
 - 04/07/2023, 1:30 PM, Houghtaling, Melissa, PSF 143 $\rightarrow$ **16 cases**
 - 05/09/2023, 1:30 PM, Browne, Michael K, GC-C459 $\rightarrow$ **16 cases**
 - 05/10/2023, 11:30 AM, Hughey, Rachel, GC-C655 $\rightarrow$ **16 cases**

- 09/22/2023, 1:30 PM, Houghtaling, Melissa, PSF 143 → **16 cases**
- 09/25/2023, 10:00 AM, Hughey, Rachel, GC-C655 → **16 cases**
- 10/31/2023, 1:30 PM, Browne, Michael K, GC-C459 → **16 cases**
- 11/02/2023, 10:30 AM, Hughey, Rachel, GC-C655 → **16 cases**
- **2025 dates with 12–13 cases at once** in front of Tweeten, Meyer, Chu, Olson, Mokri.
- **Interpretation:**
 - Each of these 16-case sessions is one actual court appearance by Ayan, where the court calls her entire stack of open cases at once.
 - The **CMS then clones that single appearance as 16 separate hearing entries**, one for each case number.
- That is logistically plausible. Courts do global calls all the time for chronic defendants.
 - But the repetition and precision — many different judges, many dates, always with exactly 16 or 15 of the 16 cases marching in lockstep — is not how independent cases typically accrete over time. **It looks like a cluster object being moved as a unit.**

6. Rule 20 / Competency Pattern

Here the templating gets really obvious.

- **Cluster-wide counts from case_events:**
 - “*Order-Evaluation for Competency to Proceed (Rule 20.01)*” → **48 events**
 - “*Rule 20 Evaluation Report*” → **31**
 - “*Rule 20 Report Distributed*” → **32**
 - “*Rule 20 Progress Report*” → **1**
 - “*Found Competent*” → **15**
 - **No “*Found Incompetent*” entries at all**
- **Per case, it’s almost identical:**

Every case has:

 - 3× ***Rule 20 evaluation orders***,
 - 2× ***evaluation reports***,

- $2\times$ *report-distributed events*,
- $1\times$ *“Found Competent”*.
- **And the dates are mass-bundled:**
 - Rule 20 orders:**
 - 11/08/2022 → **16 orders** (*one in each case*)
 - 04/07/2023 → **16 orders**
 - 09/25/2023 → **16 orders**
 - Rule 20 evaluation reports:**
 - 05/03/2023 → **16 reports**
 - 10/30/2023 → **15 reports**
 - Rule 20 reports distributed:**
 - 05/03/2023 & 05/04/2023 → **8+8 = 16**
 - 10/30/2023 → **16**
 - Found Competent:**
 - 11/02/2023 → **15 “Found Competent” events, all on the same date.**
- **So the official timeline is:**
 - **All 16 cases:** mass Rule 20 orders on **11/08/22** → again on **04/07/23** → again on **09/25/23**.
 - **All 16:** mass evaluation reports in May & Oct 2023.
 - **15 out of 16:** mass “Found Competent” on 11/02/23.
- That is extremely stylized. Real life often has clustering, but this is cookie-cutter: the same sequence, on the same days, for all case numbers in the cluster.

Also, note:

- Offense period ends 08/04/2022.
- The first Rule 20 order is 11/08/2022 — after the spree is over.

- After that, the cluster lives in this Rule-20 world from late 2022 through late 2023 without any new offenses in the data.

7. Case Outcomes (*or not*)

From the CSV/JSON:

- **None of the 16 cases are marked Closed.**
 - Disposition records in the JSON are basically blank:
 - 9 disposition “rows” exist but all fields are empty (no disposition type, no date, no charge mapping).
- **Case statuses remain:**
 - **13 Open, 3 Under Court Jurisdiction.**
 - Yet we see hearings scheduled and held **all the way out to 11/19/2025, more than 4 years after the last offense date.**
- For low-/mid-level property offenses with this vintage, that’s unusual: You’d normally expect:
 - Convictions and sentencing on at least some files,
 - Or a global plea consolidating a bunch of cases,
 - Or a cluster of dismissals.
- Instead, **you have 16 cases stuck in a kind of permanent pretrial limbo with repeated findings of competency (not incompetency), yet no actual resolutions visible in the data.**
 - That **“forever pending” posture** — combined with the templated Rule 20 blocks — is another synthetic-looking feature.

8. Does this Feel Like a Legitimate, Organic History?

If we split the question into layers:

- **Physical scheduling**
 - 48 hearing days over ~4 years → **about one court visit a month.**
 - For someone with 16 active cases, that’s totally feasible.

- **Substantive behavior**

- A woman in her late 30s repeatedly involved in shoplifting, trespass, one burglary, minor drug paraphernalia — all within ~1.5 years — is sadly very plausible.
- A spate of 16 cases over 17 months (roughly one every 5–6 weeks) is high but believable for someone unstable and constantly in and out of loss-prevention interactions and arrests.
- On these two axes, the cluster passes the “real person could live this” test.

- **System behavior & structure (*where fraud/synthetic issues show up*)**

Here’s where it goes sideways:

- **Mass-bundled hearings**

- Multiple dates where all 16 cases (or 15/16) have the exact same hearing time, judge, and courtroom.
- Repeated across many judges, dates, and courtrooms in a very tidy pattern.
- Mass-bundled Rule 20 events
- 16 identical Rule 20 orders three times in a row on three exact dates.
- 16 identical evaluation reports on one date; 15 on another.
- 15 identical “Found Competent” entries on the same date.

- **No name noise at all**

- Unlike some other clusters where you see Sr/Jr, spelling differences, etc., here the identity fields (name, DOB, address) are perfectly standardized across all 16 cases and all warrants.
- Real data often has at least a few typos or format differences over this many filings.

- **No visible dispositions / endless pretrial**

- As of late 2025 hearing data, ***none of these 2021–2022 cases are closed.***
- Yet the record says she was found competent (15 times) in late 2023.
- That suggests a kind of ***suspended, never-ending status*** rather than normal case life cycles.

- **Putting it all together, my plain-English summary would be:**
 - Could a real person live out the underlying story (lots of theft/trespass in 2021–2022, then years of court)?
 - Yes, that part is believable.
 - Does the way the dockets are constructed — with perfectly synchronized hearings and Rule 20 events blasted across 16 case numbers, no name variation, and no real dispositions — feel like organic, hand-entered court history?
 - Not really. *It looks heavily templated*, like someone is *managing a “cluster” of case numbers as a single object* and just stamping events onto all of them in bulk.
- **So, on the “Do these seem legitimate?” axis:**
 - **Human-life plausible:** Yes.
 - **System-behavior plausible:** Highly questionable, with *strong indicators of synthetic or mass-generated docketing* rather than 16 truly independent, organically evolving cases.

9. Source Material

- **The two files used as the input for this analysis are:**
 - [AYAN_HERSI.csv](#)
 - [AYAN_HERSI.json](#)
- **Additional data pertaining to this case docket is the following:**
 - [AYAN_HERSI.xlsx](#)
 - [AYAN_HERSI_events_aligned_exact.csv](#)
 - [AYAN_HERSI_events_long.csv](#)
- **The full list of cases which make up the “AYAN HERSI” cluster are:**
 - [27-CR-21-13526](#)
 - [27-CR-21-14266](#)
 - [27-CR-21-17656](#)
 - [27-CR-21-21707](#)
 - [27-CR-21-21833](#)

- [27-CR-21-22737](#)
- [27-CR-21-5179](#)
- [27-CR-22-10565](#)
- [27-CR-22-14239](#)
- [27-CR-22-1664](#)
- [27-CR-22-18472](#)
- [27-CR-22-2444](#)
- [27-CR-22-6512](#)
- [27-CR-22-6895](#)
- [27-CR-22-7520](#)
- [27-CR-22-8226](#)

** * ALL OF THESE FILES ARE EMBEDDED WITHIN THIS PDF DOCUMENT AND ALSO URL LINKED ABOVE * **

ANTONIO ZAPATA | Cluster Case Analysis

Yes, I got them — both **ANTONIO_ZAPATA.csv** and **ANTONIO_ZAPATA.json** loaded and I've gone through the data for this cluster. Here's a structured “does this feel like a real person's life in court?” pass.

1. Quick Snapshot of the Cluster

From your CSV + JSON:

- **Number of cases in cluster:** 10
- **Case IDs:**
 - 27-CR-20-16554
 - 27-CR-20-20380
 - 27-CR-20-20634
 - 27-CR-20-25542
 - 27-CR-20-26515
 - 27-CR-20-27232
 - 27-CR-21-891
 - 27-CR-21-2280
 - 27-CR-21-3219
 - 27-CR-21-6719
- **Filing window:**
 - Earliest file date: 2020-07-28
 - Latest file date: 2021-04-05
 - So 10 cases filed over ~8 months.
- **All cases location:** Hennepin County – Criminal Downtown
- **Case type:** All are “Crim/Traf Mandatory”
- **Status:** All 10 are Closed.

Charges profile (very high-level):

Each case has 1–3 charges, mostly:

- Trespass / return to property within one year
- Damage to property (4th, 3rd, and one 1st degree)
- Disorderly conduct
- Obstructing legal process
- Fleeing, etc.

Prosecutors rotate between Minneapolis City Attorney and Hennepin County Attorney, communities like Minneapolis, Bloomington, MAC, Metro Transit. This is a plausible repeat low-level / quality-of-life / property-type offender profile.

Warrants:

- **Total warrants across cluster:** 33
- **Per case:** between 2 and 5 warrants each.
- Many are “Bench Warrant – fail to appear at a hearing,” plus some arrest/order of detention entries.

So the textual / legal side of the data (charges, prosecutors, cities) is not obviously fake on its face. It looks like a chronic, unstable defendant constantly missing court on relatively low-level charges.

2. Hearings and Human-Level Schedule

From the JSON hearings data:

- **Total hearing entries:** 155 (all “previous”; no upcoming, all Closed)

All hearings fall between:

- **First hearing date:** 2020-10-13
- **Last hearing date:** 2024-02-27
- **Span:** 1,232 days $\approx$ 3.4 years

But the key question is:

| *How many actual court days would this human need to show up for?*

If we collapse to unique calendar dates (ignoring that there are 10 parallel case entries for each date/time):

- **Unique court dates in this cluster:** 27
 - **2020:** 5 dates
 - **2021:** 9 dates
 - **2022:** 7 dates
 - **2023:** 5 dates
 - **2024:** 1 date

That's about **8 hearing days per year**, or **one court day roughly every 1.5 months** over the life of the cluster.

From a *purely physical* / life-logistics standpoint, that is absolutely doable for a single person — especially someone with 10 open criminal files.

The gaps between court dates:

- **Minimum gap:** 1 day (occasional back-to-back dates)
- **Maximum gap:** ~252 days (long lull)
- **Average gap between court days:** ~47 days

Again, nothing here is physically impossible.

3. The “10 Hearings at Once” Pattern

Now the weird part: how the hearings are distributed across those 10 cases.

There are **155 hearing entries**, but they're extremely synchronized:

- There are 27 distinct “session” combinations (unique date + time + judge + courtroom).

- On many of those dates, all 10 cases have a hearing at the exact same time in the exact same courtroom with the same judge.

Examples (all real from your data):

- **2021-09-22, 09:30 AM, Couri, Theresa, GC-C655**
 - → All 10 case numbers have a “Hearing” at that exact time & place.
- **2022-10-13, 09:00 AM, Janzen, Lisa K, GC-C857**
 - → Again, all 10 cases, same time, same courtroom, same judge.
- **2022-05-26, 01:30 PM, Chou, Marta M., PSF 143**
 - → All 10 cases.
- **2022-10-03, 02:00 PM, Dayton Klein, Julia, GC-C1553**
 - → All 10 cases.
- **2023-07-18, 01:30 PM, Garcia, Tamara G., PSF 143**
 - → All 10 cases.
- **2023-07-27, 11:00 AM, Bartolomei, Luis, GC-C1953**
 - → All 10 cases.
- **2023-08-29, 01:30 PM, Dayton Klein, Julia, GC-C559**
 - → All 10 cases.
- **2023-09-06, 09:00 AM, Bartolomei, Luis, GC-C1955**
 - → All 10 cases.

Over and over, the same pattern:

|
On a given date/time, you see 10 separate “hearings” — one in each of the 10 case numbers — all stacked on the same judge, courtroom, and start time.

Is that physically possible?

Yes, *if* you interpret it this way:

- The defendant shows up once at 9:30 AM in courtroom GC-C655 before Judge X.

- The court calls all *his* open case numbers in that same block.
- The case management system logs that same live hearing as a separate “Hearing” event in each docket.

So in *reality*, that’s **1 human appearance**, but **10 docket entries** (one per case). That’s the only sensible way to read it.

Given that, the cluster’s real-world attendance is 27 live sessions total — which is not crazy.

Is that Pattern Normal or Too Tidy?

This is where it starts to *feel* computer-ish:

- Many of the mass-hearing dates have ***exactly all 10 cases*** included — not 7, not 9, but 10/10, repeatedly.
- For those mass-hearing days, every event has identical labels: “Hearing”, same time, same judge, same courtroom, often same flavor of reschedule/cancellation notes.
- Resets are synchronized: when one mass hearing is rescheduled, all ten cases have notes like “Reset by Court to [new date/time]”, again in lockstep.

Is that *possible*? Yes. If the case management system or clerk is just copying the same event across all of the person’s active case numbers, you would see exactly this sort of lockstep.

Is it **organically messy** like you’d expect from 10 independent criminal files? No, it’s unnaturally tidy:

- No obvious “orphan” hearing dates where only 1 or 2 cases move.
- Very strong “all or nothing” patterns for many of the group hearing dates.

So:

- **Physically/logistically:** still plausible.
- **Statistically / organically:** looks very scripted and administrative.

On this cluster alone, that’s a *yellow flag* pattern, not proof of fakery.

4. Volume and Intensity Per Case

From the CSV:

- **Case events per case:**
 - **Low end:** 38 events
 - **High end:** 69 events
 - Many cases have 50–60 docket events.
- **Hearings per case (as recorded):** 12–19 per case.
- **Warrants per case:** 2–5.

For a chronically unstable, non-compliant defendant (homeless, severe mental health, or chemically dependent), this amount of court churn is high but plausible, especially over 3–4 years and across 10 cases, with repeated FTAs and bench warrants.

It does *not* read like a single summary case; it reads like:

“Guy who keeps getting arrested, missing court, getting picked up on warrants, having combined omnibus hearings on all his open files, and finally resolving things years later.”

That overall story is believable.

5. Identity / Name Consistency

- In the CSV, every row is **“ANTONIO ORLANDO ZAPATA”** as the defendant_name.
- In warrants, parties, etc., names are also consistently **“ZAPATA, ANTONIO ORLANDO”** — no obvious mid-cluster flip to a different spelling or middle name in this data.

So this particular cluster doesn’t show the “weird name variation” tell you mentioned. It’s actually too consistent, if anything.

6. Bottom-Line Smell Test for this Cluster

If we assume:

- All 10 case numbers truly belong to the same physical person, and
- The portal legitimately logs a single combined hearing across all case numbers as 10 separate “hearings,”

then:

1. **Number of court days** (27 over 3.4 years) is absolutely realistic.
2. **Per-month burden** (roughly one court date every 1–2 months) is heavy but humanly feasible.
3. **Charge mix, communities, and prosecutors** line up with a plausible repeat offender profile.
4. **Warrant volume** is high but consistent with someone who repeatedly fails to appear.

The suspicious aspect is not “this person couldn’t attend this many hearings” — they clearly could — but:

- The **extreme lockstep synchronization** across 10 distinct case numbers
- The repetition of identical date/time/judge/room for all cases on many dates
- The very uniform way reschedules are propagated across the entire cluster.

On its own, I’d summarize it as:

Human-schedule plausible and textually realistic.

Structurally unnatural when you look at how perfectly all 10 dockets march in formation.

Whether that tips over into “this doesn’t seem legitimate” really depends on comparison to:

- **Non-clustered “normal” defendants** with multiple cases, and
- The patterns you see across your other 10 clusters.

But purely from this cluster: I’d call it *suspiciously tidy in structure, but not physically impossible for a single real person.*

7. Source Material

- The two files used as the input for this analysis are:
 - [ANTONIO ZAPATA.csv](#)
 - [ANTONIO ZAPATA.json](#)
- Additional data pertaining to this case docket is the following:
 - [ANTONIO ZAPATA.xlsx](#)
 - [ANTONIO ZAPATA_events_aligned_exact.csv](#)
 - [ANTONIO ZAPATA_events_long.csv](#)
- The full list of cases which make up the “ANTONIO ZAPATA” cluster are:
 - [27-CR-20-16554](#)
 - [27-CR-20-20380](#)
 - [27-CR-20-20634](#)
 - [27-CR-20-25542](#)
 - [27-CR-20-26515](#)
 - [27-CR-20-27232](#)
 - [27-CR-21-891](#)
 - [27-CR-21-2280](#)
 - [27-CR-21-3219](#)
 - [27-CR-21-6719](#)

** * ALL OF THESE FILES ARE EMBEDDED WITHIN THIS PDF DOCUMENT AND ALSO URL LINKED ABOVE * **