

I. BIG-PICTURE SUMMARY: FOURTH RULE 20.01 ORDER

From late February to early May 2025, Mr. Matthew Guertin’s criminal case saw a series of abrupt twists centered on his mental competency to stand trial. Mr. Guertin – who faces several firearm-related charges – insists he is competent and has uncovered serious evidence tampering and fraud in his case. He actively fought to prove his capability to participate in his defense, going so far as to file detailed exhibits of alleged discovery manipulation on his own. On April 3, 2025, a judge agreed “*the Court finds Mr. Guertin is competent*”, seemingly clearing the way for the case to proceed. But less than a month later, on April 29, a different judge abruptly reopened the question of Guertin’s competency without any new evidence, halting the case and ordering yet another psychiatric evaluation. This whiplash reversal – from deemed competent to back in limbo – raises concerns about whether the court is fairly addressing Mr. Guertin’s claims or using procedure to sidestep his serious allegations of misconduct. It matters because the outcome will determine if Mr. Guertin gets to openly contest the evidence fraud he claims or if he remains trapped in a cycle of competency evaluations that delay justice.

II. FIVE KEY TURNING POINTS

A. | Feb 28, 2025: *Defendant Takes Initiative*

With his public defenders unresponsive, Mr. Guertin filed a pro se submission of five exhibits exposing alleged discovery fraud and asserting his own competence. This bold move put his claims of evidence tampering and his lucidity on the official record, ahead of a scheduled competency hearing.

B. | Mar 5, 2025: Competency Hearing – Guertin Speaks Out

An evidentiary competency hearing was held where Mr. Guertin testified at length. He challenged the court-appointed examiner’s report (which had labeled him delusional) by presenting his side of the story – including claims that tech companies stole his intellectual property – to prove his thinking is grounded in reality. The court took his testimony and the doctor’s report under advisement, setting the stage for a crucial decision.

C. | Apr 3, 2025: Court Finds Him Competent

Judge William Koch issued a written order formally declaring Mr. Guertin competent to proceed with his case. The judge noted that while some of Mr. Guertin’s beliefs (e.g. a patent theft plot) seemed “fantastical and paranoid”, Mr. Guertin nonetheless understood the charges, the court process, and the role of attorneys, and could rationally consult with counsel. This ruling restored Mr. Guertin’s full rights to participate in his defense, allowing his case to move forward on the merits.

D. | Mid-April 2025: Guertin Mounts a Defense Offensive

Newly deemed competent, Mr. Guertin quickly went on the offensive. On April 16 he filed a motion to dismiss all charges with prejudice, accusing the State of egregious misconduct – from fabricating evidence and falsifying psychiatric reports to violating his due process rights. He argued that the case was irreparably tainted by fraud and urged the court to throw it out in the interest of justice. A few days later, on April 21, he also petitioned to discharge his public defenders and represent himself, invoking his constitutional right to self-representation even if the court thought it unwise. These filings signaled Mr. Guertin’s deep mistrust of the process so far and his determination to personally take charge of his defense.

E. | Apr 29, 2025 (and its aftermath): Court Reverses Course – Case Back in Limbo

Instead of hearing Mr. Guertin’s motion or his request to go pro se, Judge Sarah Hudleston abruptly ordered a new Rule 20.01 competency evaluation and appointed a “*forensic navigator*” to gather Mr. Guertin’s records. This occurred without any party requesting it and without letting Mr. Guertin speak in court that day. In effect, the court put the case on hold again, undoing the April 3 competency finding. Mr. Guertin’s progress was halted: his big dismissal motion was frozen, and he was once more treated as possibly incompetent solely because of the content of his legal filings (which the judge bizarrely cited as evidence of instability). In response, on May 7, 2025, Mr. Guertin (still fighting to be heard) filed an emergency motion asking to stay and vacate the April 29 orders. He argued that nothing had changed since he was found competent and that the court had no right to cast him back into a competency review based only on his vigorous defense arguments. This last-ditch effort aimed to get the case back on track and force the court to address his evidence of fraud rather than his mental state.

III. SIMPLE TIMELINE (DATE-BY-DATE)

A. | February 28, 2025: Defendant’s Pro Se Evidence Filing

Mr. Guertin, frustrated by lack of response from his attorneys, personally filed a packet of exhibits (A–E) to support his competency and prove “discovery fraud” in the evidence against him. In a cover statement, he explained that local rules normally require evidence to be filed 7 days before a hearing, but since his lawyers failed to respond to him on Feb 20 and 24, he had “no alternative” but to submit this material himself just days before the March 5 competency hearing. He noted that his ability to compile and present such detailed exhibits on his own – including a technical flipbook showing altered photographs – “*reinforces my*

assertion that I am competent to present my own defense.”. Effect for Guertin: This proactive move helped Mr. Guertin by preserving his claims on the record and demonstrating his lucidity and research abilities. However, it also highlighted a breakdown in trust with his court-appointed counsel, setting the stage for a confrontational hearing.

B. | March 5, 2025: *Contested Competency Hearing*

An in-person evidentiary hearing was held in Hennepin County to determine Mr. Guertin’s competency to proceed. The State’s psychiatrist, Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook, had provided a December 20, 2024 report opining that Mr. Guertin was psychotic, suffering from “*delusional thinking*,” had refused to cooperate with the exam, and was unlikely to regain competence. At the hearing, the judge took judicial notice of Dr. Cranbrook’s report and then allowed Mr. Guertin himself to testify at length in opposition. Mr. Guertin used this opportunity to directly refute the claim that he was delusional. He testified that he had undergone three prior Rule 20 competency exams (in 2023 and 2024) and believed those findings were skewed by manipulated evidence in a related civil commitment case. He spoke about discovering irregularities in police evidence (for example, distorted photo evidence) and even filed motions in that earlier case seeking “*authentic*” discovery materials. Most notably, Mr. Guertin addressed the centerpiece of the doctor’s concern: his assertions that Netflix had stolen his patented technology. He insisted this claim was *not* a delusion, offering details about his professional background to lend credibility to his story. The judge listened as Mr. Guertin described his career and inventions, which he said big corporations misappropriated – the very allegations the doctors had cited as signs of paranoia. According to the later written order, “*Mr. Guertin provided extensive testimony*” challenging Dr. Cranbrook’s conclusions and trying to prove his beliefs were reality-based.

1. Court’s response:

The hearing ended without an immediate decision. The judge (William Koch) took the matter under advisement to review the evidence.

2. Effect for Guertin:

The hearing gave Mr. Guertin a critical chance to present himself as rational and informed, which likely helped his case. However, some of his testimony (especially the claims of a tech conspiracy against him) did not appear to convince the court on the spot – the judge would later describe those claims as “*fantastical and paranoid.*” There was a risk that raising such extraordinary allegations could undermine his credibility, but he felt it necessary to rebut the notion that his ideas were delusional.

C. | April 3, 2025: Court Order – Guertin Ruled Competent

Judge Koch issued formal Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and an Order regarding Mr. Guertin’s competency. In this 4-page order, the court reviewed both Dr. Cranbrook’s report and Mr. Guertin’s hearing testimony. The judge acknowledged that Mr. Guertin indeed holds some unorthodox beliefs – notably the conviction that major companies stole his intellectual property – and the judge bluntly stated “*his beliefs in that regard appear to be fantastical and paranoid.*” Despite this, the court found that Mr. Guertin understood the legal proceedings and could work with counsel. The order notes that Mr. Guertin was able to accurately describe the charges against him (a reckless discharge and firearms possession case) and showed a realistic understanding of how a criminal trial works. He knew, for example, that he has the right to a jury, the possibility of a plea deal, and the roles of various courtroom participants. Mr. Guertin even testified that he valued having an attorney’s help and would not necessarily insist on representing himself at trial despite his frustrations. The judge found that crucially, Mr. Guertin can

rationality consult with his lawyers about his defense – which is the core standard for competency. In the judge’s words: “*He understands the nature of the charges... the benefits of having counsel... He will work with his legal team... Ultimately, the Court finds Mr. Guertin is competent.*”.

1. Effect for Guertin:

This was a major victory for Mr. Guertin. After having twice been ruled incompetent in the previous year, he was now restored to competency status, meaning the criminal case could move forward to address the actual charges and any defense motions. It validated that, at least in the court’s eyes, Mr. Guertin met the legal standards of competence (despite his lingering belief in a broader conspiracy). However, the order also put him on notice that the court was not convinced by his claims of corporate theft, which the judge explicitly found unsupported by evidence. In short, the court separated Guertin’s *legal* competency from the *veracity* of his personal claims – finding him competent even if some of his views were doubtful.

D. | April 16, 2025: Motion to Dismiss for Misconduct

With competency affirmed, Mr. Guertin wasted no time advancing his defense. On April 16 he (likely with assistance, but filing as “Pro Se Defendant”) submitted a 50-page Motion to Dismiss all charges *with prejudice*. This document is a scathing, comprehensive attack on the integrity of the prosecution and the evidence. In it, Mr. Guertin alleges grave government misconduct: he argues that the police and prosecutors fabricated evidence, tampered with digital files, and even falsified psychiatric evaluations to portray him as mentally ill and dangerous. He supports these claims by referencing the exhibits he’s gathered (e.g. image metadata proving tampering, email records, discrepancies in who actually wrote evaluation reports, etc.). The motion asserts that this conduct has “*irretrievably*

destroyed the integrity of these proceedings.” Mr. Guertin writes that allowing the case to continue “*would be to condone the unconscionable,*” whereas dismissing it would show the court does not tolerate “*convictions obtained by cheating and corruption.*” He specifically points out that “*officials fabricated evidence and lied to have a citizen hospitalized as incompetent,*” which he says the evidence now proves. As remedies, along with dismissal, he requests evidentiary hearings to investigate the allegedly *fraudulent psychiatric reports* and the *digital evidence tampering* in detail, including subpoenas for the people involved.

1. Court’s response:

The court did not take any immediate action on this motion on April 16. Such a motion would normally be scheduled for a hearing or at least await prosecution’s response.

2. Effect for Guertin:

This filing served to put all of Mr. Guertin’s allegations of fraud and rights violations squarely before the court. It was an aggressive move that, if successful, could end the case in his favor. However, it also significantly raised the stakes. The motion’s strong language and extraordinary claims (essentially accusing the State and court officials of a conspiracy against him) likely put the court on the defensive. In fact, these very arguments would later be used by the judge as a reason to question Guertin’s sanity again, illustrating the risk that the motion could backfire by antagonizing the court rather than persuading it.

E. | April 21, 2025: Defendant Seeks to Go Pro Se

Early in the morning on April 21, Mr. Guertin filed a Petition to Proceed as His Own Counsel (i.e. to represent himself). In this filing, he invoked his constitutional right (under *Faretta v. California*) to self-representation. He even

quoted Minnesota case law: *“Even if the court does not think it is a ‘good idea’ for a defendant to choose self-representation, it is not the court’s role to insert counsel between an unwilling defendant and that defendant’s right of self-representation.”*. Mr. Guertin’s stance was that he *no longer trusted* his public defenders to advocate the issues he cared about, given that in his view they had been unresponsive and possibly not aggressive enough about the alleged fraud. By going pro se, he hoped to directly litigate his claims (like the Motion to Dismiss) and ensure nothing was left off the record.

1. Court’s response:

The court did not hold any immediate hearing or grant this request before the next scheduled court date. The request remained pending. Legally, a judge must ensure a defendant is making a knowing, voluntary decision before allowing them to go pro se, usually via a colloquy in court. In this case, that colloquy never occurred in the days following April 21.

2. Effect for Guertin:

This set up a confrontation for the next hearing. If granted, it would empower Mr. Guertin to speak for himself in court. If ignored or denied, it could breed further conflict. In the short term, as events unfolded, Mr. Guertin’s pro se petition was effectively left in limbo – which meant that at the crucial April 29 hearing, he was still technically represented by counsel and not allowed to speak on his own behalf.

F. | April 29, 2025: New Judge Reopens Competency & Halts Case

This date marked a dramatic turning point against Mr. Guertin’s momentum. A court hearing took place (before Judge Sarah Hudleston) ostensibly to address pending matters in the case. Crucially, instead of hearing arguments on Mr. Guertin’s motion to dismiss or his self-representation request, Judge Hudleston

abruptly took the case in a different direction. Without any motion from the prosecutor or new incident to justify it, the judge sua sponte (on her own) ordered yet another Rule 20.01 competency evaluation of Mr. Guertin. Along with this, she signed an Order Appointing a Forensic Navigator – a court agent meant to assist in competency cases – who was empowered to collect a wide range of Mr. Guertin’s private records (medical, employment, etc.) within 96 hours. These two orders (Index 187 and 188 in the court record) were issued effectively *ex parte* – that is, Mr. Guertin had no opportunity to speak or object. In fact, Mr. Guertin was present in the courtroom, but because his attorneys were still officially on the case (and they apparently did not object), he was “*effectively silenced*” and not permitted to address the court directly. The judge’s stated rationale for suddenly questioning competency again was the content of Mr. Guertin’s own recent filings – specifically, his pro se Motion to Dismiss (with its references to patent theft and grand conspiracy) which the court said raised concern that Mr. Guertin might be delusional or mentally unstable. In other words, the judge treated Mr. Guertin’s vigorous legal defense – particularly his insistence that a high-level fraud was at play – as evidence that his mental health should be reevaluated. Importantly, there was no disruptive behavior or new psychological episode cited at this hearing – the judge focused only on Mr. Guertin’s *words on paper*. By doing so, Judge Hudleston effectively overrode the April 3 competency finding made by Judge Koch, barely four weeks earlier.

1. Effect for Guertin:

This court action was a major setback for Mr. Guertin. Practically, it froze all progress on his case – “*All progress on Mr. Guertin’s motion to dismiss and on the case-in-chief is now frozen pending a months-long psychiatric re-evaluation.*”. The judge’s order suspended the criminal

proceedings until the new evaluation could be completed and reviewed. A review hearing was scheduled for July 15, 2025, meaning at least a 2½-month delay. Mr. Guertin, who “*just weeks prior stood ready to finally confront the charges*” at a hearing or trial, was thrust back into limbo, now forced to “prove his sanity” before he can prove his innocence. Strategically, this also derailed his Motion to Dismiss – the court did not address it at all on April 29, and it would not be considered until competency was resolved (if ever). In sum, the court’s move effectively nullified Mr. Guertin’s recent win (the competency ruling) and put him back on a path toward possible indefinite commitment, which is exactly what he feared. It also signaled an adversarial stance from the court: rather than entertain the possibility of official wrongdoing, the judge chose to interpret Mr. Guertin’s allegations as a sign of mental illness, further marginalizing his claims.

G. | May 7, 2025: *Emergency Motion to Undo April 29 Orders*

In response to the sudden turn of events, Mr. Guertin (now apparently *acting pro se*, as he indicated) filed an Emergency Motion to Stay and Vacate the April 29 competency re-evaluation order (Index 187) and the forensic navigator order (Index 188). This motion, filed on May 7, asked the court to immediately halt any enforcement of those orders (staying the new competency exam and any record subpoenas) and to vacate them entirely, essentially asking the court to restore the status quo as of April 3. In the filing, Mr. Guertin argues forcefully that the judge’s April 29 actions were improper and unjustified. He notes that “*the ink was barely dry*” on the April 3 competency finding when the new evaluation was ordered, and that Minnesota law does not allow one judge to overturn another judge’s competency finding without materially new information – yet “*the April 29 order points to no new facts at all – because there were none.*”. The motion suggests the

court's decision was not driven by legitimate concern for his mental state, but rather was a “*retaliatory*” or “*vindictive*” reaction to the pressure his dismissal motion created. It cites due process principles, arguing that this sudden reversal violates fundamental fairness and harms Mr. Guertin's rights. As relief, besides vacating the orders, Mr. Guertin requested an expedited hearing within 5 business days or a quick ruling, and if the judge refused to undo the orders, he asked her to certify the question to the Court of Appeals immediately (to get appellate review of whether this competency do-over is lawful).

1. Court's response:

As of May 7 (the end point of this timeline), the emergency motion had just been filed at 2:04 PM and was pending. There is no indication in the record here of how the court responded in the immediate days following.

2. Effect for Guertin:

The emergency motion is Mr. Guertin's last resort to regain control of the situation. If granted, it would stop the new competency evaluation in its tracks and reaffirm him as competent, forcing the court to address his Motion to Dismiss on its merits. If denied, Mr. Guertin faces a protracted period of further psychiatric review and the sidelining of his defense claims. The mere necessity of this motion shows how far Mr. Guertin's position had swung in a week – from preparing to litigate dismissal to having to argue, yet again, that he is sane enough to participate. This motion also catalogues the court's actions as errors, preserving the record in case Mr. Guertin needs to seek relief from a higher court.

IV. COURT WRONGDOING / FAILURE TRACKER

A. | Issue: Ignored or delayed ruling on Self-Representation (Faretta) Request

1. What the Court Did

The court failed to address Mr. Guertin's April 21 petition to proceed pro se. At the April 29 hearing, Judge Hudleston neither held a Faretta inquiry nor allowed Mr. Guertin to argue for himself; instead, she proceeded as if the request didn't exist, keeping the public defenders in place and not letting Mr. Guertin speak at all.

2. Why This is a Problem

This violates Mr. Guertin's Sixth Amendment right to represent himself. When a defendant clearly asserts the desire to go pro se, the court is obliged to address it promptly. Ignoring the request and silencing the defendant inserts counsel against the defendant's wishes, which case law forbids. It deprived Mr. Guertin of autonomy in his defense and prevented him from objecting when critical orders (the new eval) were issued.

3. Evidence

"Instead of allowing Mr. Guertin to argue his motion or holding a hearing on his request to represent himself, the Court on April 29, 2025, issued two orders..." (showing no hearing on self-rep) "...orders were entered ex parte, at a proceeding where Mr. Guertin was present but effectively silenced as a pro se litigant (since his counsel was still technically on the case and had not been discharged)." (he was not allowed to speak); See also the rule in State v. Camacho: "it is not the court's role to insert

counsel between an unwilling defendant and that defendant's right of self-representation."

4. Confidence

High. The record clearly indicates the judge did not entertain the self-representation request, which is a fundamental error.

B. | Issue: Contradictory Reversal of Competency Finding (No New Evidence)

1. What the Court Did

Judge Hudleston ordered a new competency evaluation on April 29 – effectively nullifying Judge Koch's April 3 finding that Mr. Guertin was competent – without any new factual development. No motion from the State, no new psychological reports, nothing except Mr. Guertin's legal filings was cited as cause.

2. Why This is a Problem

Reopening the competency issue so soon undermines the finality of the court's own rulings and violates standard procedure. Typically, a competency finding stands unless there's a material change or new information. Here, "the ink was barely dry" on the April 3 order when a different judge reversed course. Minnesota law does not allow one judge to casually overturn another's competency decision without new evidence. Doing so raises concerns of arbitrariness or bias – it suggests the court may have been looking for a pretext to stall the case. It also erodes Mr. Guertin's due process rights: he met the legal criteria for competence, yet is being treated as if he didn't, based on nothing new.

3. Evidence

“Here, the Court’s April 29 order points to no new facts at all – because there were none.” (defense highlighting the lack of any new information); “Minnesota law does not lightly allow one judge to overturn another judge’s finding of competency without materially new information.”. These show the absence of justification for the April 29 reevaluation order.

4. Confidence

High. It’s documented that no new evidence arose; the only thing “new” was Mr. Guertin’s motion, which isn’t legitimate grounds. This is a clear procedural irregularity.

C. | Issue: Treating Defense Arguments as Evidence of Mental Illness

1. What the Court Did

The court (Judge Hudleston) effectively used Mr. Guertin’s own legal filings against him by characterizing their content as proof that he might be delusional. Specifically, the judge fixated on Mr. Guertin’s references to a patent theft conspiracy in his Motion to Dismiss and re-framed them as “possible mental instability” rather than addressing the actual legal issues raised. In other words, the more strenuously Mr. Guertin defended himself, the more the court doubted his sanity.

2. Why This is a Problem

This is deeply problematic because it creates a catch-22 for the defendant. It means that exercising his legal rights and presenting evidence (even if it involves complex or outlandish-sounding facts) is interpreted as a sign of incompetence. That chills his ability to make a defense – he’s punished for bringing up certain arguments. Judges are supposed to evaluate competency based on rational understanding of proceedings and ability to

consult with counsel, not whether the judge personally finds the defendant's claims credible. Here the court ignored Mr. Guertin's proven grasp of the case and instead cherry-picked his mention of a broader conspiracy to justify sidelining him. This approach borders on bias – effectively discrediting potentially valid claims by labeling them delusional without evidentiary hearing. It also forecloses any inquiry into the misconduct he alleged, because the focus shifts to his mind, not the State's actions.

3. Evidence

“...the Court recast Mr. Guertin's pro se Motion to Dismiss and its exhibits – which the Court selectively fixated on his contextual references to patent theft... – as evidence of possible mental instability.”. The filing notes the judge “ignored the motion's core... arguments” and used his defense as “the sole trigger for doubting his competency anew.” This shows the court's own words (from transcript) indicating it treated his legal claims as a symptom. Also, Mr. Guertin's motion itself explicitly did not raise the patent issue as a legal defense (it was background), yet the court construed it otherwise.

4. Confidence

High. The record (via the defense motion quoting the judge) plainly shows the court's reasoning. Using a defendant's assertion of innocence or claims of misconduct as grounds for a psych eval is not standard – it's an abuse of the competency process.

D. | Issue: Ex Parte Decisions – No Opportunity to Be Heard

1. What the Court Did

The court issued the April 29 orders without notice or input from Mr. Guertin. He was in the courtroom but was not invited to speak on the matter, and his attorneys apparently were not prepared (since no motion was pending). This means the judge's decisions to re-evaluate competency and sweep up personal records were made unilaterally, with only the judge's and perhaps the prosecutor's viewpoints considered. Mr. Guertin had zero chance to respond or object before the orders were signed.

2. Why This is a Problem

Such ex parte or one-sided action in an adversarial proceeding is a due process failure. Fundamental fairness requires that if the court is contemplating an action as severe as suspending the case and ordering mental health interventions, the defendant (or his counsel) should be heard. Here, Mr. Guertin was literally in the room yet effectively had no voice. This undermines confidence that the decision was impartial or fully informed. It's especially problematic because the orders intrude on significant rights (e.g. medical privacy via the navigator, liberty via potential commitment). By not allowing any argument, the court denied Mr. Guertin the basic right to contest the need for another eval or to remind the court of the recent competency ruling. It conveys the appearance of a pre-determined outcome, not a fair hearing.

3. Evidence

"These orders were entered ex parte, at a proceeding where Mr. Guertin was present but effectively silenced...". This line confirms that the defense had no opportunity to participate in the decision. The emergency

motion further points out no party motioned for these orders, indicating the judge acted on her own without adversarial process.

4. Confidence

High. It's incontrovertible that Mr. Guertin wasn't heard – even the State didn't formally move for the eval. This secretive approach is a clear procedural wrong.

E. | Issue: “Competency Loop” Causing Indefinite Delay

1. What the Court Did

With the April 29 re-evaluation order, the court put Mr. Guertin back into the cycle of competency assessments that had already stalled his case for nearly two years. The new eval meant the criminal proceedings were stayed again, and a review set for mid-July 2025. In effect, every time Mr. Guertin attempts to advance his defense, the case resets to a mental health inquiry. This can repeat indefinitely (find competent → defendant asserts defense → court doubts → find incompetent → treatment, and so on).

2. Why This is a Problem

This is a serious due process and speedy trial concern. Mr. Guertin's case cannot progress while competency is unresolved. By repeatedly questioning competency without strong cause, the court can keep him in a state of legal limbo, potentially for months or years, without ever reaching the merits of the charges or his claims. It creates a risk of abuse: a court could avoid a troublesome or embarrassing issue (like Mr. Guertin's allegations of fraud) by cycling the defendant through competency proceedings to stall or avoid a trial. For Mr. Guertin, who has already spent two years fighting just to be found competent, this loop is effectively denying him his day in court. It could also be leveraged to pressure a

defendant into dropping certain arguments (for fear of being deemed insane if he persists). The pattern here – competent on April 3, then new eval on April 29 just due to filings – exemplifies what Mr. Guertin calls a “synthetic incompetency” trap. It’s damaging because it may lead to indefinite confinement (if found incompetent again, he could be committed) without a verdict on the actual charges.

3. Evidence

“All progress on Mr. Guertin’s motion to dismiss and on the case-in-chief is now frozen pending a months-long psychiatric re-evaluation (a review hearing is scheduled for July 15, 2025). Mr. Guertin – who just weeks prior stood ready to finally confront the charges... – is thrust back into limbo, forced to prove his sanity rather than being allowed to prove his innocence.”. This vividly describes the looping effect and delay. Also, historically he was found incompetent in 2023 and 2024, showing a cycle. The defense affidavit argues this is intentional: *“by constructing years of ‘court history’ of repeated incompetency, they could eventually hold him indefinitely while claiming due process.”*.

4. Confidence

Medium. It’s undeniable that the new eval paused the case and that repeated competency holds cause delay. The concern about indefinite or strategic use of the loop is an allegation, but given the history and timing, it’s a plausible one.

V. CONTRADICTIONS THAT NON-LAWYERS CAN UNDERSTAND

A. | Competency Flip-Flop

On April 3, the court unequivocally declared, “Ultimately, the Court finds Mr. Guertin is competent.” yet on April 29 the same court system abruptly acted as if he might not be competent after all – ordering a new psych exam “with no new facts at all – because there were none.”. In plain terms: one judge said he’s fine, then weeks later another judge hit the reset button without any new reason.

B. | Credible or Crazy?

The April 3 competency order admits the court had “no basis upon which it can discount Mr. Guertin’s... credible testimony about his past professional career” – acknowledging that his work history and expertise appeared legitimate – but in the very next breath the order calls his belief that Netflix stole his ideas “fantastical and paranoid.”. So, the court basically said “we believe you’re a real professional, but we don’t believe what you professionally claim happened to you.” This mixed message is confusing: is he credible or not?

C. | Using His Evidence Against Him

Mr. Guertin’s April 16 motion carefully did not present his patent-theft saga as a legal defense to the gun charges – it was mentioned only to explain why he was labeled delusional (he wasn’t claiming a “patent defense” in court). Nonetheless, the court took those mentions and “recast [them] as evidence of possible mental instability,” using his own words to justify a new competency test. In short, the more evidence and context he provided, the more the court viewed him as crazy, which is a head-spinning contradiction.

D. | Voice Then Silence

During the March 5 hearing, Mr. Guertin “provided extensive testimony” in person, telling his side of the story for the record. But at the April 29 proceeding, when life-altering orders were issued, he was “present but effectively silenced” – not allowed to utter a word in his defense. So, one day the court actively listens to him, and on another day the court doesn’t let him speak at all.

VI. EVIDENCE STRENGTH SNAPSHOT

A. | Strongly Supported

Certain defense claims are backed by robust, concrete evidence from the record. For example, Mr. Guertin’s allegation that key digital evidence was manipulated is strongly supported by side-by-side image comparisons and file metadata. In his Feb 28 filing, he included a flipbook (Exhibit C) showing the exact visual discrepancies – the same crime-scene photo in August 2023 versus February 2025, where one was intentionally resized (“squished”) to hide differences. He also provided OneDrive chain-of-custody logs (Exhibit D) proving which images were officially in discovery, bolstering the authenticity of his evidence. This technical evidence leaves little doubt that the prosecution’s photo evidence was altered, a fact an independent reviewer could verify. Additionally, the competency of Mr. Guertin himself (his ability to understand proceedings) is strongly evidenced by the transcripts and filings: he wrote extensive, coherent legal arguments, navigated court procedure on his own, and even the judge noted he understood the charges and court process well. The court’s finding of competency on April 3 confirms that by legal standards he had the capacity to participate – a point strongly in his favor. These points – evidence tampering and basic legal competency – are grounded in hard proof (documents, transcripts, technical data), making them solid pillars of his defense.

B. | Partially Supported

Some of Mr. Guertin's claims have some evidence behind them but require further investigation or corroboration. One example is the claim of fraudulent or fabricated psychiatric evaluations. Mr. Guertin suspects that the Rule 20 competency reports on him were not just mistaken, but knowingly falsified. He points to irregularities, such as an administrative employee (not a doctor) apparently authoring one of his past evaluation reports. In his motion, he names a staffer (Ms. Chela Guzman-Wiegert) whom he believes actually wrote a psychologist's report, and he seeks an evidentiary hearing to prove this. There is some support for this – possibly metadata or internal emails that he uncovered – which justifies further inquiry. However, without live testimony or an admission, this remains an allegation with partial documentary support. Similarly, Mr. Guertin's broader suggestion that there is a pattern of court cases ("synthetic" cases) used to entrap him is partially supported by data he collected. He analyzed court records and found over 160 cases with eerily similar patterns (defendants repeatedly ruled incompetent under the same judge, etc.), and even found a mysterious name ("Kristen Otte") listed as an evaluator in his own case who never actually saw him. These are compelling anomalies – for instance, an evaluator's name inserted into the system with no actual evaluation – which suggest something is amiss. They lend credence to his claim of a coordinated effort to paint him as mentally ill. Still, the existence of a pattern doesn't conclusively prove who orchestrated it or why. The evidence is enough to raise suspicion and should be verified by independent means (for example, by subpoenaing the records or individuals involved), but on its own it's not a full proof of a conspiracy. In short, these points have evidence-based smoke, but more investigation is needed to find the fire.

C. | Needs More Proof

A few of Mr. Guertin's most extraordinary allegations remain unproven and require much more evidence before they can be accepted. Chief among them is the idea that there is a grand, years-long conspiracy involving court officials, prosecutors, and possibly corporate actors (like Netflix) all working in concert to "make Guertin vanish.". He alleges that a "synthetic judicial ecosystem" was built around him – including fake court cases dating back to 2017 to lay groundwork, fabricated dockets, and planted individuals – solely to engineer his indefinite detention. He even posits that out of an entire pool of cases, "his was the only truly real case... The rest were synthetic 'ballast' created to envelop and isolate him.". These claims are extraordinary in scope. While he has pointed out some intriguing coincidences and irregularities (as noted above), proving a conspiracy of that magnitude would require independent investigation, testimony, and likely intervention by law enforcement or higher courts. As of now, no neutral authority has confirmed such a scheme. There's also Mr. Guertin's underlying claim that Netflix/Microsoft stole his patented technology, which is the backdrop for why he believes he was targeted. That claim, too, falls in this category – it's outside the criminal case's scope and would need its own proof (patent records, etc.) to substantiate. In summary, the sweeping narrative that all these moving parts (corporations, fake cases, fraudulent doctors, court personnel) were deliberately coordinated against him is not yet backed by proof that meets a general public's "proof beyond coincidence" threshold. It's a theory built on circumstantial evidence that, while not implausible, remains unverified. These are points where a healthy skepticism remains until more concrete evidence emerges.

VII. FINAL TAKEAWAYS: 10 CONCLUSIONS

1. | Competency Battles Defined the Case

From February to May 2025, the biggest fights in Mr. Guertin’s case weren’t about the gun charges – they were about whether he was mentally fit to stand trial. This issue overshadowed everything else, determining if and when the actual facts of the case would be heard.

2. | Guertin Demonstrated Competence (According to Judge Koch)

On April 3, 2025, a judge officially found Mr. Guertin competent to proceed. The judge acknowledged that Guertin understood the charges and the court process, despite his unusual claims about being wronged by big tech. This was a green light for Mr. Guertin to actively fight his case.

3. | Alleged Evidence Tampering is at the Heart of His Defense

Mr. Guertin isn’t just claiming clerical errors – he presented tangible evidence that key digital evidence (like crime scene photos) in his case was manipulated or falsified. He even created a visual flipbook to show side-by-side how images were distorted. In short, he believes he can prove the government tampered with evidence to incriminate him or declare him incompetent.

4. | Guertin Alleges a High-Level Fraud/Conspiracy

Beyond the immediate evidence, Mr. Guertin has a broader theory that there’s a coordinated effort to frame him as mentally ill and “contain” him. He submitted data suggesting dozens of other court cases might have been fake or orchestrated similarly to make his situation look normal. This includes a claim that a phantom evaluator was inserted in his case records. These allegations are very unusual – essentially that he’s the target of a “synthetic” prosecution scheme – and they go far beyond a typical criminal defense.

5. | Public Defenders vs. Guertin – a Breakdown in Trust

By late February 2025, Mr. Guertin lost confidence in his court-appointed lawyers. He felt they were not responding or acting on crucial information (like the discovery fraud issues). That’s why he started filing things on his own. Eventually, he formally asked to fire them and represent himself. This is a key dynamic: Guertin believed only he would properly raise the issues of fraud, whereas his attorneys may have been more cautious or skeptical, leading to friction.

6. | Court’s Unusual April 29 Move (Competency Redux)

Just when it looked like the case would move forward (after Guertin was found competent and filed his big motion), Judge Sarah Hudleston made a highly unexpected move on April 29, 2025: she ordered a new competency evaluation and halted the case. No new incident happened to prompt this; instead, the judge pointed to Guertin’s own filings and essentially said, “these claims seem crazy, let’s check him again.” This reversed the April 3 decision in practice and put everything on pause.

7. | Guertin’s Defense Claims Were Turned Against Him

The rationale for the new psych exam was basically that Mr. Guertin’s allegations (of a grand conspiracy involving patent theft and systemic fraud) sounded delusional to the court. In a twist, the more vigorously Guertin defended himself and detailed the alleged fraud, the more the court doubted his sanity. This comes across as a catch-22 – if he fights too hard or mentions “big” conspiratorial-sounding stuff, the court moves to treat him as incompetent again.

8. | Procedural Fairness Issues Arose

There are signs that Mr. Guertin didn’t get to fully exercise his rights during this period. Notably, when Judge Hudleston reopened the competency question on April 29, Mr. Guertin was not allowed to speak in court to object or respond. His

request to represent himself was essentially ignored at that hearing. Decisions were made largely behind the scenes or without adversarial input, which is unusual and has been criticized in his filings as unfair.

9. | Case Stalled Again – Clock Ticking

As of May 7, 2025, instead of gearing up for trial or a hearing on the evidence tampering, Mr. Guertin's case is stalled in another competency review. A new psychiatric evaluation was ordered and a review set for mid-July 2025, meaning at least a few more months of delay. Mr. Guertin has essentially been put back on the slow track, despite already spending a long time being evaluated before.

10. | Guertin is Fighting Back (Emergency Motion)

Mr. Guertin did not accept the April 29 development quietly. He (through an emergency motion on May 7) is actively fighting to cancel those orders and get the case moving on the merits. In that motion, he accuses the court of overstepping and even suggests the judge acted to shield the prosecution from his misconduct claims. This shows he's still vigorously pursuing his defense and trying to hold the court to account, even as he navigates the technicalities of procedure.

VIII. 5 OPEN QUESTIONS

1. | Will the court allow Mr. Guertin to represent himself?

So far, his self-representation request hasn't been truly addressed. Will the judge grant him the right to go pro se, and under what conditions? If they continue to ignore or deny it, that could become a major appellate issue or source of controversy.

2. | What will the new competency evaluation find – and who will conduct it?

After April 29, a new exam was ordered. Will a different psychologist examine Mr. Guertin, and could they possibly conclude something different (incompetent or competent)? Given the prior history, the outcome of this evaluation is critical. If it declares him incompetent again, the case enters a whole new phase (likely civil commitment). If it still finds him competent, it might underscore that the April 29 orders were unnecessary. How impartial and thorough this next eval is remains a question.

3. | Can Mr. Guertin's claims of evidence tampering and fraud be independently verified?

He has provided a lot of technical detail suggesting evidence was faked and court records manipulated. Will any independent expert, investigator, or perhaps higher court take a look at those claims? So far, only Mr. Guertin and those he accuses have engaged with this evidence. An open question is whether, for example, a forensic expert or an oversight body will audit the files to confirm or debunk his allegations of fabricated photos and reports.

4. | How will the higher courts respond, if at all?

Mr. Guertin's emergency motion hints at possibly asking the Court of Appeals to intervene. If the trial court refuses to budge, will an appellate court step in to examine whether Judge Hudleston's actions were lawful? And if Mr. Guertin remains stuck in limbo, might he file a separate appeal or petition (like for violating speedy trial or due process)? This case might not stay confined to one courtroom.

5. | Is there more to the alleged conspiracy?

Mr. Guertin's accusations involve a lot of moving parts (from a scheme to alter Wayback Machine archives to supposedly fake court cases). Are any journalists, watchdogs, or law enforcement agencies looking into these broader claims? Or any of the individuals named (like the mysterious evaluator or the people handling evidence) offering explanations? Right now, many of Guertin's more explosive claims are one-sided. It remains to be seen if additional information surfaces – either corroborating his story or providing innocent explanations for the patterns he identified.

IX. SOURCE FILES

All source files are embedded within this pdf file in a zip file named “source_files.zip”