

The defendant used the Minnesota Judicial Branch 'Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO)' system to conduct a 'Hearing Search' for each of the three 'Judicial Officer's' that are heavily involved (to the point of the defendant believing it is affecting the fairness/prejudice/impartiality of his case) in making decisions and rulings in his criminal court proceedings related to case # '27-CR-23-1885' which is under the jurisdiction of the 4th Judicial District Court in Hennepin County, MN.

The three Judicial Officer's the defendant is concerned about in relation to his criminal proceedings and who he conducted the hearing search in order to conduct the statistical analysis and overview being presented herein are:

Judge: Julia Dayton Klein

Court Referee: Danielle C Mercurio

Court Referee: George Borer

The defendant believes that the involvement of these three judicial officers in his criminal case, which contains a litany of procedural and other issues related to record handling as well as substantiated, and very serious concerns regarding the professional conduct of both his criminal defense attorney as well as Judicial Officers and the the Hennepin County Courts overall related to the handling of his case thus far is rather noteworthy due to the fact that all three of their official roles within the Hennepin County District Court as indicated on the website www.MnCourts.gov/Hennepin > Judges & Referees > Probate / Mental Health Court is as follows:

Probate/Mental Health Judge

Browne, Michael K. (Presiding Judge)

Dayton Klein, Julia

Probate/Mental Health Court Referees

Borer, George

Mercurio, Danielle

Skibbie, Lori

- where the official role of the 'Probate / Mental Health Court' on the MnCourts.gov website is outlined as the following verbatim description:

Hennepin Probate / Mental Health Court

Probate Court handles cases involving the property of deceased persons, wills, trusts, guardianships and conservatorships.

Mental Health Court handles the legal process involving the civil commitment of people to treatment centers based on allegations of mental illness, developmental disability, chemical dependency, and referrals from Criminal Court.

with the 'Civil Commitments (Mental Health)' > 'Laws & Rules' section of the website simply stating the following verbatim excerpt:

The Mental Health Unit is governed by **MN Statutes § 253B**.

The online search that the defendant conducted used the courts own online records system for the purpose of extracting data that the defendant could then further analyze and conduct research into as part of his broader efforts of not only addressing the many issues occurring in his criminal and civil commitment court proceeding used the website 'publicaccess.courts.state.mn.us/HearingSearch'

The defendant conducted a separate search FOR EACH of the three judicial officers, by name, which was based on the 'Hearing' results returned, having occurred within the date range of January 1, 2023 – April 26, 2024

Two separate 'Case Category' filters were used FOR EACH Judicial Officer – 'Criminal' and 'Probate or Mental Health' – Meaning that that defendant undertook a total of 6 searches, where the defendant collected two separate 'Hearing' histories related to each of the three Judicial Officers where each of the two resulting historical records contained either their criminal court hearings, or their probate / mental health (civil) court hearings. The defendant then processed and filtered the rather large amount of data he had collected by implementing various Python scripts which he created especially for the task of 'processing' and making sense out of the data and how it might relate, and potentially support the concerns he currently has about in his own case, in a more broad context.

The results of the defendant's personal undertaking of conducting an in depth, and irrefutable 'forensic analysis' in which he is supporting and substantiating his own concerns and ultimate conclusions regarding his criminal and civil court proceedings, is a rather profound and compelling presentation due to the fact that the data used to conduct the analysis being presented is in fact nothing more than the courts own records itself which cannot be altered/disputed/or challenged in any way whatsoever – meaning that the defendant's efforts to defend himself now hinge entirely on the interpretation of the data itself as opposed to any argument against the source or validity of the data that was used in order to produce the defendants statistical analysis.

The following are the results of the defendant's analysis and research into the criminal and civil court 'hearing history' for the three Judicial Officer's which is preceded with a brief overview of 'how' the defendant processed the data and a detailed description of 'what' exactly the data pertains to for the purpose of providing every single detail needed in order to help the defendant further process these results in way which maintains the overall simplicity of the results (insofar as the defendant having to essentially 'draw the line' somewhere as otherwise the overall analysis could very easily become a massive project involving a thorough and in depth analysis of each of the particular 'matching cases' themselves and the individual timeline 'case events' pertaining to the individual 'matching cases' themselves)

1 – Each of the three judicial officers two case histories (criminal, and civil/mental health) were individually processed based on the originating year of the actual cases themselves as opposed to any correlation of the actual hearing dates themselves that took place. The deliniation between the criminal and civil cases as well as the year the case originated is all contained within the courts official case numbers themselves where 'CR' indicates a criminal case and 'MH-PR' indicates a 'Mental Health / Probate' civil case where a unique criminal case in the court would begin with '27-CR-23-*' if it originated in 2023, and a unique 'Probate / Mental Health' case would begin with '27-MH-PR-19-*' if it originated in 2019. These are provided as a way of better understanding how the case number itself serves as an easy method of filtering, matching, and processing the data collected by defendant.

2 – It is important to rememeber and consider the 'date range' search criteria used for obtaining all of the resulting output figures. Meaning that everything presented was 'tended to' in a court hearing that

HAD to have occurred within the specified time period (which can be viewed simply as '2023 – Current') as the defendant chose April 26, 2024 as the end range due to the fact that it was and still is the last Friday of a full court week prior to the defendant beginning the data collection and gathering process detailed herein. SO – even though the defendant then sorted the resulting cases themselves based on their year of origination as indicated within the case number itself, these dates DO NOT directly correspond to the 'hearing' dates that were included as part of the data being analyzed. I am mentioning this for clarity so that we can arrive at the most solid mathematical and statistical analysis figures, and in turn, the most compelling and 'in your face' argument as to why the resulting data is indicative of a much broader question concerning the impartiality of the current Hennepin County Court system itself in terms of the obvious crossover, and assignment of a very small group of three judicial officer's essentially 'taking over' an entire criminal case even though their explicit role as outlined by the court itself pertains to a completely 'separate' court proceeding – with that being the established and legally defined separation and treatment pertaining to criminal law and civil law as universally understood in a legal context.

3 – The defendant undertook the following process in terms of analyzing/segregating/organizing/filtering of the data he collected:

- All of the 'hearings' for each of the three judicial officer's returned were filtered where a python script sorted through all of the individual hearings and only output a single court case # a single time (for both 'CR' and 'MH-PR' text files) – meaning that the large amount of hearing dates contained within the data contains multiple hearings and events pertaining to the same case (duplicates..) - The defendant is only focused on the individual court cases themselves and NOT the actual hearings or dates of said hearings. The resulting output only contained the first hearing in the list of a particular case and all other were excluded from the output resulting in a list of unique case #'s
- A Python script was ran which then separated/segregated all of the remaining unique court cases by the year of their origination as identified in the case # itself and discussed previously. This resulted in an individual text file for each year of origination of the individual court cases for either criminal ('CR') or mental health ('MH-PR') FOR EACH judicial officer, with all of the resulting outputs then further being sorted and simplified to contain only the actual case # and title of the court case on the same row which were then sorted based on the unique ID of the court case itself ('27-CR-21-XXXX') from lowest to highest value.
- Once this process was complete a Python script was created and ran which used the three individual text files FOR EACH year of origination, where the script then produced an output text file that contained ONLY the court cases that were present in ALL THREE Judicial officer's court case hearing history. SO essentially the final output arrive at consists of all of the cases identified based on year of origination in which ALL THREE judicial officers currently involved in the defendant's criminal court case all had a particular hearing related to said case within the specified 'date range' search criteria used to obtain all of the data initially.

The final output results which I would like help making sense of both from a legal perspective related to the issues surrounding the courts, assignment of judges, impartiality, ethics, etc. AS WELL as being able to produce a statistically significant presentation in which we are using all of the mathematical processes and formula's that exist and would serve to present this in the most powerful, and irrefutable way possible. In regards to the mathematics and statistical analysis I am seeking the simplest way of relaying what I am 'envisioning' in my mind would be similar to the mathematical analysis

related to DNA evidence in a court room setting – where even though there is no such thing as the DNA being a ‘100% match’ it is still viewed as being 100% due to the fact that it is something like ‘99.99987354%’. Obviously the figures for what I have analyzed here are not going to be that significant but I believe that there is a lot that could be revealed further from a proper mathematical approach insofar as further ‘making sense’ of the results and data compiled as a result of my thorough and detailed analysis – mathematical and statistical analysis focused on the crossover between the mathematics and statistical analysis that can be produced which have a strong, and direct correlation to the legal issues identified concerning a small group of judges essentially ‘taking over’ defendant’s (me..) entire court case it would appear.

CRIMINAL CASES:

2016 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 4

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 5

George Borer total unique court cases: 6

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 0

2017 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 11

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 9

George Borer total unique court cases: 11

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 3

2018 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 11

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 24

George Borer total unique court cases: 27

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 4

2019 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 44

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 70

George Borer total unique court cases: 61

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 12

2020 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 120

George Borer total unique court cases: 81

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 108

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 20

2021 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 231

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 253

George Borer total unique court cases: 167

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 41

2022 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 322

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 378

George Borer total unique court cases: 289

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 44

2023 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 424

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 486

George Borer total unique court cases: 244

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 39

2024 Criminal Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 30

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 38

George Borer total unique court cases: 8

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 0

MENTAL HEALTH / PROBATE (CIVIL) CASES:

2020 Mental Health/Probate Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 1

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 1

George Borer total unique court cases: 1

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 0

2021 Mental Health/Probate Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 1

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 3

George Borer total unique court cases: 2

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 0

2022 Mental Health/Probate Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 41

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 81

George Borer total unique court cases: 81

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 1

2023 Mental Health/Probate Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 326

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 322

George Borer total unique court cases: 257

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 8

2024 Mental Health/Probate Cases -

Julia Dayton Klein total unique court cases: 81

Danielle Mercurio total unique court cases: 120

George Borer total unique court cases: 155

Common cases across all three Judicial Officers: 1