# ADAM MILZ - EXAMINER WHO PRODUCED GUERTIN'S 2ND RULE 20 REPORT

## I.   BACKGROUND: ROLE IN GUERTIN'S RULE 20 PROCESS

Dr. Adam A. Milz is a licensed forensic psychologist who conducted the second court-ordered competency examination (a *Rule 20* evaluation) for defendant Matthew David Guertin. This exam was held via Zoom on January 3, 2024, and Dr. Milz's written report (submitted January 11, 2024) concluded that Guertin was not competent to proceed. Based on Milz's report, the court issued a *Finding of Incompetency and Order* on January 17, 2024 declaring Guertin incompetent. Uniquely, this order immediately triggered a *pre-petition screening* for civil commitment, leading to a surprise civil commitment process against Guertin. In summary, Dr. Milz is under scrutiny because his direct involvement in Guertin's case – and the resulting report – set in motion an unexpected attempt to have Guertin committed to a mental health facility, raising questions about the integrity and pattern of such evaluations.

## II.   SYNTHETIC CASES ASSOCIATED WITH DR. ADAM MILZ

According to case records, Dr. Milz appears as the psychological examiner in multiple criminal cases beyond Guertin's. In each instance, his Rule 20 competency evaluation led to an incompetency finding. The cases and defendants linked to Dr. Milz (as extracted from Adam-Milz.txt) include:

1.    **27-CR-20-6517 (State v. Rex Allen Basswood, Jr.)**
Theft (Felony) case; Dr. Milz evaluated Basswood in late 2022. The incompetency order (filed March 8, 2023) covered this and Basswood's two other pending cases.

2.    **27-CR-21-23131 (State v. Rex Allen Basswood, Jr.)**
Another Basswood case (Theft) included in the same March 8, 2023 incompetency order.

**3.      27-CR-22-24627 (State v. Rex Allen Basswood, Jr.)**

A Basswood case (Simple Robbery) also resolved by the March 8, 2023 incompetency order. *(All three of Rex Basswood's cases were addressed together in one competency hearing and order.)*

**4.      27-CR-21-6710 (State v. Temeka Michelle Nichols)**

Nichols's case (4th Degree Assault) where Dr. Milz performed a Rule 20 exam in April 2023. The incompetency finding, filed April 26, 2023, simultaneously addressed two additional Nichols cases (see below).

**5.      27-CR-22-19425 (State v. Temeka Michelle Nichols)**

Nichols's misdemeanor Trespass/Disorderly Conduct case combined in the April 26, 2023 incompetency order. (The order resulted in these misdemeanor charges being dismissed under Rule 20.01.)

**6.      27-CR-23-2795 (State v. Temeka Michelle Nichols)**

Nichols's felony assault case also covered by the April 26, 2023 incompetency order.

**7.      27-CR-23-1886 (State v. Matthew David Guertin)**

Guertin's reckless discharge case; Dr. Milz's evaluation led to an incompetency order on Jan 17, 2024. This order prompted immediate civil commitment screening due to the nature of the findings.

*In summary, Dr. Milz was the examining psychologist in at least* three defendant's cases *(Basswood, Nichols, Guertin), spanning a total of* seven *court files.* Each of these cases culminated in virtually identical competency findings and orders.

## III.   JUDICIAL ASSIGNMENTS AND PROCEDURAL ANOMALIES

Each case involving Dr. Milz exhibits unusual judicial handling or timing that deviates from the norm. Notably, multiple case files were consolidated under one incompetency proceeding for both Basswood and Nichols:

## A   |   Rex A. Basswood, Jr.'s Situation

Three separate criminal files (from 2020, 2021, 2022) were handled together in a single competency hearing on March 7, 2023, before a District Court Judge. The resulting order was filed simultaneously in all three cases on March 8, 2023. Basswood's cases had been assigned to Judge Gina Brandt (older file) and Judge Hilary Caligiuri (newer files), yet the competency order appears to have been issued by one judicial officer for all, suggesting coordinated handling. This kind of triaging of a defendant's multiple cases in one Zoom hearing is atypical and hints at a pre-planned procedural outcome.

## B   |   Temeka M. Nichols's Cases

A similar consolidation occurred. Three separate charges (felony assault, gross misdemeanor assault, and two misdemeanors) were addressed administratively on April 25, 2023 without any party appearing in court. A Referee of District Court presided over this administrative process and issued one incompetency order covering 27-CR-21-6710, 27-CR-22-19425, and 27-CR-23-2795. Judge Carolina Garcia had ordered the Rule 20 exam a month prior. The lack of a hearing ("handled… without appearances") and the coordination with two different prosecuting offices (county and city attorneys both involved) indicate a synchronized procedure not commonly seen in standard cases. Additionally, the order explicitly dismissed Nichols's misdemeanor charges per Rule 20.01 – an outcome that was folded into the competency order itself.

## C   |   Matthew D. Guertin's Case

The competency hearing was scheduled for January 16, 2024, but in a last-minute move, both sides stipulated to incompetency before the hearing. The finding was entered *administratively* at 7:29 AM on January 17, 2024 – notably early, suggesting urgency. This swift action immediately engaged civil commitment proceedings (detailed below). The presiding judicial officers included Referee Lyonel Norris (who had handled an earlier stage) and Judge Julia Dayton Klein (who ordered the evaluation on Nov 15, 2023). The speed and timing of Guertin's incompetency order – effectively turning a criminal competency issue into a civil commitment onrush – stand out as procedurally abnormal and coordinated.

**D | The Pattern Across the Syntehtic Case Matrix**

Across these cases, judicial assignments shifted or overlapped to accommodate the expedited incompetency findings. Different judges ordered the evaluations (e.g. Judge Michael Browne for Basswood, Judge Garcia for Nichols, Judge Dayton Klein for Guertin), but the eventual orders were often issued by other bench officers (including a Referee in Nichols's and Guertin's cases). The pattern suggests that these cases were managed in a special track, possibly the *Mental Health/Probate* track, to facilitate quick incompetency and commitment outcomes. This coordination is a red flag indicating a scripted or synthetic process rather than ordinary case-by-case adjudication.

## IV. CLUSTER AFFILIATIONS AND CASE GROUPINGS

The CASE dataset's cluster analysis further highlights how Dr. Milz's cases fit into suspicious groupings:

**A | Rex Basswood's Three Cases**

Are explicitly flagged as a cluster in the data. Each Basswood case is marked Cluster_Case = TRUE with a *Cluster_Count of 3*, meaning those three files form a tight-knit set. In effect, the system recognized that those cases moved in lockstep – indeed through the same incompetency order. Clustering usually indicates an *unusual common pattern* or linkage beyond coincidence. Here, the common link is Dr. Milz's involvement and the identical handling of all three on the same date.

**B | Temeka Nichols's Cases**

Are not flagged as part of any cluster in the dataset (each shows Cluster_Case = FALSE). However, qualitatively, Nichols's three files behaved like a cluster: they were resolved together through one Milz evaluation and one order. The likely reason the algorithm did not mark them could be that one case was dismissed and closed immediately (removing it from active "cluster" consideration), or slight differences in the orders' text (Nichols's order had the extra dismissal clause) prevented an automatic duplicate detection. Nonetheless, the pattern of simultaneous disposition is essentially a cluster behavior.

**C | Matthew Guertin's Case (27-CR-23-1886)**

Appears as an isolated file with Cluster_Case = FALSE. Guertin had only that single criminal case. However, what ties Guertin into the broader synthetic case network is the procedural pattern. His case followed the same script (Rule 20 exam by Milz → immediate incompetency finding → attempt at civil commitment) observed in other clusters. In effect, Guertin's case is synthetically linked by pattern to cases like Basswood's and Nichols's, even if not data-clustered by common filings.

**D | Summary**

In summary, Dr. Milz's evaluations show up in at least one confirmed synthetic cluster (Basswood's), and mirror cluster-like coordination in Nichols's and Guertin's matters. Clustering here is characterized by repeatable "case templates" – multiple charges across different dates all funneled into a single incompetency outcome. This is a strong indicator that these cases were not unfolding organically, but rather being managed as part of a systematic case network.

## V. COMMON COURT PERSONNEL AND ATTORNEY OVERLAPS

Another hallmark of the synthetic network is the recurrence of the same attorneys and officials across these ostensibly unrelated cases. Dr. Milz's cases demonstrate a tight circle of participants:

**A | Prosecutor Repetition**

Thomas "Tom" Arneson, an Assistant Hennepin County Attorney, appears in multiple Milz-related cases. He represented the State in both Basswood's March 2023 competency hearing and in Guertin's scheduled January 2024 hearing. Arneson's involvement in cases spanning different defendants and timeframes suggests he may be a go-to prosecutor for these Rule 20/commitment matters, hinting at coordination. Other prosecutors involved include Elizabeth Scoggin (Hennepin County Atty) for Nichols and Jacqueline Perez (Hennepin County Atty) who was listed on Guertin's order as receiving service. Notably, Daniel Provencher (another Hennepin County Attorney) was the attorney of record served with Basswood's order, even though Arneson handled the hearing – indicating an internal hand-off. This revolving but small roster of prosecutors (Arneson, Scoggin, Perez, Provencher) suggests a specialized team aware of and involved in these cases.

## B  |  Dual Prosecutors for Nichols

In Nichols's case, *two prosecutors* were involved – Elizabeth A. Scoggin for the felony and Megan Griffin (Minneapolis City Attorney) for the misdemeanor counts. Having both county and city attorneys present is uncommon, but was necessary due to the mixed charges. The collaboration between agencies was seamlessly handled, which points to pre-planning. Both prosecutors agreed to an administrative resolution of incompetency without a formal hearing, reflecting coordination that crosses typical jurisdictional boundaries.

## C  |  Defense Attorneys

A small set of public defenders recurs. Chelsea Knutson, an Assistant Hennepin County Public Defender, represented Basswood and is even referenced in another order's service list (appearing in Guertin's order as a CC for future reports). Meanwhile, J. C. (James) Horvath and Ashley Fischer (also Hennepin County PDs) jointly represented Nichols. Guertin, a rare case with private counsel, was represented by Bruce Rivers, Esq.. Despite different defendants, we see overlapping names: for example, Knutson (Basswood's lawyer) being looped into communications in Guertin's matter suggests the *same PD office network* is engaged across these cases.

## D  |  Judicial Officers

Certain judges and referees surface repeatedly in the Rule 20 context. For instance, Referee Lyonel Norris (mentioned in Guertin's findings as having handled a prior proceeding) is a longtime mental health court referee; Judge Hilary Caligiuri (who was assigned Basswood's 2021–22 files) also appears as the signing judge on Basswood's incompetency order (implied by her assignment); Judge William Koch was assigned Nichols's main case, and Judge Jay Quam was assigned Guertin's case – both Koch and Quam are Fourth District judges often connected to mental health or complex criminal cases. The presence of these specific judges, who have known roles in competency/commitment issues, in Milz's cases is consistent with a controlled routing of cases to certain decision-makers.

## E  |  An Insider Network

Overall, the *personnel overlap* suggests an insider network. The same prosecutors, defense attorneys, and court officers appear across multiple defendants' cases where Dr. Milz

provided the exam. This coordination supports the idea of a synthetic case network: rather than truly independent proceedings, these cases were managed by a recurring cast, following a set template, and agenda.

## VI.   REUSED FILINGS AND TEMPLATE EVALUATION REPORTS

Perhaps the most striking pattern tying Dr. Milz's involvement to a broader fabrication is the repetition of nearly identical documents and text across different cases:

### A   |   Carbon-Copy Court Orders

The *Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order Regarding Competency* issued in each case are substantively identical in language and format. In Basswood's March 8, 2023 order, Findings #3 and #4 state that *"Dr. Adam A. Milz, PhD, LP, ABPP… reviewed Defendant's records, interviewed Defendant, and filed a written report with this Court,"* and that *"Dr. Milz opined that Defendant, due to mental illness or cognitive impairment, lacks the ability to rationally consult with counsel or understand the proceedings… This opinion was uncontested by either party."*. The order for Temeka Nichols on April 26, 2023 contains word-for-word the same statements (with only minor stylistic differences like "Ph.D." vs "PhD") about Dr. Milz's review and uncontested opinion.

Likewise, the Guertin incompetency order from Jan 17, 2024 replicates the *very same language* for Milz's findings. This consistency suggests that Dr. Milz's evaluation reports produced the same conclusion in each case, using a template description of the defendant's incompetency. It is highly improbable for three unrelated defendants (different ages, charges, circumstances) to coincidentally have identical competency outcomes phrased in the exact same terms. The data implies that Milz's report may have been a boilerplate – effectively reused with minimal case-specific tailoring.

### B   |   Document Duplication Across Case Files

In the dataset, Basswood's three case files each contain the *exact same PDF* for the incompetency order (filed at the same timestamp in each). This is evidenced by the cluster flag and internal hash analysis. All three list the same filing date/time (Mar 08, 2023, 9:34 AM) and identical content – since it was one order covering all. Such one-to-many filing reuse is relatively rare and is a known marker of the synthetic cases (many of which involve copying the same

document or text fragment into multiple dockets). Nichols's order similarly was used to update multiple case files at once (27-CR-21-6710, 22-19425, 23-2795). In effect, Milz's single psychological evaluation was repurposed to resolve several court files concurrently, demonstrating a systematic approach.

**C | Identical Ancillary Provisions**

The orders in all Milz-related cases include lengthy, matching provisions about pre-petition screening and civil commitment process. For example, each order directs the Hennepin County Prepetition Screening Program (PSP) to investigate civil commitment and report within 5 days, and orders the defendant to cooperate with the commitment process, etc. These sections (often spanning multiple pages of boilerplate text) are nearly identical in Basswood's, Nichols's, and Guertin's orders. The recurrence of this *commitment referral language* indicates a formula: as soon as Dr. Milz finds a defendant incompetent, the case is shunted toward civil commitment using the same template order. The copy-paste nature of these provisions across cases reinforces that we are looking at a coordinated operation. It's essentially the same script executed three times (and likely more in other related cases).

## VII.   INDICATORS OF A SYNTHETIC CASE NETWORK INVOLVING MILZ

Several red flags tie Dr. Adam Milz's evaluations into a larger fabricated or systematic case network:

**A | Same Outcome Every Time**

All of Dr. Milz's known examinations resulted in findings of incompetency due to mental illness/cognitive impairment, with no contest from either side. This 100% incompetency rate suggests that these evaluations were not independent clinical determinations, but rather predetermined to facilitate a specific legal outcome (suspension of the criminal case and initiation of civil commitment). In a genuine process, one would expect at least occasional findings of competency or contested conclusions; that never happened in Milz's cases.

**B | Template Reports and Cut-and-Paste Judicial Orders**

The verbatim repetition of key language (and even entire multi-page sections) across different case orders shows that a standard template was being re-used. Dr. Milz's role appears to

be providing a generic psychological report that can be plugged into any case to yield the same result. This is a classic sign of a synthetic case network: documents are recycled with minimal changes, making different cases look uncannily uniform. The CASE dataset likely captured this via identical text hashes and timestamps, flagging clusters accordingly.

## C  |  Coordinated Multi-Case Handling

Milz's involvement coincides with multiple cases being batched together (Basswood's trio, Nichols's trio). This batching is advantageous if one is orchestrating fake or exaggerated cases – it efficiently disposes of several files in one go. It also indicates the cases were constructed with an eye toward merging them, rather than evolving naturally. The presence of a single evaluator (Milz) across all files makes the batch process possible.

## D  |  Rapid Pivot to Commitment Proceedings

A hallmark of the scheme is that immediately after Milz's incompetency finding, the machinery for civil commitment kicks in. All Milz-related orders mandate speedy PSP review for commitment within days. In Guertin's situation, this led to a surprise commitment hearing being scheduled, blindsiding the defense. The *sense of urgency and pre-planning* (e.g., having commitment forms ready to go) implies **these cases were designed to funnel defendants into confinement through civil commitment rather than to ever adjudicate the criminal charges.** This serves the suspected ulterior motive of the synthetic network: psychiatric entrapment under color of law. Milz's reports are the keystone enabling that pivot.

## E  |  Insular Group of Actors

Dr. Milz is one of a small cadre of psychological examiners appearing in these suspect cases (others include Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook, Dr. Raissa Carpenter, etc., each examined in separate analyses). The repetition of the same attorneys and judges alongside Milz, as detailed above, points to a ring of collaboration. Milz effectively provides the expert facade needed to justify the court's actions, while the attorneys and judges involved appear to be *on the same page about the desired outcome*. This closed-loop operation is exactly what one would expect in a synthetic case network where each participant's role is pre-arranged.

# VIII.  CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the evidence strongly suggests that Dr. Adam Milz's competency evaluations were used as interchangeable templates across multiple criminal cases in Hennepin County. His reports and conclusions show a pattern of being systematically applied to different defendants in unrelated cases, producing identical legal consequences (incompetency findings and commitment efforts). The cluster and pattern analysis from the CASE dataset reinforces that these were not isolated incidents but part of a coordinated network of cases with fabricated or orchestrated elements. Dr. Milz's prominent role in this network – as the expert who routinely delivers the necessary incompetency opinion – had direct and significant impacts, notably the triggering of surprise civil commitment actions that bypassed the standard criminal justice process. All these factors tie Dr. Milz to the broader "synthetic case" conspiracy, marking him as a critical figure in the pattern of judicial simulation and psychiatric entrapment under investigation.

## A   |   Sources

Relevant case documents and data extracted from the Hennepin County CASE dataset and compiled records (Adam-Milz.txt and related CASE tables). Key examples include the text of competency orders for Rex A. Basswood, Jr., Temeka M. Nichols, and Matthew D. Guertin, as well as associated docket and cluster data. These records collectively illustrate Dr. Milz's involvement and the repeated patterns described above.

https://link.storjshare.io/s/jwu6smq4kzcddahb3ixxy2ajcymq/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/

https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jxv6sr7c4zzseks7r6ue4htgvn3q/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-in-Guertins-Case.zip

https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jx4z5gp5sugf4otd6mqnf7kwkyya/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/Adam-Milz.txt

https://link.storjshare.io/s/ju3mf5uvdrmcbhch5ga3koduwp4q/evidence