

KRISTIN A. OTTE - EXAMINER INSERTED INTO BACK-END ODYSSEY SYSTEM OF GUERTIN'S CASE

Case # 27-CR-23-1886 - State of Minnesota vs MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN

Case Information

Location Hennepin Criminal Downtown	Category Criminal	Case Type Crim/Traf Mandatory
Case Initiation Date 1/24/2023	Case # 27-CR-23-1886	
Assigned to Judge Hudleston, Sarah		

Party Information

Party Type	Party Name	Lead Attorney
Jurisdiction	State of Minnesota	MAWERDI HAMID (+4 m...
Defendant	MATTHEW DAVID GUE...	RAISSA CARPENTER (+...
Examiner	Regional Psychological S...	
Examiner	Kristen Otte	
Examiner	Jill Rogstad	
Examiner	Adam Milz	
Examiner	Katheryn Cranbrook	

1

10 items per page

1 - 7 of 7 items

Enter details for this Party

Party Type
Examiner

First Name
Kristen

Last Name
Otte

Add Another Party

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dr. Kristin A. Otte (Psy.D., LP, ABPP) is repeatedly cited as a forensic psychologist in a series of fabricated court case filings. In the uploaded case documents, Dr. Otte evaluates defendants' mental competency and invariably concludes they are incompetent to stand trial due to mental illness or cognitive impairment. Her findings trigger court orders for indefinite psychiatric commitment. This report documents Dr. Otte's presence and role in all relevant case filings, identifies patterns in the narrative (especially repeated incompetency findings and mental-illness diagnoses leading to civil commitment), quantifies her involvement (eight distinct court filings, totaling ~41 pages in the dataset), and flags anomalies suggestive of fraud – including boilerplate text duplication, procedural errors, and implausibly repetitive scenarios. Finally, we contextualize how Dr. Otte's evaluations serve as a foundational narrative device to justify long-term psychiatric commitments in the synthetic court scheme. All evidence is drawn directly from the provided case texts and data tables.

II. KRISTIN OTTE’S PRESENCE ACROSS CASE FILINGS

Dr. Otte appears as the court-appointed forensic examiner in multiple synthetic criminal cases spanning 2017–2023. In each, she is tasked with assessing the defendant’s competency under Minn. R. Crim. P. 20.01 and her reports are referenced in judicial orders. Key instances include:

A | State v. Adrian Michael Wesley

(Case Nos. 27-CR-17-1555, 27-CR-17-8342, 27-CR-17-22909)

In this 2017 case cluster, Judge Jay Quam ordered a Rule 20.01 evaluation for Mr. Wesley, which Dr. Otte performed as a Senior Clinical Forensic Psychologist. She filed her report on Feb. 17, 2017, diagnosing Wesley with *Other Specified Neurodevelopmental Disorder (Fetal Alcohol exposure)*, *Moderate Intellectual Disability*, and *Unspecified Depressive Disorder*, and opining that he was incompetent to stand trial. Dr. Otte noted Wesley’s “complex” clinical profile (developmental deficits, hearing impairment requiring ASL, aggression, etc.) as factors impeding his ability to participate in his defense. Her evaluation concluded Wesley lacked capacity to consult with counsel or understand proceedings.

Based on this report, Judge Carolina Lamas found Wesley mentally ill/deficient and incompetent on Feb. 21, 2017, and Wesley was subsequently committed to the Minnesota Security Hospital as Mentally Ill and Dangerous on July 27, 2017. Notably, Dr. Otte’s original report was re-used across Wesley’s multiple case files – e.g. the order in case 27-CR-17-8342 expressly attached and incorporated her report from case 27-CR-17-1555. Dr. Otte’s name and findings reappear in at least five court filings tied to Wesley’s cases (2017 incompetency orders in two files, and a combined follow-up order in 2020), underscoring her central role in establishing Wesley’s long-term incompetency narrative.

B | State v. Stephone Ahmad Gammage

(Case No. 27-CR-21-8412)

In April 2021, on charges of Second- and Third-Degree Assault, Judge Hilary Caligiuri ordered a Rule 20.01 competency evaluation. Dr. Otte (with Dr. John Anderson, Ph.D.) was assigned as evaluator, and they “*reviewed the defendant’s records, interviewed the defendant, and filed a written report with the Court.*” Their report concluded that Mr. Gammage, “due to

mental illness or cognitive impairment, lacks the ability to rationally consult with counsel or understand the proceedings,” a conclusion unchallenged by either party. The court’s *Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order* (filed August 31, 2021) adopted Dr. Otte’s opinion and declared Gammage incompetent to stand trial, suspending the criminal case. This order also directed that a civil commitment pre-petition screening be conducted, anticipating possible commitment under the Minnesota Commitment Act. Dr. Otte’s role here is as co-examiner rendering an incompetency opinion that halted the prosecution.

C | State v. Mark Anthony Reinhart

(multiple petty cases: 27-CR-22-13185, 27-CR-22-14723, 27-CR-23-5213, 27-CR-22-7578, 27-CR-22-8532, 27-CR-22-9449, 27-CR-22-10914, 27-CR-22-11384, 27-CR-23-2104)

Mr. Reinhart’s synthetic record spans nine low-level cases in 2022–2023 (trespass, disorderly conduct, indecent exposure, theft, etc.), consolidated for a competency review. On March 9, 2023, Judge Bev Benson found probable cause on these charges and immediately ordered a competency evaluation. Dr. Kristen Otte performed the evaluation, and in an April 11, 2023 hearing, her written report was entered. She “reviewed [Reinhart’s] records, interviewed [him], and filed a report,” concluding that the defendant lacked the capacity to consult or participate in his defense due to mental illness or impairment. The finding was uncontested.

The court’s order, citing Dr. Otte, declared Reinhart incompetent, dismissed all pending misdemeanor charges, and gave the prosecutor 30 days to decide whether to pursue any gross misdemeanors. The proceedings were suspended and Reinhart was routed into the civil commitment process (via Pre-Petition Screening) for potential commitment to a treatment facility. Dr. Otte is thus the linchpin in this 2023 case cluster, providing the expert basis for converting a string of minor offenses into a mental health commitment narrative.

D | State v. William Lee Nabors

(Case Nos. 27-CR-18-26530, 27-CR-19-9270, 27-CR-20-1053, 27-CR-22-3553)

Mr. Nabors, born 1970, had a mix of cases (trespass, transit interference, misdemeanor theft, and a 2022 felony assault) consolidated for a competency determination. After a violent offense in Feb 2022, Judge B. Askalani ordered a Rule 20.01 evaluation on April 20, 2023. Dr.

Otte conducted the exam in this case as well, and her report to the court stated that Mr. Nabors “may be mentally ill or mentally deficient so as to be incompetent to stand trial.” The order recounts that Dr. Otte found the defendant lacked competency, leading the court to conclude he is presently incompetent to stand trial.

Consistent with the pattern, the *Findings and Order* (filed May 24, 2023) suspended the criminal proceedings and initiated civil commitment avenues. Notably, even this order contains the boilerplate line that “*the misdemeanor charge must be dismissed pursuant to Rule 20.01,*” indicating any lesser charges in his cluster should be dropped. Dr. Otte’s evaluation is explicitly referenced as the basis for Nabors’ incompetency finding.

E | Summary of Involvement

Across these cases, Dr. Otte is portrayed as the examiner whose conclusions of “mentally ill and incompetent” provide the legal basis for halting prosecutions and committing defendants. In total, she is named in eight separate court filings in the dataset (spanning four defendant clusters). These filings collectively amount to approximately 41 pages of court orders referencing Dr. Otte’s evaluations.

Table 1 below summarizes the case filings involving Dr. Otte:

Defendant (Case No.)	Year	Dr. Otte’s Role	Outcome
Adrian M. Wesley (27-CR-17-1555 et al.)	2017, 2020	Rule 20.01 Examiner – found incompetent	Incompetent; committed as MI&D
Stephone A. Gammage (27-CR-21-8412)	2021	Co-Examiner – found incompetent	Incompetent; case suspended, commit screening
Mark A. Reinhart (27-CR-22-13185 et al.)	2023	Examiner – found incompetent	Incompetent; misdemeanors dismissed, commit screening
William L. Nabors (27-CR-18-26530 et al.)	2023	Examiner – found incompetent	Incompetent; proceedings suspended, commit process started

(MI&D = *Mentally Ill and Dangerous commitment*)

III. NARRATIVE PATTERNS: INCOMPETENCY FINDINGS AND CIVIL COMMITMENT

The case narratives involving Dr. Otte follow a consistent template engineered to justify long-term psychiatric commitment of the defendants:

A | Triggering Offenses

Each defendant's record shows a pattern of offenses (often minor *and* one more serious charge) that precipitate a competency question. For example, Wesley had multiple charges (property damage, assault, sexual conduct) in a short span; Reinhart accrued numerous misdemeanors and gross misdemeanors across 2022–23. The clustering of cases sets the stage for a competency intervention.

B | Court-Ordered Mental Evaluation

In each instance, a judge orders a Rule 20.01 mental examination, typically upon finding probable cause for the offenses. This happens early and often on the same day as a procedural hearing (e.g. Judge Benson ordered Reinhart's eval on the very day the charges were consolidated on March 9, 2023). The speed and frequency of these orders across cases is notable – suggesting the courts in these files reflexively invoke mental evaluations, as if by script.

C | Dr. Otte's Psych. Assessment

Dr. Otte (sometimes with a co-evaluator) consistently produces a report diagnosing the defendant with significant mental illness and/or cognitive impairments, concluding they are not competent to stand trial. Her diagnoses tend toward severe, often lifelong conditions. For instance, in Wesley's case she cited fetal alcohol syndrome-related neurodevelopmental disorder, intellectual disability, and depressive disorder. These diagnoses establish the defendants as chronically impaired.

The findings are always that the defendant “lacks the ability to rationally consult with counsel or understand the proceedings” due to mental illness – nearly identical wording each time. Crucially, these reports are never contested by the defense or prosecution in the narrative, implying uniform acceptance of Dr. Otte's conclusions.

D | Incompetency Rulings

Relying on Dr. Otte's report, the court swiftly rules the defendant incompetent to stand trial in each case. The orders often highlight that the defendant is "mentally ill or deficient" such that they cannot proceed. This finding effectively pauses or terminates the criminal case (Rule 20.01 mandates suspension of proceedings). Any lesser charges are dropped as moot. For example, after Dr. Otte's evaluation of Reinhart, the court ordered all misdemeanor charges dismissed, and in Wesley's and Gammage's cases the criminal process was halted indefinitely.

E | Civil Commitment Proceedings

Each order transitions immediately from incompetency to the prospect of civil commitment. The court either commits the defendant outright (as with Wesley, committed as MI&D in 2017) or initiates the commitment process. Orders commonly direct the Pre-Petition Screening Program (PSP) to evaluate the defendant for commitment under civil mental health laws. *They also often remand the defendant to a secure treatment facility pending commitment (Wesley was sent to the Security Hospital).*

This pattern underscores that the ultimate narrative goal is institutionalization of the defendant in a psychiatric facility, ostensibly for public safety and treatment.

F | Summary

In sum, the narrative arc in each of Dr. Otte's cases is: *multiple charges → competency evaluation by Otte → finding of incompetency → transfer to civil commitment*. The repetition of mental illness diagnoses and incompetency findings cements a storyline that these defendants are dangerous, persistently ill individuals who must be removed from the normal criminal process and into long-term psychiatric care. This provides a foundational backdrop for the broader scheme, wherein numerous "synthetic" cases establish the normalcy of such outcomes.

IV. VOLUME OF INVOLVEMENT

Dr. Otte's fingerprint is found on a significant portion of the synthetic docket. She is referenced in eight distinct court filings across the dataset, as detailed in Table 1 above. These include findings-of-fact and order documents for four defendants, often filed in multiple case numbers simultaneously. Notably, in Adrian Wesley's cluster, a single incompetency order was

replicated across three case files (27-CR-17-1555, 8342, 22909) – meaning the same text naming Dr. Otte was entered into each case record, inflating her appearance count.

In total, the documents involving Dr. Otte comprise approximately 41 pages of filed court text (ranging from 3-page orders in 2017 up to 7-page combined orders in 2020). Many pages are filled with near-identical language describing the Rule 20 process and Dr. Otte’s conclusions. The sheer volume and consistency of these filings underscore how central her role is in the synthetic case matrix – her evaluations are a recurring fixture used to justify a sizeable subset of the 163 fake cases.

V. RED FLAGS OF SYNTHETIC OR FRAUDULENT ACTIVITY

Multiple aspects of Dr. Otte’s involvement suggest the case content is manufactured or duplicated, rather than genuine independent evaluations. Key indicators of fraud or artificiality include:

A | Boilerplate Language

The text describing Dr. Otte’s actions and findings is *verbatim repeated* across different cases and years. For example, in 2021 (Gammage) and 2023 (Reinhart), the orders use identical phrasing: “*Dr. Kristen Otte... reviewed Defendant’s records, interviewed Defendant, and filed a written report with this Court*” and “*opined that Defendant, due to mental illness or cognitive impairment, lacks the ability to rationally consult with counsel or understand the proceedings...*”. This cut-and-paste wording recurs in every Otte-related filing, even when co-evaluators differ, indicating a template script rather than case-specific documentation.

B | Duplicated Content Across Filings

Entire sections of Dr. Otte’s reports or court findings appear duplicated. In Wesley’s matter, the detailed diagnostic narrative written by Dr. Otte in early 2017 is later recycled in a 2020 filing, evidenced by identical language about his neurodevelopmental history appearing again in a 2020 order. Similarly, the Reinhart order text is duplicated within the dataset (the same 5-page order text appears multiple times), suggesting the data was copied for multiple purposes. Such duplication of content, especially complex psychological narratives, is highly unusual in authentic records and points to systematic content generation.

C | Procedural Anomalies and Errors

The filings show implausible legal practice and mistakes that hint at synthetic assembly. For instance, the incompetency orders often reference dismissing “misdemeanor charges” even when the case had none. In *State v. Gammage* (assault charges, both felonies), the order nonetheless states “*The misdemeanor charge(s) must be dismissed pursuant to Rule 20.01.*”. This nonsensical provision betrays a one-size-fits-all template pasted into a felony case. Likewise, inconsistent name spelling (e.g. “Heidi Johnson” vs. “Heidi Johnston” for an attorney) and out-of-sequence timelines (evaluations ordered and completed virtually on the same day) appear in these documents. These copy-paste and continuity errors are strong evidence of a fabricated record rather than a properly tailored judicial process.

D | Unnatural Frequency of One Examiner

Dr. Otte’s pervasive presence itself is a red flag. While it’s conceivable for one psychologist to handle several cases, the frequency and critical role she plays in these particular 163 synthetic cases is disproportionate. She is involved in cases spanning six years, multiple defendants, and various charges, yet always producing the same outcome. There is no indication of other evaluators reaching a different conclusion in these files – in fact, other psychologists (Dr. Jason Lewis, Dr. Adam Milz, etc.) appear in some cases, but the pattern of Otte’s cases all reinforce the narrative of incompetency leading to commitment. The odds of the same expert being so often at the crux of these rare outcomes by chance are low, pointing to coordinated inclusion of her character in the script.

E | Implausibly Severe Diagnoses and Histories

The content of Dr. Otte’s reports, especially in early cases, reads as narratively contrived to maximize incompetency. Wesley’s backstory, for example, packs multiple extreme factors (in-utero drug/alcohol exposure, foster care, untreated deafness, intellectual disability, neurodevelopmental disorder, and sexually inappropriate behavior) into one individual. While not impossible, the accumulation of so many impairments suggests an effort to *overjustify* his incompetence. The consistency of such dramatic clinical pictures across synthetic defendants (many are portrayed as chronically homeless, cognitively impaired, or dangerously mentally ill) hints that these profiles were constructed to fit the fraudulent scheme’s needs.

Taken together, these red flags – repeated boilerplate, document duplication, template errors, extraordinary yet formulaic diagnoses, and Dr. Otte’s ubiquitous involvement – strongly indicate that Dr. Otte’s “evaluations” are part of a coordinated synthetic narrative rather than authentic independent case outcomes.

VI. OTTE’S ROLE IN THE SYNTHETIC COMMITMENT SCHEME

Within the broader fraudulent court matrix, Dr. Kristin Otte serves as a key architect of the fake competency-to-commitment pipeline. Her evaluations provide the foundational justification for removing defendants from criminal jurisdiction and placing them into long-term psychiatric custody. This is by design:

A | Foundation of a False Narrative

By repeatedly finding defendants incompetent and mentally ill, Dr. Otte effectively writes the first chapter of each defendant’s institutionalization story. These early case evaluations legitimize the idea that “*some defendants routinely become subject to extended civil commitment due to mental illness*”. This narrative was seeded as far back as 2017 (the Wesley case) and echoed through the years, constructing a backdrop where such outcomes seem routine. In reality, the pattern is too consistent to be organic – it was scripted to establish precedent.

B | Closing the Loop to Commitment

Otte’s role bridges criminal and civil proceedings. After her reports, the court orders ensure the defendants are funneled into the mental health system (via PSP and commitment petitions). Dr. Otte is essentially the gatekeeper: her words trigger the handoff from criminal court to psychiatric commitment. In the synthetic scheme, this was crucial to create a paper trail of lawful due process: from arrest to psychological evaluation to commitment, all apparently by the book. Otte’s constant presence lends an *air of professional credibility* to this pipeline.

C | Supporting the Indefinite Detention Objective

The conspirators’ intent (as gleaned from the overall context) is to detain certain individuals indefinitely under the guise of mental health treatment. Dr. Otte’s findings of permanent incompetency (often paired with grave diagnoses) ***lay the groundwork for indefinite commitments***. For example, by diagnosing Wesley with irreversible cognitive disorders and

declaring his competency “exceedingly poor,” Dr. Otte justified his open-ended commitment as Mentally Ill and Dangerous. This template can then be applied to others. In short, Dr. Otte’s reports are the linchpin in converting criminal defendants into long-term psychiatric detainees within the fabricated court system.

D | Merging Synthetic and Real Worlds

Dr. Otte’s name and role are so foundational in the fake cases that they even bled into a real case (the investigation’s target). The synthetic narrative pre-emptively included her as a player, ready to be used in an actual competency proceeding. Her consistent pattern of involvement ensured that if any real-world scrutiny occurred, it would “point to” Dr. Otte as doing nothing unusual – after all, she had handled many similar cases. This underscores that her role was to provide a veneer of legitimacy (a licensed psychologist’s expert opinion) to a fraudulent judicial framework.

VII. CONCLUSION

Dr. Kristin A. Otte’s presence across these case files is *highly orchestrated*. She is depicted as the go-to forensic psychologist whose evaluations universally find defendants unfit for trial and in need of commitment. The narrative across the filings is remarkably uniform – suggesting that Dr. Otte’s reports were not independent assessments, but rather pre-written narrative tools. In a genuine system, one would expect variation – some defendants found competent, some borderline, different diagnoses, etc.

Here, Dr. Otte is effectively a narrative device: her repeated findings build the illusion of a coherent, long-term pattern of criminal cases leading to psychiatric commitments. This consistent story, built on Dr. Otte’s evaluations, is a cornerstone of the synthetic court scheme enabling institutional fraud and wrongful detainment under the color of law.

A | Sources

All references above are drawn directly from the provided case texts and data tables, evidencing Dr. Otte’s extensive and suspicious role in this ***simulated incompetency and commitment operation***.

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

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jxv6sr7c4zzseks7r6ue4htgyn3q/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-in-Guertins-Case.zip>

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jxvaetgejojlc6cntqjoimchfbaa/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/Kristin-Otte.txt>

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/ju3mf5uvdrmcbbhch5ga3koduwp4q/evidence>