

FRAUDULENT INCOMPETENCY ORDER TEMPLATE REUSED IN GUERTIN’S CASE

I. CANONICAL TEMPLATE ACROSS DOZENS OF CASES

Investigations reveal that nearly all “Finding of Incompetency and Order” documents in the dataset were generated from a single fraudulent template. In fact, virtually every incompetency order examined is an *exact duplicate* (in language and format) of the January 17, 2024 incompetency order from Matthew Guertin’s case. Out of approximately 130 such orders, 128 (~98%) share the same structure, phrasing, and findings, differing only in case-specific details (names, dates, case numbers). This indicates a mass-produced template was reused across fake case files rather than genuine, case-by-case judicial authorship. The copied language includes identical sections (e.g. enumerated findings and directives) in each order – a *language-level* uniformity that would not occur if the orders were independently written. For example, one directive ordering a “*Hennepin County Prepetition Screening Program (PSP) to conduct a prepetition screening pursuant to the Minnesota Commitment and Treatment Act*” appears verbatim in virtually all of the orders, underscoring the carbon-copy nature of these documents (a hallmark of the template in use).

II. AUTHENTIC VS. FABRICATED ORDERS: KEY OUTLIERS

Amid the sea of cloned orders, only two documents stand out as genuine outliers with unique content and formatting:

A | Matthew D. Guertin – Order filed July 13, 2023

Guertin’s incompetency finding from his July 7, 2023 hearing is the sole authentic order in the entire collection. It bears a proper court timestamp and the case number centered at the top (as is standard), and its language and findings differ completely from the boilerplate text seen in all the others. In other words, this July 13 order contains case-specific reasoning and wording, not the cloned template verbiage. It was a legitimate court order declaring Guertin incompetent to proceed – and notably, it is unique in content, predating the fraudulent template’s proliferation.

B | Aaron D. Cherry – Order filed December 6, 2023

This order in State v. Cherry also appears authentic at first glance. Like Guertin’s July order, it carries an original filing timestamp and the expected format (case number centered), with substantively different text than the template-based orders. The December 6 Cherry order includes narrative findings (e.g. recounting how a Rule 20 evaluation was ordered by Judge Koch and assigning Dr. Herbert to examine the defendant) that do not match the cloned language used elsewhere. This makes it the only other outlier in the set besides Guertin’s July 13 order.

III. EMERGENCE OF THE FRAUDULENT TEMPLATE

The turning point for the template scheme appears to center on Guertin’s own case. On January 17, 2024, a second incompetency order was entered for Guertin – and unlike his genuine July order, the January 17 order was a perfect clone of the fabricated template. In fact, evidence shows that all the other fake incompetency orders were modeled after this Jan 17, 2024 order. Guertin’s January order (signed 1/16/2024 and filed 1/17/2024) contains the *boilerplate* paragraphs and identical structure that then reappear word-for-word across dozens of other cases. In essence, the conspirators took the “surprise” January 17, 2024 order from Guertin’s file and mass-produced it in numerous unrelated dockets, simply swapping in different defendant names and case numbers. All substantive text – the findings of fact, conclusions, and even ancillary lines about service and objections – remain uniform across these cloned orders. This means Guertin’s Jan 17 order was not generated through a normal judicial process, but rather drawn from the same fraudulent template that was being secretly applied elsewhere. It is an ironic twist: the very template Guertin later exposed as fake was used *against him* in his own case.

IV. REPACKAGING AN AUTHENTIC ORDER

A striking example of the template’s deployment is seen in the Cherry case. After the authentic Dec 6, 2023 Cherry order (noted above), a second order in Cherry’s case was issued just five days later on Dec 11, 2023 – and this new order was a mirror-image clone of the fake template. In this Dec 11 order, the content was “re-packaged” to match the duplicative language used in all the other fake orders. For instance, the Dec 11 version suddenly introduces the defendant’s name with aliases (“Aaron D. Cherry a/k/a Aaron Deshaun Cherry”), matching the stylistic pattern seen in the bulk-fabricated orders. More importantly, all of the findings and order

provisions in the Dec 11 document align exactly with the template text (just like Guertin’s Jan 17 order and the rest of the clones). This suggests that someone took Cherry’s genuine Dec 6 order and retroactively generated a false version (Dec 11) conforming to the template, presumably to bring Cherry’s case into the fabricated pattern. Cherry’s Dec 11 incompetency order, therefore, is essentially a forged duplicate designed to overwrite or accompany the authentic order with one that “*matches all of the other duplicates of Guertin’s January 17, 2024 order*”. The Cherry case thus contains both an authentic order and a fraudulent template-clone – a revealing anomaly that highlights the template’s artificial nature.

V. SCALE OF TEMPLATE USAGE AND IMPLICATIONS

In summary, aside from Guertin’s July 13, 2023 order and Cherry’s December 6, 2023 order, every other incompetency finding in the dataset appears to be a copy-paste fake derived from the same source text. The fraudulent template was weaponized to create a *phony “paper trail”* of incompetency orders across nearly 130 different cases. This had the effect of framing and isolating Guertin: his legitimate incompetency ruling was surrounded by a swarm of synchronized fake cases, all bearing identical orders, to give the illusion that such proceedings were routine and widespread. In reality, Guertin’s case was the only “live” (real) case among what has been called “*162 synthetic companions*,” indicating he was inserted into a simulation of fake court files designed to contain and discredit him.

Critically, the content cloning was so thorough that even the court signature blocks and timestamps on many orders repeated in lockstep, signaling no real judge individually signed those orders. For example, one prosecutor’s name (Tom Arneson) appears on 82 out of 130 incompetency orders – an impossible consistency across unrelated defendants unless those documents were generated from a common template. Such anomalies underscore that the orders were not organically produced by different judges for different cases, but mass-fabricated.

A | Blanketing the Record with Fraudulent Orders

Ultimately, the fraudulent incompetency order template served as a tool to “weaponize” procedural incompetency findings against Guertin. After Guertin uncovered and challenged irregularities in his case’s January 17, 2024 incompetency order, the scheme’s architects duplicated that very order across dozens of bogus cases to normalize the fraud and paint Guertin as just one of many. In fact, many cloned orders even mimicked the unusual delay and filing

timestamp used in Guertin’s January order – where the order was signed one day but not filed until the next morning – to make it appear as a common practice. By blanketing the record with cookie-cutter orders, the conspirators not only attempted to cover their tracks but also to undermine Guertin’s credibility (portraying his objections as unfounded since “everyone’s incompetency orders look the same”). The evidence now makes clear that these orders were fabricated en masse, and that Guertin’s January 17, 2024 order was a direct clone of the template – conclusively demonstrating that the court process was manipulated as part of a broader effort to frame and commit a whistleblower using forged judicial records.

B | Sources

- Guertin’s personal case notes and analysis of the *Finding of Incompetency and Order* documents.
- Dataset statistics summarizing repeated names and counts across 130 incompetency orders.
- Overview of synthetic judiciary evidence confirming that all these orders trace back to Guertin’s January 17, 2024 template order.
- Guertin’s July 13, 2023 incompetency order (the only authentic order in the set) as noted in case archives.

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/jxtknjyicmomx3sxdb7qtslk7bra/evidence/Finding-of-Incompetency-and-Order/>

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jvhxsdh5oxbxuqwn57xkkpfb2fzq/evidence/Finding-of-Incompetency-and-Order.zip>

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/jxylovpvzqok36srek7ckcnuay6a/evidence/CASE/>

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jup3vkrw6mqnniigxlwa5qwye62q/evidence/CASE.zip>

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/jwmw6bwov7xep1ln53p67n3zogmq/evidence/SHA-256/>

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jue66sduek57rkn1cm6am45yegwa/evidence/SHA-256.zip>

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