STATE OF MINNESOTA   **DISTRICT COURT**

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN   **FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT**

State of Minnesota,	Court File No. : 27-CR-23-1886
Plaintiff,	
vs.	**EXHIBT D** **MAY 3 2024 AFFIDAVIT AND** **MCRO DATA ANALYSIS**
Matthew David Guertin,	
Defendant.	Judicial Officer: Sarah Hudelston

TO: THE HONORABLE SARAH HUDLESTON, JUDGE OF DISTRICT COURT; MARY F. MORIARTY, HENNEPIN COUNTY ATTORNEY; AND MAWERDI HAMID, ASSISTANT HENNEPIN COUNTY ATTORNEY

SYNTHETIC JUDICIAL SYSTEM EXPOSED
AI-DRIVEN DOCKET SIMULATIONS AND PSYCHIATRIC DISPOSAL WITHIN THE 4TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

STATE OF MINNESOTA

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

DISTRICT COURT

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

State of Minnesota,

    Plaintiff,

vs.

Matthew David Guertin,

    Defendant.

Court File No.: 27-CR-23-1886

DEFENDANT'S

AFFIDAVIT OF FACT

TO: THE HONORABLE JULIA DAYTON KLEIN, JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT
COURT; THE CLERK OF THE FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT; MS.
JACQUELINE PEREZ, ASSISTANT HENNEPIN COUNTY ATTORNEY; AND
THE OFFICE OF THE HENNEPIN COUNTY ATTORNEY.

AFFIDAVIT OF FACT

  I, MATTHEW DAVID GUERTIN, residing at 1075 Traditions Court, City of Chaska,
County of Carver, State of Minnesota, being duly sworn, hereby depose and state under penalty
of perjury:

INTRODUCTION

I conducted a data analysis of the Minnesota Court Records Online (MCRO) by downloading a
total of 3,556 MCRO PDF criminal case files, which span a total of 163 unique criminal case ID
numbers which were obtained through the 'hearing' search provided on the MCRO website that
allows someone to search by specific Judicial Officers. This analysis began out of curiousity, and
my wondering as to whether or not it was standard procedure to have a very small group of just
three Judicial Officers essentailly 'take over' a criminal court case from early on in its inception
in what seems to be a very 'contained' or 'controlled' manner. This is what it seems like in my
current case anyways – which lead me take a look at the the case distribution amongst the three

Exhibit D | p. 1

Judicial Officers who have been making all of the key decisions in my criminal, as well as my civil case now. A brief exercise if you will...one which involves using a multi-step process in which I printe a PDF of each 200 result date range search beginning at April 26, 2024, and spanning into the past until reached January 1, 2023. I then converted these PDF files to text files and processed them using custom Python scripts that allowed me to clean up, and sort the massive collection of data I compiled – which eventually resulted in me being able to run a Python script that used three different text files as its input, and then output a new text file that only contained the cases which the Honorable Judge Julia Dayton Klein, Danielle Mercurio, and George Borer all had hearings listed for in the 2023-Current date range I searched. I then segregated these even further using the year ID signifying the cases origination year.

The total number of 'Shared Cases' between all three is 163.

I then created a custom Python script that uses the Selenium library, allowing for automation scripting of a developer version of Chrome web browser. The script allowed me to navigate to any individual case timeline page, hit 'enter', and automatically download every single PDF document filed into the case in a matter of seconds. This resulted in a massive dataset of around 2gb total. All of the PDF documents are directly downloaded and organized into individual folders for the 'year of case origination' with each year directory containing a folder for each individual case, where each case folder contains every single avaialabe PDF document from the MCRO website in addition to the full HTML website download, and a PDF page printout of the MCRO webpage.

There are a lot of duplicate names. Some of them with slight, as well as not so slight variations. These would include the following as an example:

PRIEST JESUS, ANGELIC DENISE SCHAEFER, ANGELIC DENISE NUNN, MAKIS DUVELL LANE, MAKIS DEVELL LANE, and MAKIS DEVIL LANE.

Exhibit D | p. 2

I also conducted an insightful data analaysis that involved simple file searching by the name of the MCRO filed document – such as 'Finding of Incompetency and Order', 'E-filed Comp Order for Detention', and 'Rule 20.01 Evaluation for Competency to Proceed' among others.

I intentionally wrapped this side project up very quickly as far as drawing a line, and being done with it as otherwise there is obviously a million other directions, and datapoints one could further investigate. Not me however. I am of the belief that what I have compiled is presented in its most basic, and simple form insofar as being left open for interpretation and not trying to draw any specific conclusions beyond those which the data serves to perhaps draw on its own.

EXHIBIT SUMMARY

Below is a summary of the three exhibits accompanying this affidavit.

Exhibit A:

> **Data Analysis of Shared Judicial Assignments to Cases**
> A very detailed introduction and overview of the analysis process along with a massive amount of random datapoints I assembled. This exhibit also includes an overview of the much broader question that is raised in regards to impartiality in legal proceedings, and how there might be a much larger question raised based on the results of this analyis.

Exhibit B:

> **Circular Handling Anlaysis**
> A selection of cases that are shared between all three Judicial Officers, in which I analyze the 'circular handling' that has become very apparent to me in my current court case. 'Circular Handling' could also perhaps be called 'Decision Bouncing' as it is simply taking a closer look at how many critical decisions in a defendant's criminal case are essentially bounced back and forth between the same three people in a consistent, and regoznizable pattern.

Exhibit C:

MCRO 'Finding of Incompetency and Order' Analysis

A data table grouped by year which shows who ordered the initial Rule 20.01 Exam, and who ultimately made the ruling once the Rule 20.01 exam was completed. These are all 130 of the orders, as contained between all of the shared case files. As part of this tables assembly I was able to discover that out of the 130 orders there were 6 instances in which the same Judicial Officer who recommended the Rule 20.01 exam was then also the one to rule on their previous order once the Rule 20.01 exam was completed and it came before them once again.

Shared Download Folder of All MCRO Files I Downloaded and Analyzed:

Case files origination spans 2017 – 2023. Six separate .zip files.

Includes Python download script I used to collect all of the PDF files.

https://drive.proton.me/urls/QA8TBVTHEC#Wy7ygZMVpev7

CONCLUSION

I affirm under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. I also affirm that all of the data I have presented herein is accurate, true, and correct to the best of my knowledge. I made every effort to double and triple check every figure I listed, my Python scripts, and each step that it took to ensure this data was compiled in accurate and thorough process. All of the data collected and analyzed is all directly from the MCRO website itself, and is all authentic and without any altering, omissions, or deceit of any kind. All of this data was gathered, processed, and analyzed within the last 4-5 days from the filing of this affidavit. It is 'fresh' – and I am filing this affidavit 'as is' so that it doesn't go stale for whatever reason.

DATED this 3rd day of May, 2024.