

STATE OF MINNESOTA  
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

DISTRICT COURT  
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

State of Minnesota,

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

Plaintiff,

vs.

**DEFENDANT'S MOTION**  
**TO REPRESENT SELF**  
**PRO SE**

Matthew David Guertin,

Defendant.

Judicial Officer: Jay Quam

TO: THE HONORABLE JAY QUAM, JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT; MS. JACQUELINE PEREZ, ASSISTANT HENNEPIN COUNTY ATTORNEY; AND MR. BRUCE RIVERS, CURRENTLY APPOINTED COUNSEL, WHO IS HEREBY NOTIFIED OF THE DEFENDANT'S INTENT TO DISMISS SAID COUNSEL AND PROCEED PRO SE.

**MOTION**

COMES NOW the Defendant, Matthew David Guertin, pursuant to Rule 10.01 of the Minnesota Rules of Criminal Procedure, the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, Minn. Stat. § 611.14, and relevant case law, including *Indiana v. Edwards*, 554 U.S. 164 (2008), and respectfully moves this Court for an order allowing the Defendant to represent himself in the above-captioned matter. In support of this Motion, the Defendant states as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

The Defendant has been informed of his right to effective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment and understands the risks and responsibilities associated with self-representation.

## LEGAL BASIS FOR MOTION

Under Rule 10.01 of the Minnesota Rules of Criminal Procedure, a defendant has the right to the assistance of counsel and the corollary right to represent oneself.

The Supreme Court in *Indiana v. Edwards*, 554 U.S. 164 (2008), recognized that a state may insist upon representation by counsel for those competent enough to stand trial under the Dusky standard but who still may not be competent to conduct trial proceedings by themselves.

The Dusky standard, established in *Dusky v. United States*, 362 U.S. 402 (1960), requires that a defendant have a sufficient present ability to consult with his lawyer with a reasonable degree of rational understanding and a rational as well as factual understanding of the proceedings against him.

## DEFENDANT'S COMPETENCY AND UNDERSTANDING

The Defendant reasserts his competency under the Dusky standard, emphasizing a rational and factual understanding of the proceedings and the ability to conduct his defense. Notably, the court has previously acknowledged the Defendant's capacity to engage in significant legal decisions, as evidenced in the following instances:

### 1. Consultation and Waiver Decision:

The court deemed the Defendant competent enough to consult with a court-appointed attorney and make informed decisions regarding the waiver signed by the Defendant on January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024. This action presupposes a recognition of the Defendant's understanding and capacity to make reasoned legal decisions.

*SEE EXHIBIT A – Waiver.*

*For the purposes of this argument, Exhibit A - the Waiver, is referenced solely to illustrate inconsistencies in the court's application of competency standards, not as*

*an acknowledgment of its validity or as an affirmation of informed consent. The Defendant explicitly reserves all rights to contest the waiver's validity on grounds of lack of informed consent and miscommunication regarding the court proceedings.*

2. 'ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS OF STAY OF COMMITMENT' Agreement:

Furthermore, in the proceedings related to the Defendant's civil commitment, the court's decision to proceed with the 'ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS OF STAY OF COMMITMENT' agreement—specifically altering the requirement for a psychologist's endorsement by placing 'N/A' on the signature line of Court Examiner, Michael Robertson in which his signature would have been affirming the following statement:

*“Based upon my examination of the respondent and review of relevant records, I am of the opinion that the respondent is competent to understand this agreement.”*

This decision implicitly acknowledges the Defendant's competency to understand and agree to complex legal and medical arrangements.

*SEE EXHIBIT B – Page 4 of 'ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS OF STAY OF COMMITMENT'*

**ARGUMENT FOR CONSISTENCY IN COMPETENCY DETERMINATIONS**

The Defendant argues for a consistent application of competency standards across his legal proceedings. The inclusion of Exhibits A and B supports the argument that the Defendant has been recognized as competent in crucial legal contexts, which should logically extend to his capacity for self-representation.

## DEFENDANT'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RISKS

The Defendant acknowledges the risks associated with self-representation, including the potential for a less favorable outcome than if represented by counsel, and asserts his informed decision to waive his right to counsel.

## REQUEST FOR STANDBY COUNSEL

Given the complexities of legal proceedings and in alignment with the principles established in *Indiana v. Edwards*, the Defendant requests the Court appoint standby counsel to assist if necessary, ensuring the fairness of the trial process while respecting the Defendant's autonomy in his defense.

## EXHIBITS

Attached herewith are the exhibits referenced in this motion:

### Exhibit A:

Waiver signed by the Defendant in consultation with court-appointed attorney Joel Fisher, on January 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024 demonstrating the court's recognition of the Defendant's competency to make informed legal decisions.

### Exhibit B:

Page 4 from the "ACCEPTANCE OF TERMS OF STAY OF COMMITMENT" agreement, which was altered by the court to reflect the Defendant's competency in agreeing to complex legal and medical arrangements, signed by the Defendant on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and officially entered into the record of civil case file 27-MH-PR-23-815 on August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

These exhibits are provided to substantiate the Defendant's argument for a consistent application of competency determinations and his capacity to represent himself pro se.

### **COMMITMENT TO PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Defendant wishes to affirm to the Court his full understanding and commitment to upholding both the procedural and substantive responsibilities entailed in self-representation. The Defendant recognizes the gravity and complexity of navigating legal proceedings and is prepared to diligently engage with the court's processes, adhere to legal standards, and present a defense that is coherent, respectful, and grounded in law. This commitment underscores the Defendant's determination to ensure that his representation is not only in compliance with the procedural requirements but also effectively advocates for his rights and interests within the substantive framework of the justice system.

### **RELIEF SOUGHT**

WHEREFORE, the Defendant respectfully requests the Court:

- a) Grant this Motion allowing the Defendant to represent himself pro se in the above-captioned matter;
- b) Appoint standby counsel to provide assistance as needed, pursuant to *Indiana v. Edwards*;
- c) Schedule a hearing on this Motion, if the Court deems it necessary<sup>1</sup>; and
- d) Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant respectfully requests that any scheduled hearings be scheduled after May 5, 2024 as Defendant is also currently maintaining the role of 'pro se patent attorney' insofar as formulating a legally sound response to the non-final office action that was issued by the USPTO for US Patent Application 18/108,858 on December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023 of which the Defendant is the inventor of.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 3, 2024

By: /s/ Matthew Guertin

Matthew David Guertin

Defendant Pro Se

4385 Trenton Ln N #202

Plymouth, MN 55442

Telephone: 763-221-4540

Email: MattGuertin@Protonmail.com

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on April 3, 2024, I served a copy of this Motion on the Prosecutor's Office, Ms. Jacqueline Perez, through the 'E-File & Serve' system which automatically notifies all included 'Service Contacts', and on my current attorney of record, Bruce Rivers, through the 'E-File & Serve' system, in addition to a copy of this motion sent to his email 'RiversLawyers@aol.com', and a text message to his personal cell phone making him aware of my decision to dismiss him as my defense counsel.



STATE OF MINNESOTA  
COUNTY of HENNEPIN

DISTRICT COURT FOURTH  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT MENTAL  
HEALTH DIVISION

**In Re: the Civil Commitment of  
Matthew Guertin**

**Court File: 27-MH-PR-23-815**

**DOB: 7/17/1981**


**WAIVER**

**Respondent.**

---

After a full consultation with my attorney who has explained my rights to me and discussed with me the various alternatives available to me, I do hereby knowingly and voluntarily consent to the Court extending my Stay of Commitment for a period of 9 months, without the hearing provided by Minn. Stat. §253B.05 subd.3, 08 and .09.

Dated: 1/31/2024

  
Matthew David Guertin  
Respondent

**CERTIFICATION**

I have advised the Respondent of all rights affected by the foregoing waiver, including the various options available and the consequences flowing from each option. The Respondent understood the rights involved and willingly signed the Waiver.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Attorney ID# 29579


Joel Fisher

EXHIBIT  
B

**X ~~Agreement Regarding the Requested Jarvis (Neuroleptic Medication)~~**

- ~~I understand that the County Attorney may also request that the continued neuroleptic medication Petition be set on for hearing, and the revocation of the stayed commitment will not be delayed because of it.~~
- ~~I understand that the neuroleptic medication hearing will be set as soon as possible, and I waive the right to object to the timeliness of the notice, as long as transportation can be arranged for me, and my attorney can appear.~~
- ~~I understand that if a neuroleptic medication hearing is scheduled on this continued petition, only that issue will be addressed at the hearing.~~
- ~~If I wish to request a hearing on the revocation of the stayed commitment, I must make a separate request for hearing to the Court, within 14 days after the revocation.~~

Dated: August \_\_, 2023

  
 Mathew David Guertin, Respondent

I have advised Mathew David Guertin, Respondent above, of the nature and conditions of this agreement, his/her trial rights, the right to have this matter tried before the District Court, and his/her right to have the matter reconsidered pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 253B.17.

Dated: August \_\_, 2023

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Michael Biglow, Counsel for Respondent

Based upon my examination of the respondent and review of relevant records, I am of the opinion that the respondent is competent to understand this agreement.

Dated: August \_\_, 2023

N/A  
 Michael Robertson, Court Examiner