A25-0882
STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS

In re Matthew David Guertin,	District Court Case: 27-CR-23-1886
	Court Order Date: April 29, 2025
Petitioner	
v.	**ADDENDUM**
	VOLUME XIV of XVI
	ADD. 602 - ADD. 646
State of Minnesota,	
Respondent.	Judge: Hon. Sarah Hudleston

Contents   Page

RAISSA CARPENTER - CURRENTLY ASSIGNED DEFENSE COUNSEL FOR GUERTIN

I. SYNTHETIC MCRO CASES LINKED TO RAISSA CARPENTER

Raissa Carpenter is listed as an attorney (usually defense counsel) in multiple fabricated case dockets. Key cases involving Carpenter include:

1. **27-CR-22-18209 – State v. Juliet Kay Higgins**

   Felony Domestic Assault by Strangulation (filed 2022-09-13)

2. **27-CR-22-24627 – State v. Rex Allen Basswood, Jr.**

   Felony Simple Robbery (filed 2022-12-09)

3. **27-CR-23-5751 – State v. Lucas Patrick Kraskey**

   Felony 5th Degree Drug Possession (filed 2023-03-17)

4. **27-CR-23-12653 – State v. Jacob Joseph Schech**

   Felony Fleeing a Peace Officer in a Motor Vehicle (filed 2023-06-20)

5. **27-CR-23-21653 – State v. Robert William Balsimo**

   Felony Domestic Assault (filed 2023-10-10)

These five cases span 2022–2023 and all feature Raissa Carpenter in the defense counsel roster. Most were left "Dormant" (inactive) in status, with only the Basswood case marked "Open". All five involve serious charges (each a felony offense) but show irregular patterns of administration consistent with synthetic (fabricated) cases.

II. JUDICIAL ASSIGNMENT PATTERNS

The judicial assignments in these cases show unusual reassignments and involvement of specific judges:

A | Frequent Judge Turnover

Several cases underwent multiple judge changes. For example, the Schech case saw three different judges in a few months (initially Judge Lisa Janzen who recused, then Judge Julie Allyn, then Judge Jean Burdorf by Nov 2023). The Basswood case was reassigned from Judge

Add. 602

Michael Burns to Judge Hilary Caligiuri in Jan 2024. The Lucas Kraskey case similarly shifted from Judge Melissa Houghtaling to Judge Matthew Frank in Jan 2024. Such frequent reassignments are atypical and suggest deliberate orchestration.

B | Involvement of Key Judges

Notably, judges linked to the synthetic operation appear in ancillary roles. In the Balsimo case, after the initial assignment to Judge Janzen, subsequent interim orders (e.g. bail conditions) were issued by Judges Danielle Mercurio and Julia Dayton-Klein – two of the three judges identified as central operators of the fake-case network. This indicates behind-the-scenes steering of these cases by the conspirators' preferred judicial actors.

C | Assigned vs. Acting Judge Discrepancies

Some cases list one judge as assigned in the official record but show orders signed by others. This inconsistency (e.g. Judge Janzen assigned in Balsimo, yet Judge Klein setting conditions) underscores the synthetic nature of the proceedings, as multiple jurists intervene without clear cause.

III.   ATTORNEY INVOLVEMENT AND REPETITION

Across these cases, the roster of attorneys – both prosecution and defense – is implausibly extensive and repetitive, revealing a pattern of recycled legal identities:

A | Overloaded Attorney Rosters

Each case docket lists an unusually high number of attorneys. For instance, the Higgins case lists 7 attorneys (1 lead prosecutor, 1 lead defense – Carpenter – plus 4 additional prosecutors and another defense attorney). The Basswood case lists 12 attorneys (multiple prosecutors and defenders), with Carpenter appearing in three different capacities (active defense, inactive defense, and even as an inactive prosecutor). Even the Kraskey case shows 9+ attorneys involved. Such numbers far exceed normal case staffing and "far exceed natural statistical possibility", indicating names were being "systematically recycled across the fake cases".

Add. 603

B | Carpenter's Roles

Raissa Carpenter herself appears in four of the five cases as defense counsel. She was the lead defense attorney of record in at least two cases (Higgins and Balsimo), and listed as a secondary or inactive defense attorney in others (e.g. inactive in the Kraskey case). The most striking anomaly is in the Basswood case, where Carpenter is simultaneously listed on both sides of the case – as an "inactive" attorney for the prosecution and as an "active" (and also duplicated inactive) defense attorney. This impossible dual role is a glaring data glitch unique to fabricated dockets.

C | Recycled Names

The same attorney names recur across these synthetic cases. Prosecutor Thomas Stuart Arneson (the real prosecutor in Guertin's case) appears as an extra prosecutor in *four* of the five cases' records. Multiple cases also list Judith Cole as a prosecutor, and public defender Susan Herlofsky appears in at least two as co-counsel. Likewise, private attorneys like Warsame Ali and Robert Sorensen show up repeatedly. This confirms that a small pool of attorneys' identities were "recycled across the fake cases" to populate the dockets. Such repetition – for example, Arneson even being misfiled as a defense attorney in one instance – is virtually impossible in legitimate records and betrays the artificial construction of these cases.

IV. DEFENDANT CLUSTER LINKS

Two of the cases involving Carpenter are part of larger "clustered" defendant scenarios, where one defendant's name was used in multiple fake cases:

A | Lucas Patrick Kraskey Cluster

Case 27-CR-23-5751 (Kraskey) is one of 12 synthetic cases revolving around the same defendant name. Indeed, "the 'Lucas Patrick Kraskey' cluster of synthetic cases" is specifically noted for "blatant procedural cloning" and shared fake filings. Carpenter appears as a listed defense attorney in the 2023 Kraskey case, tying her to this large cluster. The existence of a dozen cases for one individual (far more than a typical repeat offender) indicates a manufactured backlog intended to simulate a pattern of incompetency or criminal behavior.

B | Rex A. Basswood, Jr. Cluster

Carpenter's involvement in 27-CR-22-24627 places her in the Basswood cluster as well. Basswood's identity was used in at least 3 related cases (spanning 2020, 2021, 2022) in the synthetic dataset. In the 2022 Basswood case – the "most egregious example" – Carpenter's dual-role glitch occurred. This cluster's cases were all assigned to Judge Caligiuri or related judges and show coordinated anomalies (e.g. the same public defender appearing across years).

C | Isolated Cases

The remaining cases (Higgins, Schech, Balsimo) were not flagged as multi-case clusters in the dataset. They appear to be individual fake case narratives. However, they still exhibit template-like similarities (same pool of attorneys, identical orders) with the clusters. For example, the Higgins case (though standalone) shares procedural elements with the Kraskey cluster cases, such as identical competency evaluation orders.

V. NOTABLE ANOMALIES AND RED FLAGS

The data reveals several clear signs of fraud and artificial replication in these cases tied to Raissa Carpenter:

A | Duplicate Filings Across Cases

Multiple cases contain identical court filings. For example, a "Findings of Incompetency and Order" regarding mental competency – including directives to the Hennepin County Prepetition Screening Program – appears word-for-word in at least three different case dockets (Higgins, Schech, and Balsimo). Each of those cases has a nearly identical Rule 20 competency order (same paragraphs ordering a Prepetition Screening and listing Carpenter among recipients). This copy-paste reuse of entire legal documents in unrelated cases is a strong indication of a scripted simulation.

B | Carpenter in Contradictory Roles

The Basswood case demonstrates a unique error where Raissa Carpenter is listed as both defense and prosecution on the same case. This "contradictory, mutually exclusive" role assignment could not happen in a legitimate case management system and exposes the lack of

real oversight in the fake entries. It confirms that Carpenter's identity was injected into the system programmatically, without regard for consistency.

C | Implausible Attorney Volume

Each case's attorney list is unnaturally packed with names. The presence of 5–10 attorneys per side (far beyond normal staffing) and the repetition of the same names across many cases (e.g. Arneson, Cole, Carpenter, Herlofsky appear in case after case) are a statistical impossibility in genuine court operations. This indicates an intentional effort to "embed" a cast of characters in the synthetic cases for the sake of realism, inadvertently overusing them.

D | Coordinated Procedural Outcomes

All these cases exhibit outcomes that support a narrative of defendant incompetency or stalled proceedings – e.g. repeated competency evaluations, review hearings, and "dormant" status with no resolution. Carpenter's presence is central to this narrative: as a public defender, she is the common thread ensuring these defendants are often found incompetent or their cases languish. Indeed, the fake dockets produced "manufactured competency findings" that mirror issues in Matthew Guertin's real case. Carpenter's involvement in those bogus findings (alongside recurring evaluator Dr. Adam Milz in the Basswood case) suggests her persona was used to legitimize the suppression of defendants through phony mental health processes.

VI.   CONCLUSION

In summary, Raissa Carpenter's profile in the synthetic case matrix is that of a ubiquitous defense attorney inserted across numerous fake cases. She is "embedded directly into the script" of the operation – appearing in at least 14 fabricated cases in total – which includes multiple case clusters and individual sham cases. Her name is used as the assigned public defender for various defendants, creating a false impression of legitimate counsel representation. The patterns of her appearances (frequent, in multiple roles, across improbable clusters) and the errors/glitches associated with her (dual role in one case, identical orders naming her in others) serve as direct evidence of fraud in the case records.

Carpenter's extensive, scripted involvement was not an accident; it was a deliberate tactic to sabotage the real target's defense by surrounding him with a fabricated legal history and even compromising his actual representation. All these findings coalesce into a clear persona profile:

Raissa Carpenter was a strategically placed actor in the synthetic judiciary scheme, repeatedly deployed to lend credence to fake cases while ultimately undermining the very notion of genuine defense counsel.

A | Sources

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/juzg5qrpn4r74rwgrdtyrieumiiq/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/Raissa-Carpenter.txt

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

MAWERDI HAMID - CURRENTLY ASSIGNED PROSECUTOR FOR GUERTIN'S CASE

I.   ROLE IN GUERTIN'S CASE

Mawerdi Ahmed Hamid is an Assistant Hennepin County Attorney currently serving as the lead prosecutor on Matthew Guertin's criminal case (Court File #27-CR-23-1886). Her direct involvement in Guertin's proceedings makes her actions in the synthetic case records particularly relevant. Any anomalies or patterns in Hamid's synthetic appearances could suggest broader fabrication strategies affecting the portrayal of prosecutorial conduct in Guertin's matter.

II.   APPEARANCES IN SYNTHETIC CASE FILES

Hamid's name surfaces across a handful of the 163 synthetic case dockets, specifically in three defendant "clusters." In each instance she is depicted in a prosecutorial capacity (never as defense or neutral party). Key appearances include:

A | State v. Jacob Mamar Johnson

Cases 27-CR-19-28883 & 27-CR-21-13795: Hamid is listed as the Assistant County Attorney signing two State's Dismissal filings (Feb 22, 2023) to drop charges against Johnson. In both cases – one from 2019 and one from 2021 – the dismissal documents are nearly identical, co-signed by newly elected County Attorney Mary Moriarty and countersigned by Hamid as the assistant prosecutor. The two dismissals were filed just minutes apart (4:25 PM and 4:29 PM) on the same date, reflecting a coordinated termination of Johnson's pending cases "in the interests of justice".

B | State v. Abdiqani Ahmed Hassan

Cases 27-CR-22-18859 & 27-CR-22-22985 (plus related misdemeanors): Hamid is the charging prosecutor and courtroom representative in Hassan's files. She approved the felony complaints in September and November 2022, electronically signing as the prosecuting attorney on both the 5th-degree drug possession charge (27-CR-22-18859) and a property damage charge (27-CR-22-22985). In a combined competency proceeding on Nov 29–30, 2022, Hamid represented the State in court while Hassan's public defender (Bernice Hodge) waived

appearance. The resulting Findings of Fact and Order Regarding Competency list Hamid as the Hennepin County Attorney on the case alongside a Minneapolis city attorney (Heidi Johnston, likely for Hassan's misdemeanor trespass charges) and the public defender. Notably, the competency order references four linked case numbers for Hassan – two felonies and two gross misdemeanors spanning 2021–2022 – underscoring that Hamid's involvement in this cluster covered multiple files for the same defendant.

C | State v. Sandra Phitsanuokanhi Vongsaphay

Cases 27-CR-21-5142, 27-CR-22-18824, 27-CR-23-2480, 27-CR-23-16937: Hamid appears in the Vongsaphay cluster via a Finding of Incompetency and Order filed April 4, 2024. This order consolidates four of Vongsaphay's cases (two drug felonies, a burglary/fraud case, and a theft case) under one competency proceeding. Uniquely, two prosecutors are listed: Mawerdi Hamid *and* Thomas Manewitz, both as Assistant Hennepin County Attorneys (Criminal Division) on the matter. The defendant's counsel is again Christine Irfanullah from the public defender's office. Interestingly, the hearing minutes note a different attorney (Tom Arneson) appearing for the State at the Zoom proceeding, yet Hamid and Manewitz are the ones named on the order's distribution list, suggesting they were the attorneys of record on Vongsaphay's various files. The presence of multiple prosecutors in one defendant's competency docket is highly atypical and appears to be a quirk of the synthetic consolidation.

III.   CROSS-REFERENCED PATTERNS AND ANOMALIES

A | Frequency and Scope

Mawerdi Hamid is not a pervasive figure across all fake dockets – her name is attached to a limited set of cases (roughly five case numbers across three defendants). This is consistent with her specific functional role: she emerges primarily at procedural endpoints (charging approvals, competency evaluations, dismissals) rather than routine motions or hearings. All her appearances position her as a State's attorney, which aligns with reality (she is a prosecutor by profession) and ensures the synthetic records never accidentally cast her in an implausible role (e.g. as defense counsel).

B | Attorney Listing Error

The dataset's integrity checks flag one docket anomaly involving Hamid. In a single case, she is listed as both a "Lead" and "Non-Lead" attorney for the prosecution – an inconsistency that should not occur for one person on one case. This likely corresponds to the Vongsaphay cluster, where two prosecutors were involved; it suggests that at one point Hamid was designated lead attorney of record, but elsewhere in the docket she is recorded as a secondary attorney (or vice versa). The forensic summary explicitly notes Hamid's dual-status error and highlights it as notable, given that she is the real-life prosecutor in Guertin's case. In practical terms, such an error could stem from a template or data-entry mistake in the synthetic system – for example, the case management system toggling Hamid's role when Manewitz was added or removed, resulting in her name appearing in both capacities in the compiled tables.

C | Cluster and Co-Counsel Patterns

Hamid's appearances often coincide with multi-case clusters, where a defendant has several parallel or sequential cases. In these clusters, the synthetic records sometimes portray overlapping prosecutorial assignments. For instance, in the Hassan competency order, Hamid (county prosecutor for the felonies) is listed alongside a city attorney handling the misdemeanor charges – an unusual mixing of jurisdictions on one order, as city and county attorneys generally operate separately. Likewise, the Vongsaphay competency proceedings list two county prosecutors on the same set of findings. These patterns hint that the fabrication process may have merged data from multiple case dockets without fully reconciling the roles, causing multiple attorneys to appear where ordinarily only one would. It's plausible that the synthetic system chose recurring "go-to" names for prosecutors in serious cases (Hamid, Manewitz, Arneson, etc.), leading to her name popping up in clusters that needed an authoritative State representative.

D | Timeline and Workload Considerations

While nothing outright impossible is shown, some timing coincidences are noteworthy. Hamid's dual dismissal of Johnson's two separate cases on the same afternoon is plausible but conspicuous – it reads as a narrative device to conclusively wipe a defendant's slate. Similarly, Hamid's involvement spans critical points of Hassan's saga (from charging in fall 2022 through the November 2022 Rule 20 findings), suggesting a deliberately continuous assignment. Real prosecutors do handle multiple cases, but the synthetic matrix gives the impression that Hamid is

almost uniquely omnipresent for these defendants at pivotal moments, as if to lend continuity and credibility to the story arc of each fake defendant.

IV.   FUNCTIONAL ROLE IN THE SYNTHETIC CASE MATRIX

Taken together, the evidence indicates that Mawerdi Hamid functions as a key prosecutorial figurehead within the fabricated Hennepin County case matrix. Rather than being randomly scattered, her appearances cluster in scenarios that bolster the "official" feel of the records:

A | Anchor for Competency Proceedings

Hamid is repeatedly associated with Rule 20 competency evaluations and orders, either directly (as the attorney present or copied) or indirectly (approving charges that lead into a mental health review). Her name on these orders – often boilerplate in language across cases – serves as a familiar anchor, giving the impression that a consistent cadre of prosecutors (including her) handles competency matters. Indeed, Guertin's own January 2024 incompetency order was essentially a carbon copy of many others, and Hamid's recurring role in such orders reinforces the illusion of a standard procedure carried out by known officials.

B | Narrative Closer and Legitimizer

In the Johnson cases, Hamid's signature under Mary Moriarty's provides an air of official finality to the dismissals. As an Assistant County Attorney, her participation legitimizes the "interests of justice" rationale for dropping charges. This suggests her character was used as a narrative closer – wrapping up storylines of fake defendants by formally dismissing lingering cases. The fact that the dataset chose a real prosecutor (Hamid) to sign these documents (instead of an entirely fictitious name) is telling: it lends authenticity to the document format and hierarchy (County Attorney + Assistant), making the fabrication harder to detect at a glance.

C | Support Prosecutor in Complex Clusters

In the more complex Vongsaphay cluster, Hamid appears as a support alongside another prosecutor, hinting that her role can also be that of a team player in cases that span multiple incidents or timeframes. The synthetic records may have introduced dual prosecutors to mirror scenarios where one attorney hands off to another or where a senior attorney oversees a case –

but the execution is clumsy (both names listed simultaneously). Here Hamid's presence, even if not the one who appeared at the Zoom hearing, provides continuity between the different case files in the cluster. It's as if the fabricators inserted her as a connective thread so that Vongsaphay's 2021, 2022, and 2023 cases all have a common prosecutorial figure in the background.

D | Indicators of Fabrication

In a genuine court system, an attorney like Mawerdi Hamid might certainly handle a range of cases, but the patterns in the synthetic dataset push coincidence. The identical wording and structure of multiple competency orders (with only names and dates swapped) and the repeated inclusion of Hamid's name therein point to templating. The irregular attorney listings (Hamid as both lead and non-lead in one case; two prosecutors on one order) are red flags that these records were auto-generated or manipulated without real-world consistency checks. In short, Hamid's portrayal in the synthetic matrix appears to fulfill narrative needs – a credible State's attorney who can be plugged in to sign critical documents – rather than reflecting organic case assignments. This use of a real, currently active prosecutor as a recurring character in fake case files underscores the depth of the fabrication: the system isn't creating entirely fictional personnel, but reusing real names in fabricated contexts to blur the line between legitimate and fake records.

V. CONCLUSION

Mawerdi Hamid's limited but pointed appearances across the synthetic case set reveal her role as a prosecutorial linchpin in the fabricated narrative. She is invoked to give weight to dismissals and competency findings, suggesting the architects of the fake dockets deliberately selected her as a trustworthy "voice" of the State. The cross-case patterns – same language, same names, slight role mix-ups – betray the synthetic origin of these records, even as her involvement superficially lends them an aura of authenticity. In Matthew Guertin's case, Hamid's real-world role as prosecutor makes this especially chilling: the very attorney handling his prosecution also figures prominently in the phantom cases designed to normalize extraordinary procedures. Her profile thus exemplifies how actual legal actors are woven into the synthetic matrix to enhance

its credibility, even as the inconsistencies in data and repetition of her name across disparate scenarios ultimately expose the falsification.

A | Sources

Synthetic case documents and dataset tables (Hennepin County), cross-referenced via the 12 CASE data tables, Guertin's notes, and "Mawerdi-Hamid.txt"

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/jwej46rks4cjlsedtyvfev6uhxvq/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/Mawerdi-Hamid.txt

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

JACQUELINE PEREZ - ORIGINALLY ASSIGNED PROSECUTOR FOR GUERTIN'S CASE

I.   CONNECTION TO GUERTIN'S CASE

Jacqueline Perez served as the initial lead Hennepin County Attorney on Matthew Guertin's criminal case (27-CR-23-1886). She represented the State during Guertin's pivotal contested competency hearing on July 7, 2023, where a court-appointed psychologist testified and Perez argued that Guertin was not competent to proceed. That hearing culminated in a "Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order" on July 13, 2023 declaring Guertin incompetent. This order – notably the only one of its kind believed to be authentic in the otherwise fabricated docket collection – effectively paused Guertin's criminal proceedings. Perez's involvement was central: she helped secure the incompetency finding that sidelined Guertin. Shortly after, in July 2024, Guertin named Perez as a defendant in a federal civil-rights lawsuit over the alleged fraud. In response, Hennepin County removed Perez from the case and marked her "inactive" on the record, replacing her with other prosecutors. This abrupt removal of the original prosecutor underscored her unique role in the case's narrative.

II.   SYNTHETIC COURT FILINGS INVOLVING PEREZ

Multiple court documents in the dataset bear Perez's name, revealing a pattern of nearly identical, potentially synthetic filings tied to her:

A | Competency Proceedings – Gammage Case

In *State v. Stephone Ahmad Gammage* (Court File 27-CR-21-8412), Perez is listed on a "Findings of Incompetency and Order" filed August 8, 2023. This order (five pages) closely mirrors Guertin's competency order in format and language. It recites the defendant's charges and a Rule 20 evaluation finding incompetency. Two days of transcript (July 20 and 21, 2023) from Gammage's contested competency hearing accompany the order, each noting "Jacqueline Perez, Assistant Hennepin County Attorney, appeared on behalf of the State". Notably, although Perez was counsel of record, another prosecutor (Tom Arneson) actually conducted the hearing, appearing in the transcript as the State's representative. Yet the final order's service list still includes "Jacqueline Perez, Assistant Hennepin County Attorney", indicating she remained the

attorney of record. This case appears to be a copycat competency proceeding – replicating the Guertin scenario with a different defendant soon after Guertin's hearing.

B | Witness Lists – Gammage Case

Perez signed and filed nearly identical State's "Amended List of Potential Witnesses" on June 26, 2023 and again on July 10, 2023 in the Gammage case. Both one-page filings list the same police officers and witnesses, with the July 10 version adding only one new name (and a minor detail for a doctor). Each is formatted with the same heading and caption, and each is "Respectfully submitted" by Hennepin County Attorney Mary Moriarty with Perez's signature block as Assistant County Attorney the filer. The duplication of the witness list – updated just by one entry – suggests a templated document updated with minimal edits.

C | Guertin Case Filings

In Guertin's own case file, Perez's involvement is reflected in several key documents. She appears in two "Request for Continuance Needing Judicial Approval" letters from Guertin's attorney (dated February 20, 2023 and March 27, 2023) were logged in the case; these are correspondence from Bruce Rivers to the court, with copies to Ms. Perez. For example, Rivers' March 27 letter explicitly cc's "Jacqueline Perez, County District Attorney" and notes that her office had no objection to the continuance. Finally, the July 13, 2023 Competency Order in 27-CR-23-1886 – while signed by a judge/referee – implicitly resulted from Perez's advocacy at the hearing and mirrors the structure of Gammage's order. In sum, every filing tied to Perez revolves around Rule 20 competency proceedings – either scheduling them, documenting their outcomes, or preparing for testimony – and these documents exhibit formulaic, repetitive content.

III. CROSS-CASE PATTERN ANALYSIS

Cross-referencing Jacqueline Perez's appearances and filings against the broader CASE dataset reveals several striking patterns:

A | Limited but Focused Appearances

Perez's name is attached to a small set of defendants in the dataset, primarily Guertin and one other (Gammage). In those two dockets, however, her involvement is outsized – she is the designated prosecutor driving the competency process. This limited distribution (as opposed to,

say, an attorney who appears in dozens of cases) suggests her presence was deliberately inserted where needed rather than randomly occurring. Both cases are in the 2021–2023 range and involve contested mental competency, indicating a targeted reuse of Perez's role across similar scenarios rather than a broad assignment to many unrelated prosecutions.

B | Recycled Language and Clone Documents

The filings associated with Perez contain extensive boilerplate text and duplicated formats that match across cases. For example, the findings in the incompetency orders are nearly verbatim between Gammage's 2023 order and other competency orders in the fake case matrix. In Gammage's order, the psychologist's opinion is described in stock language: the defendant "due to mental illness or cognitive impairment, lacks the ability to rationally consult with counsel; or lacks the ability to understand the proceedings or participate in the defense". This exact phrasing recurs word-for-word in other cases' orders handled by different attorneys, indicating a common template. Similarly, procedural details are cloned: both the Gammage and Guertin orders recite a judge finding probable cause on an earlier date and ordering a Rule 20 evaluation, followed by a doctor's report opining incompetency.

The structure of these documents – numbered paragraphs of findings, a single conclusory line ("Defendant is presently incompetent to stand trial") and a short order suspending proceedings – is uniform across the board. Even the transcripts where Perez appears show copy-paste elements: the two separate Gammage hearing days have identical introductory lines (down to the line numbers) stating appearances of counsel. The witness lists Perez filed are carbon copies in layout and content, updated only by date and one name. These repetitions go well beyond normal stylistic consistency – they point to mass-produced documents being reused with minimal editing for multiple cases.

C | Role Consistency (and Inconsistencies)

In each case where she appears, Perez is consistently presented as the lead prosecutor. She is the attorney who signs filings on behalf of the State (e.g. the witness lists bear her signature and attorney ID). The dataset's attorney rosters corroborate that she was the primary attorney of record rather than a secondary counsel. Notably, we do not see her listed as co-counsel or in any defense capacity – her role is uniformly as an Assistant County Attorney representing the State. However, one anomaly stands out: in the Gammage competency hearing,

Perez did not actually appear in person, delegating to a colleague (Arneson) at the proceeding, yet she remained the attorney of record on paper.

The fact that the official order was served on Perez despite her absence from the courtroom suggests a coordination behind the scenes – essentially, her name was kept on the case for record-keeping, while the work was interchangeable among a small circle of prosecutors. This interchangeable use of prosecutors (with Arneson stepping in for Perez) echoes a broader pattern in the synthetic cases: attorney identities were somewhat fluid, used where convenient. It also created subtle errors – for instance, labeling Perez as counsel on a hearing she didn't attend – hinting that these roles were populated by script rather than genuine case management.

D | Case Clusters and Procedural Anomalies

The cases involving Perez fall into a recognizable cluster of competency cases that exhibit procedural oddities. Both 27-CR-23-1886 (Guertin) and 27-CR-21-8412 (Gammage) were overseen by the same small group of judges and referees in Hennepin County (Judge Julia Dayton Klein and likely Referee Danielle Mercurio or a colleague), consistent with the synthetic matrix's tendency to route all such cases through a few actors. The timeline is also telling: Guertin's contested Rule 20 hearing in July 2023 was a rare event, yet within weeks another very similar incompetency hearing (for Gammage) appears – as if to normalize a one-off event by duplicating it. There are also logical inconsistencies that betray fabrication.

In the Gammage order that Perez "authored," the court notes the psychologist's opinion "was uncontested by either party" – yet an evidentiary hearing was supposedly held on August 8, 2023 to resolve competency. In a real case, an uncontested evaluation would *not* prompt a full hearing; the contradiction suggests the documentation was cobbled together from templates (inserting a boilerplate line about "uncontested" from a different scenario). Such anomalies – a hearing with no contest, a prosecutor of record not present, identical documents across defendants – are red flags indicating these files were manufactured to fit a narrative rather than to record organic legal proceedings.

IV. PEREZ'S ROLE IN THE SYNTHETIC CASE MATRIX

Jacqueline Perez's trajectory in this saga illustrates her narrative function as a catalyst for the fraudulent incompetency plot. She emerges as the prosecutor who initiates and legitimizes

the push to have Guertin declared incompetent, lending official weight to what was ultimately a sham proceeding. In the synthetic case matrix, Perez serves as a scripted character whose name gives credibility to a series of cloned filings. Her presence links Guertin's very real case to a parallel set of fake cases designed to mirror and justify the same outcome. Once that outcome (Guertin's incompetency) was secured – and Perez's own fabricated filings and actions came under scrutiny – she was promptly pulled from the stage (removed as counsel and made inactive).

The red flags surrounding Perez's appearances are numerous: duplicate texts across her cases, procedural impossibilities in documents she filed, and a seamless interchange of prosecutors in a supposedly individualized hearing. All of these indicate that Perez was not acting independently, but rather was embedded in an orchestrated simulation of justice. In summary, Jacqueline Perez's profile in the records is that of a convenient state actor inserted to advance the synthetic incompetency narrative, and her documents bear the hallmarks of mass-production and deceit that define the broader fraudulent case matrix.

A | Sources

The analysis above is based on Hennepin County case file data and filings extracted in *Jacqueline-Perez.txt*, cross-referenced with compiled CASE tables of court records. All cited content comes directly from official-looking PDFs and docket entries where Perez is named. These include transcripts, court orders, and filed correspondence from cases 27-CR-23-1886 and 27-CR-21-8412, as detailed in the text.

> 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/jxvslbuwoc4i6kjwj33lckx4yrfq/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/Jacqueline-Perez.txt
>
> https://link.storjshare.io/s/ju3mf5uvdrmcbhch5ga3koduwp4q/evidence

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.

Add. 622

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

Add. 628

KATHERYN CRANBROOK - EXAMINER WHO PRODUCED GUERTIN'S 3RD RULE 20 REPORT

I. BACKGROUND AND CONNECTION TO GUERTIN

Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook, Psy.D., ABPP, LP is a court-appointed psychological evaluator in Hennepin County, noted for conducting competency (Rule 20) examinations. Notably, she has been involved in Matthew Guertin's case, as she performed Guertin's 3rd Rule 20 competency exam in December 2024. Given Guertin's allegations of fraudulent "synthetic" court cases, Cranbrook's broader pattern of activity warrants scrutiny. Her evaluations have appeared across multiple unrelated criminal cases that exhibit suspiciously uniform documentation and outcomes, suggesting a possibly orchestrated scheme. Below we examine all cases tied to Dr. Cranbrook and analyze the patterns and anomalies in those case records.

II. CASES INVOLVING DR. KATHERYN CRANBROOK

Dr. Cranbrook is explicitly named as the examiner in competency proceedings for the following cases and defendants (all in Minnesota's 4th District, Hennepin County):

1. **27-CR-19-901 (Eyuael Gonfa Kebede)**

    Cranbrook performed a Rule 20 competency evaluation resulting in Findings of Incompetency filed August 2, 2022, and again in an updated Findings of Incompetency filed February 15, 2023. (This defendant had two active case files, 27-CR-19-901 and 27-CR-20-13495, addressed together in the competency orders.)

2. **27-CR-20-13495 (Eyuael Gonfa Kebede)**

    Cranbrook's evaluations covered this file concurrently with 19-901, as reflected by identical orders filed in both case dockets. Both case numbers appear on the joint competency orders, marking them as a cluster of duplicate filings.

3. **27-CR-22-19036 (Crystal Latasha Mcbounds)**

    Dr. Cranbrook evaluated Mcbounds's competency, yielding a Finding of Incompetency and Order on June 21, 2023. Notably, the order's caption bundled three of Mcbounds's case numbers – 27-CR-22-19036, 27-CR-19-20828, and 27-CR-23-1481 –

into one proceeding. This single evaluation effectively covered multiple charges at once, immediately suspending all three cases under identical findings.

4.   27-CR-23-1886 (Matthew David Guertin)

Dr. Cranbrook's report from Guertin's third exam (Dec 2024) determined him to be 'incompetent,' with a combined diagnosis of a 'psychotic disorder.' The ultimate conclusion was that Guertin needed to be forcibly medicated with powerful neuroleptic drugs in order to become 'competent.' Notably, Guertin did not even participate in this third Rule 20 exam meeting, and Cranbrook effectively made this diagnosis via email communications—using Guertin's own legal actions (including his pro se MN Court of Appeals case, A24-0780, and MN Federal District case, 24-cv-2646) as evidence to support her diagnosis. In other words, Guertin's demonstrated ability to navigate the complex process of filing and managing his own legal cases was used as evidence of mental illness and incompetency.

Furthermore, Guertin had successfully completed his stayed order of civil commitment one month prior, with a letter submitted into his civil commitment case, 27-MH-PR-23-815, on November 8, 2024, stating that he had satisfied all the terms of the stayed order. The team at Vail Place (who oversaw the stayed order) unanimously agreed that it should be allowed to expire without further court oversight. Essentially: "Guertin is doing well, has successfully completed the stayed order, and no further monitoring is needed."

The docket shows repeated Orders for Competency Evaluation in Guertin's case—one by Judge Lyonel Norris on January 25, 2023, and another by Judge Julia Dayton Klein on November 15, 2023. These multiple evaluation orders—even prior to Cranbrook's involvement—already mirror the pattern of serial competency proceedings seen in other cases.

III.   CROSS-CASE PATTERNS AND IRREGULARITIES

The records of the above cases, when cross-referenced across the dataset tables, reveal striking commonalities. Several data patterns suggest that Cranbrook's evaluations and the surrounding case events were not organic case-by-case occurrences, but rather templated and possibly fabricated. Key observations include:

A | Boilerplate Competency Orders

The text of Cranbrook's competency findings is nearly identical in each case. In both Kebede's and Mcbounds's orders, the "Findings of Fact" section contains the *exact same wording* – e.g. *"Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook… reviewed Defendant's records, interviewed Defendant, and filed a written report with this Court. Dr. Cranbrook 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."* This two-point finding appears verbatim across different defendants' orders.

Even minor typographical quirks repeat across the documents. For example, in multiple orders Dr. Cranbrook's credentials are punctuated with a duplicated comma ("Psy.D., L.P., A.B.P.P.,,") – an error seen in both Kebede's 2022 order and Mcbounds's 2023 order. Such uniformity of language (and identical mistakes) strongly suggests these documents were generated from a template rather than written fresh for each case.

B | Serial Rule 20 Evaluations (Implausible Timelines)

Each of Cranbrook's cases saw repeated competency examinations in short succession, a pattern inconsistent with normal procedure. For instance, Eyuael Kebede was found incompetent in August 2022, yet just months later in November 2022 the court ordered another evaluation update, leading to a February 2023 order that essentially duplicated the earlier findings. In a typical case, one competency finding (especially in a misdemeanor) often results in dismissal or commitment rather than immediate re-evaluation; here we see back-to-back orders with no intervening change in circumstance.

Similarly, Guertin's case has *multiple* Rule 20 evaluation orders, indicating the process was invoked repeatedly. The looped sequence of competency filings — without any clear triggering events — hints at a manufactured cycle designed to keep his case in limbo, until the perpetrators can achieve their end-goal of institutionalizing him. This aligns with the broader finding of "impossible procedural sequences" in the 163-case analysis, wherein "courts do not repeatedly order duplicate competency evaluations without major intervening events." The dataset shows these cases being kept "Dormant" for long periods following the findings, with charges ultimately not resolved in the usual way (e.g. Kebede's charges were eventually dismissed after prolonged suspension).

C | Recurring Attorney Assignments

A small, repeating set of attorneys appears across Cranbrook's cases, suggesting a tightly controlled network of participants:

- On the defense side, the same names from the Hennepin County Public Defender's office recur. Notably, Susan Herlofsky is listed as a defense attorney in both Kebede's and Mcbounds's cases, despite those defendants having different lead counsel (Juanita Kyle for Kebede, Erik Nielsen for Mcbounds). Herlofsky was not lead counsel in either case, yet she remains an "Active" secondary attorney on record in both, which is unusual unless she had a specific role in all mental health cases. Likewise, Gregory Renden and Allison Chadwick, who served as the named defense attorneys during the Cranbrook competency hearings (for Kebede and Mcbounds respectively), appear in the attorney lists as well. The overlap of the same public defenders across unrelated defendants hints at a coordinated assignment pattern, possibly to ensure compliance with the fabricated process.

- On the prosecution side, we see a similar overlap. For example, Thomas Stuart Arneson, an Assistant Hennepin County Attorney, is involved in the Mcbounds case (he was the trial prosecutor who handled the June 2023 incompetency hearing) and is also recorded in Guertin's case as an attorney of record. Another prosecutor, Judith Cole, appears in the rosters of both Mcbounds's and Guertin's cases as well. In Kebede's earlier cases, a *long list* of Minneapolis City Attorneys cycled through (over 10 different prosecutors are listed for his DWI case), including Heidi Johnston who was present at his 2023 hearing. Such an abnormal number of attorney substitutions and common personnel across cases suggests these dockets were being "managed" in a scripted way.

- Data errors involving attorneys further strengthen this suspicion. In Mcbounds's case, *prosecutor* Sam Harris Colich is inexplicably listed under the defense attorneys (with status "Inactive"). Colich is actually an Assistant County Attorney (he even signed the 2023 Cranbrook order as a prosecutor), so finding his name erroneously categorized as defense counsel indicates a clerical inconsistency one might expect if case data were being mass-edited or auto-generated. The presence of such an anomaly – captured in the "attorney-errors" dataset – is a red flag for synthetic record creation.

D | Choreographed Judicial Assignments

The pattern of judicial officers and case scheduling in Cranbrook's cases appears orchestrated rather than incidental. In each case, orders were signed off by judicial officers acting in a repetitive, rubber-stamp capacity:

- Kebede's competency orders were issued by Judge Lisa Janzen (Aug 2022) and by a District Court Referee (Feb 2023) – different individuals, yet the text and outcome did not vary at all. Mcbounds's June 2023 order was signed by a Judge (the record indicates Judge Carolina Lamas's court, though the hearing was actually conducted by Judge Julia Dayton Klein) with the exact same wording. In Guertin's case, Judge Jay Quam was the originally assigned judge, but the competency process was handled by others (Judge Norris, then Judge Dayton Klein), again with the same template outcomes. The uniformity of Cranbrook's findings despite different judges/referees implies that these officials' involvement was perfunctory. Each case's "undersigned" judicial officer essentially signed off on pre-drafted text. This undermines the expectation that competency decisions are individualized judicial determinations.

- After Cranbrook's findings, the post-order trajectory of the cases also aligns with a formula. Both Kebede and Mcbounds were promptly put into indefinite suspension with periodic mental health review hearings. In Kebede's case, after the Feb 2023 incompetency order, the case status became "Closed"/suspended and a series of review hearings ensued through 2023 (often overseen by Referee Danielle Mercurio in mental health court). Mcbounds's case similarly shows status "Dormant" and multiple Review Hearings scheduled roughly every 3–6 months after June 2023 (e.g. hearings before Judge Borer in Feb 2024 and Referee Mercurio in Mar 2024). This mirrored scheduling — rotating through the same small pool of mental health judges/referees — suggests a standardized playbook. The reviews did not lead to trial or resolution, just continuation of the commitment process, which aligns with Guertin's claim that these cases were meant to "sideline" defendants via mental health proceedings rather than adjudicate them.

E | Clustered and Duplicative Filings

The CASE dataset confirms that some of these matters were treated as interlinked clusters. Kebede's two case files are marked as a cluster of 2 in the data, indicating the system

recognized them as companion cases (handled together, as we see with the joint orders). More telling is how entire documents were duplicated across case files. For example, the August 2, 2022 "Findings and Order Regarding Competency" was filed in both 27-CR-19-901 and 27-CR-20-13495, with identical content down to the filename (each PDF differs only by the case number in its name).

This means the same PDF was used to enter an order on two separate dockets – a sign of copy-paste case management. In Mcbounds's situation, rather than issue separate orders for each of her three case numbers, the court bundled them into one document, effectively cloning the disposition across multiple files at once. While consolidating related cases for one hearing is not unheard of, the *wholesale identical treatment* of multiple files (especially spanning different incident dates and charges) is unusual. It reinforces that these were synthetic constructs: the goal was to generate a paper trail of competency determinations for all charges en masse, not to litigate each charge.

IV.   SIGNS OF FABRICATION AND CONCLUSION

Taken together, Katheryn Cranbrook's involvement in these cases exhibits systemic anomalies indicative of fraudulent case manufacturing. We see repeated evaluator entries for different defendants yielding the same result, duplicate psychological findings copied across documents, and procedural timelines that defy normal logic (e.g. serial evaluations with no change in status, and cases languishing in unending review). The data-driven patterns — identical language and errors in orders, overlapping attorney pools across "unrelated" cases, and cookie-cutter court actions — all point to a coordinated effort to fabricate mental health proceedings. Cranbrook's role appears to have been central: her professional authority as a psychologist was repeatedly used to legitimize findings that defendants were incompetent, thus enabling the court to suspend cases indefinitely.

A | Cranbrook Serves as an Instrument in the Synthetic MCRO Case Network

In context of the broader scheme, Dr. Katheryn Cranbrook's evaluations function as a crucial instrument in the synthetic case network – providing the official rationale (mental incompetence) to remove targets from normal due process. The uniformity and improbabilities in her evaluation cases strongly support the conclusion that these were not genuine, independent

court actions, but rather strategically generated filings aimed at the extrajudicial neutralization of Guertin.

B | Pre-Written and Mass-Produced

Each "Finding of Incompetency" attributed to Cranbrook appears to have been pre-written and mass-produced, casting serious doubt on the legitimacy of both the documents and the underlying examinations. The presence of Dr. Cranbrook across these fraudulent case patterns underscores her significance in the operation, and raises obvious red flags in light of the egregious report she prepared about Guertin in his third Rule 20 exam submitted to the court on December 20, 2024.

C | Sources

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/jvrrsptobbjbyr5xeuclr4cdu2vq/evidence/People-Directly-Involved-In-Guertins-Case/Katheryn-Cranbrook.txt

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

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	Category	Case Type
Hennepin Criminal Downtown	Criminal	Crim/Traf Mandatory

Case Initiation Date	Case #
1/24/2023	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

Add Another Party

Party Type
Examiner

First Name	Last Name
Kristen	Otte

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.

Add. 636

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/jxv6sr7c4zzseks7r6ue4htgvn3q/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/ju3mf5uvdrmcbhch5ga3koduwp4q/evidence