

DOCUMENTED NOTICE TO COUNSEL OF RECORD · TRANSMITTED THE DAY OF
APPEARANCE

RESPONSE DUE AUGUST 10, 2026

Notice to Counsel of Record Under Rule 3.3

Eldad Z. Malamuth, Assistant Attorney General · ARDC No. 6275421
Office of the Illinois Attorney General · 115 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60603
eldad.malamuth@ilag.gov · (312) 814-2235
Appearance filed July 28, 2026 — Dkt. 50 — for Respondents

MATTER**Allababidi v. Junkin, et al., No. 1:26-cv-01077 (N.D. Ill.) (Blakey, J.)**

Petition for writ of habeas corpus · Rule 4 review passed April 13, 2026 (Dkt. 11) · answer ordered by June 5, 2026 · extended to August 10, 2026 (Dkt. 45)

Counsel:

Mr. Malamuth: you entered your appearance for Respondents today at Docket 50. The response your office bought thirty additional days to file is due in thirteen days. This letter places in your hands, before you draft it, the State's own documents on the four questions that response has to answer: whether the drug allegation was cleared in writing before it was sworn, whether anything was owed when nonpayment was called willful, whether any violation was ever adjudicated at all, and whether a state corrective process was available to me while all of this was happening. Every document cited below is attached, and every one of them is the State's own. It is sent for a single purpose: so that nothing you file on August 10, 2026 can later be characterized as unknowing.

I. THE POSTURE YOU INHERITED, FROM THE DOCKET

DOCKET	EVENT
Dkt. 11 — Apr. 13, 2026	Rule 4 review passed. The Court found that "Petitioner alleges a cognizable claim for relief" and ordered Respondent to answer or otherwise respond by June 5, 2026.
Dkt. 12	AAG Katherine M. Doersch files a statement of non-involvement.
June 5, 2026	The court-ordered deadline passes. No answer is filed.
Dkt. 45 — July 2, 2026	Twenty-seven days after the deadline, the State moves for a thirty-day extension to August 10, 2026 , supported by the representation quoted in Part II.C.
Dkt. 46	Presentment set July 8, 2026, 11:00 a.m., Courtroom 1203.
Dkt. 50 — July 28, 2026	Your appearance. You are now the signatory.

I am not writing to relitigate the extension. I am writing because it was obtained on a representation about the state-court record, and because the two substantive allegations that hold me under an outstanding custodial warrant are refuted by documents the State generated itself. You did not create that problem. As of today you are the only lawyer of record who owns it.

II. THREE DOCUMENTS YOUR RESPONSE HAS TO SURVIVE

A. The drug allegation was adjudicated compliant, in writing, five months before it was sworn. The screen detected amphetamine, which is what a screen detects in a patient prescribed Adderall. The supervising officer of the office that then held supervision resolved it in writing:



COOK COUNTY ADULT PROBATION — DECEMBER 10, 2025, 12:37 P.M. (EXHIBIT A)

[I know you are still being prescribed it ... Your drug test results were positive for amphetamine, but it is all negative in my eyes because I know you are still taking the Adderall.]

On May 14, 2026 an assistant State’s Attorney personally swore that I “tested positive for Amphetamine (**illegal substance**).” The sentencing condition he invoked prohibits “any illegal substance **or prescription medication of another**”; his petition recites that condition with those five words deleted. The probation memorandum that fed the petition dates the screen **11/20/25**; the sworn petition dates it **11/10/2025**. Neither document mentions the December clearance. (Exhibits A, E.)

B. The financial allegation has no object. The Financial Sentencing Order entered September 8, 2025 carries **no restitution figure**: paragraph 7(a), “Restitution,” is blank. It is blank because the principal property loss had already been paid — Allstate paid **\$16,557.00** on Claim No. 0670868884 before sentencing. The separate \$2,670.86 item is payable, by the sentencing order’s own terms, “in equal monthly installments ... to be paid in full not later than 90 days before the termination date.” Termination is March 7, 2028. Nothing was due in full until approximately **December 8, 2027**. The petition alleging willful nonpayment was sworn **May 14, 2026** — nineteen months early. (Exhibits B, D, E.)

ALLSTATE FIRE AND CASUALTY TO THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE, JULY 20, 2026 (EXHIBIT C)

*[Allstate **retained defense counsel** ... to see if counsel could reach out to the State’s Attorney and the public defender to resolve this ... but **no one will respond or cooperate**. ... Allstate is **not unwilling still to take care of this payment**. ... **No one from the State Attorney’s Office will give any information to Allstate or its counsel**.]*

Under 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(d) probation “shall not be revoked” for a financial condition “unless such failure is due to his willful refusal to pay.” A solvent insurer carrying \$100,000 in limits retained counsel for the express purpose of paying, and could not obtain a return call from the office that swore the nonpayment was willful. No court has made a willfulness finding. *Bearden v. Georgia*, 461 U.S. 660, 672–73 (1983), required the inquiry before custody. It was never made.

C. Your own motion says the record does not exist. Docket 45 — the motion that bought the deadline you are now working to — states:

RESPONDENTS’ MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME, DKT. 45, FILED JULY 2, 2026

*[on information and belief, **no record was prepared for petitioner’s direct appeal**.]*

That is the State’s position of record, and it cannot be withdrawn quietly. If the response filed on August 10, 2026 argues that I failed to exhaust state remedies, it will be arguing that I failed to use a record the State has already told this Court was never prepared. If the position has changed, say so expressly and produce the record. If it has not changed, the exhaustion argument is unavailable.

III. NO VIOLATION HAS EVER BEEN ADJUDICATED

Everything above assumes the allegations were at least tested. They were not. Section 5-6-4(b) of the Unified Code of Corrections directs that “[t]he court shall conduct a hearing of the alleged violation,” and section 5-6-4(c) places on the State “the burden of going forward with the evidence and proving the violation by the preponderance of the evidence.” Section 5-6-4(e) authorizes disposition only “if the court finds that the offender has violated a condition.” Here is the entire record of both proceedings. (Exhibit G.)



PROCEEDING	WHAT THE MINUTES SAY, IN FULL
May 28, 2026 captioned "Arraignment On Petition To Revoke"	Present: the judge, an assistant State's Attorney, an ECR specialist, a probation officer. Petitioner is not listed as present. No defense counsel is listed. The disposition, in its entirety: "Case Called" and "Issue Warrant." No arraignment occurred. No plea or denial was entered.
June 17, 2026 captioned "Status"	An "Oral Motion TO LIFT STAY ON JAIL SENTENCE," marked "Granted." No evidence. No witness. No stipulation. No admission. No finding. The written order that followed is one sentence: the stay "is hereby lifted."

The State's petition asked the court to "lift the stay on any jail sentence previously imposed." The State obtained precisely that relief without ever proving the petition — and the petition remains undetermined today, seventy-five days after it was filed. There is no order in Lake County No. 23 CF 1146 adjudicating any violation, because no hearing was ever held. If your response asserts otherwise, identify the order.

IV. WHY EXHAUSTION IS NOT AVAILABLE TO YOU

Section 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii) excuses exhaustion where "circumstances exist that render such process ineffective to protect the rights of the applicant." I anticipate that your response will assert that Petitioner has not exhausted available state remedies. Before you write that sentence, consider what the record shows about availability during the exact weeks the State was moving to jail me.

- 1 **June 8, 2026 — the electronic channel was refused in writing.** The Clerk's office told me the case could not be added to the call because "the motion must be filed by your attorney," and directed me to "reach out to your public defender."
- 2 **June 15, 2026 — the filing that did land was reclassified.** A file-stamped verified omnibus motion was entered on the public docket as a single entry typed "Correspondence," and was never calendared. A motion docketed as a letter is a motion no judge is ever asked to rule on.
- 3 **June 17, 2026 — counsel was erased backward.** At 2:50 p.m. the court discharged the Public Defender *nunc pro tunc* to October 6, 2025 — notwithstanding that the same court had appointed the Public Defender by its own warrant seven months later, on May 28, 2026, which bears the notation "PD APPOINTED." So the office that told me to file through my attorney, and the court that discharged that attorney retroactively, were the same courthouse in the same week. (Exhibit G.)
- 4 **June 9 to the present — the paper channel never arrived.** Certified article 9402611898765528934061 carried the paper copy of the eighty-two-page omnibus filing. Its last carrier event is the Palatine distribution center, June 9, 2026, 7:55 a.m., "in transit to the destination." It has never been delivered. Referrals are lodged with the USPS Office of Inspector General and the Postal Inspection Service. (Exhibit F.)

The result is not disputed and is capable of one-line verification: **no motion I have filed in that case since June 8, 2026 has been ruled on.** Not the motion to quash the warrant. Not the Rule 607 motion for counsel and a transcript. Not the Rule 609 motion to stay the very custody at issue here. An exhaustion defense assumes a corrective process that functions. If you intend to argue that one was available to me, name it, and identify the ruling it produced.

And your own motion has already conceded the point from the other end. Docket 45 tells this Court that "no record was prepared for petitioner's direct appeal." A state process that produces no record, rules on no motion, and reclassifies filings as correspondence is the process section 2254(b)(1)(B)(ii) describes.

V. WHAT RULE 3.3 DOES TO A LAWYER WHO RECEIVES THIS LETTER

Illinois Rule of Professional Conduct 3.3(a)(1) provides that a lawyer shall not **knowingly** "make a false statement of fact or law to a tribunal or fail to correct a false statement of material fact or law previously made to the tribunal by the lawyer." Rule 3.3(a)(3) forbids offering evidence the lawyer knows to be false and requires reasonable remedial



measures on learning of falsity. Rule 3.3(b) reaches a lawyer who knows a person “intends to engage, is engaging or has engaged in criminal or fraudulent conduct related to the proceeding.” Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(b)(3) separately certifies that factual contentions have evidentiary support.

Every one of those provisions turns on one word: **knowingly**. Whatever your predecessors in this file knew or did not know, that question is closed as to you as of the transmission of this letter. The documents are attached. They are the State’s own.

CONFIRM YOUR POSITIONS IN WRITING BY 5:00 P.M. TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2026

Nothing in this letter asks you to abandon a defense. Respondents are entitled to counsel and to every position the record supports. What follows is confined to representations the record will not bear. I ask for your positions six days before your filing date so that the answers, or the absence of them, exist in writing before the response is drafted rather than after. If I receive no reply by that hour, I will report that to the Court as exactly what it is — no response — and not as agreement.

- 1 **Do not repeat the “illegal substance” characterization of the November 2025 screen.** It is contradicted by the supervising officer’s own writing, attached as Exhibit A.
- 2 **Do not represent, or imply, that any court made a finding of willful refusal to pay.** No such finding exists in any order in Lake County No. 23 CF 1146.
- 3 **Disclose the December 10, 2025 clearance to the Court.** If Respondents rely on the revocation petition, Rule 3.3 requires that the document refuting its central allegation be placed before the tribunal rather than omitted from it.
- 4 **State the State’s position on the May 28, 2026 warrant,** outstanding sixty-one days, which commands custody for what the warrant itself calls a “technical violation” — notwithstanding 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(b), under which the court “shall admit the offender to pretrial release” unless the violation is itself a criminal offense.
- 5 **Resolve Docket 45.** Either produce the record for the direct appeal or confirm on the record that none was prepared. If Respondents intend to argue exhaustion notwithstanding Part IV, identify by name the state corrective process said to have been available, and the ruling it produced.

VI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS, STATED PRECISELY

- 1 If a factual contention is presented after this notice without evidentiary support, I will move under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c), after serving the twenty-one-day safe-harbor copy the rule requires.
- 2 If a statement of material fact is made to the tribunal that you know to be false, or a known false statement is left uncorrected, I will refer that specific statement to the ARDC. Any referral would be confined to statements made after today, because today is when knowledge attaches.
- 3 This letter and its transmission metadata will be offered as evidence of notice in the related proceedings listed below.

For completeness, and not as a threat directed at you: the two assistant State’s Attorneys who authored the sworn allegations described above are named in their individual capacities in *Allababidi v. Shepherd*, No. 1:26-cv-06738 (N.D. Ill.), on the ground that personally attesting to facts is “the function of the witness, not of the lawyer,” for which absolute immunity is unavailable. *Kalina v. Fletcher*, 522 U.S. 118, 129–31 (1997). That is the posture of a separate case. I mention it because your response may be asked to rest on their work product, and you are entitled to know what has already been alleged about it.

VII. RELATED PROCEEDINGS



CASE	COURT / POSTURE
1:25-cv-15800	<i>Allababidi v. Advocate Health and Hospitals Corp., et al.</i> — civil RICO, Hon. Jorge L. Alonso; Mag. J. McNally.
1:26-cv-06738	<i>Allababidi v. Shepherd, et al.</i> — 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Hon. Matthew F. Kennelly.
2-26-0352	<i>People v. Allababidi</i> — Illinois Appellate Court, Second District; direct appeal from the June 17, 2026 order activating the 180-day jail term.
IDOI 01124092	Illinois Department of Insurance complaint producing the insurer response in Part II.B.

I have stated no conclusion in this letter that is not preceded by the document establishing it. You are welcome to check every one; that is why they are attached rather than described. What you do with them on August 10, 2026 is your professional judgment, exercised with knowledge.

Govern your responsive pleadings accordingly.

Respectfully and without waiver of any right or remedy,

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI | *Pro Se*

8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656

(773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com



EHAB ALLABABIDI

LEGAL CORRESPONDENCE

Notice under Illinois Rule of Professional Conduct 3.3 · Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b)

8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656
(773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com

July 28, 2026

ENCLOSURE REGISTER

EXHIBIT INDEX

The following authenticated records are transmitted with and incorporated into this letter.

EX.	RECORD	BATES / SOURCE
A	Supervising officer's written clearance of the amphetamine screen Cook County Adult Probation, December 8 and 10, 2025 — the screen adjudicated compliant five months before the State swore it was an illegal substance.	MAL-000001
B	Financial Sentencing Order — paragraph 7(a), Restitution: blank September 8, 2025. No restitution figure was carried into the financial judgment.	MAL-000006
C	Insurer record — \$16,557.00 paid; counsel retained to pay the balance Allstate response to Illinois Department of Insurance Complaint No. 01124092, July 20, 2026: "no one will respond or cooperate."	MAL-000008
D	Transfer of supervision to Cook County, and arrears of \$100.00 AOIC form filed November 10, 2025 — supervision "transferred from Lake County and accepted by Cook County as of 10/1/2025."	MAL-000014
E	April 8, 2026 probation memorandum and the May 14, 2026 verified petition The memorandum dates the screen 11/20/25; the sworn petition dates it 11/10/2025.	MAL-000016
F	USPS Office of Inspector General referral — routing memorandum July 28, 2026. Article 9402611898765528934061 carried the 82-page omnibus filing and has never been delivered.	MAL-000018
G	The four orders that produced the custody — May 28 and June 17, 2026 An arraignment at which neither the defendant nor any defense counsel appeared; a "Status" call at which 180 days was activated on an oral motion; a one-sentence order; and the discharge of counsel nunc pro tunc to eight months earlier.	MAL-000019



EXHIBIT A

**Supervising officer's written clearance of the amphetamine
screen**

MAL-000001

*Cook County Adult Probation, December 8 and 10, 2025 — the screen adjudicated compliant five
months before the State swore it was an illegal substance.*



Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Re: Prescription Verification & Compliance Letter

1 message

Adison Weeks (Adult Probation) <Adison.Weeks@cookcountyil.gov>

Wed, Dec 10, 2025 at 10:32 PM

To: Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Thanks so much!!

Adison Weeks, Officer
Cook County Adult Probation Department

[2121 Euclid Ave](#)

Rolling Meadows, Illinois 60008

Office: (847)818-2360


adison.weeks@cookcountyil.gov

adison b. weeks



From: Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>**Sent:** Wednesday, December 10, 2025 1:40 PM**To:** Adison Weeks (Adult Probation) <Adison.Weeks@cookcountyil.gov>**Subject:** Re: Prescription Verification & Compliance Letter**External Message Disclaimer**

This message originated from an external source. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.



Hi! Here you go ms Adison.

On Wed, Dec 10, 2025 at 12:37 PM Adison Weeks (Adult Probation) <Adison.Weeks@cookcountyil.gov> wrote:

Hey Ehab,

Do you mind still please sending me a picture of your updated Adderall prescription? I know you are still being prescribed it, but I just want to avoid anyone giving you a hard time for taking it. Your drug test results were positive for amphetamine, but it is all negative in my eyes because I know you are still taking the Adderall. I just want to avoid anyone who sees this result though giving you a hard time for future reference.

Thank you!

Best Regards,

Adison Weeks, Standard Caseload Officer

Cook County Adult Probation Department

2121 Euclid Ave

Rolling Meadows, Illinois 60008

Office: (847)818-2360

adison.weeks@cookcountyil.gov

adison b. weeks



From: Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 8, 2025 5:04 PM

To: Adison Weeks (Adult Probation) <Adison.Weeks@cookcountyil.gov>

Subject: Re: Prescription Verification & Compliance Letter

External Message Disclaimer

This message originated from an external source. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Re: Prescription Verification & Compliance Letter

Hi Adison,

Thank you so much for handling everything so quickly, I really appreciate it. I'll be there on Tuesday, December 23rd at 9 AM in person without fail.

I'll also keep you updated on the Lake matter.

Thanks again for all your help and communication.

Best regards,

Ehab Allababidi

On Mon, Dec 8, 2025 at 12:14 PM Adison Weeks (Adult Probation) <Adison.Weeks@cookcountyil.gov> wrote:

Hi Ehab,

Great! I was literally just about to send you an email just going over what I sent you in the voicemail just now—I know Dr. Quesada also writes and adds the current verified prescriptions you are taking in his updated letters for your case as well—I greatly appreciate you getting back to me so quickly though Ehab, thank you for following up with me! Good luck in court, please keep me updated and in the loop of things on what they say in Lake.

Just a reminder as well, your next report will be on Tuesday, December 23rd @ 9 AM in person. You will NOT have to drug test this time, since your drug test results were all negative. Once your Cook case terminates on 12/16 as well, we will discuss moving forward and you being assigned a different officer.

In the meantime, I hope you have a good week now, and I appreciate it once again you getting back to me so fast.

Best Regards,

Adison Weeks, Standard Caseload Officer

Cook County Adult Probation Department

[2121 Euclid Ave](#)

[Rolling Meadows, Illinois 60008](#)

[Office: \(847\)818-2360](#)

adison.weeks@cookcountyil.gov

adison b. weeks



From: Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 8, 2025 12:02 PM

To: Adison Weeks (Adult Probation) <Adison.Weeks@cookcountyil.gov>

Subject: Prescription Verification & Compliance Letter

External Message Disclaimer

This message originated from an external source. Please use proper judgment and caution when opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email.

Dear Officer Weeks,

I'm sorry I couldn't answer your call - I am currently at the lake county courthouse. I received your voicemail. I'll send you a photo of my updated prescription today, and I've emailed my doctor to send you a standard letter of compliance as soon as possible.

Please let me know if you need anything else.

Sincerely,

Ehab Allababidi



EXHIBIT B

**Financial Sentencing Order — paragraph 7(a), Restitution:
blank**

MAL-000006

September 8, 2025. No restitution figure was carried into the financial judgment.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

FILED

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,
City or Village of _____

vs.

Ehab Allababidi
(Defendant)

General Number 23CF1146

Erin Cartwright Weinstein
Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

FINANCIAL SENTENCING ORDER

The Defendant has appeared before this court and ☒ plead guilty ☐ was found guilty of the offenses listed in paragraph 1 below.

☐ Defendant has been admonished of his/her right to be sentenced under the law in effect at the time of the offense or the time of sentencing:

In addition to any other sentences imposed in the case, the Defendant is ordered to pay the following fines and assessments:

1. Fine(s) (705 ILCS 105/27.3b-1 and 730 ILCS 5/4-4.5-5 sets forth the minimum fine):

- a. Offense: Aggravated Reckless Driving/Great Bodily Harm \$ 75
b. Offense: \$
c. Offense: \$
Total fine(s): \$ 75

2. Fine Credits:

- ☐ Credit for time served: _____ days x \$30.00 per day credit \$()

Balance of fines less fine credit(s): \$ 75

3. Criminal Assessments (One per case. Check the highest-class offense only.)

Offense:

- a. ☒ Schedule 1: Generic Felony (705 ILCS 135/15-5) \$ 549 \$ 549
b. ☐ Schedule 2: Felony DUI/OUI (705 ILCS 135/15-10) \$1,709 \$
c. ☐ Schedule 3: Felony Drug Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-15) \$2,215 \$
d. ☐ Schedule 4: Felony Sex Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-20) \$1,314 \$
e. ☐ Schedule 5: Generic Misdemeanor Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-25) \$ 439 \$
f. ☐ Schedule 6: Misdemeanor DUI/OUI (705 ILCS 135/15-30) \$1,381 \$
g. ☐ Schedule 7: Misdemeanor Drug Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-35) \$ 905 \$
h. ☐ Schedule 8: Misdemeanor Sex Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-40) \$1,184 \$
i. ☐ Schedule 9: Major Traffic Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-45) \$ 325 \$
j. ☐ Schedule 10: Minor Traffic Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-50) \$ 226 \$
k. ☐ Schedule 10.5: Truck Weight/Load Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-52) \$ 260 \$
l. ☐ Schedule 11: Conservation Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-55) \$ 195 \$
m. ☐ Schedule 13: Non-Traffic Violation (705 ILCS 135/15-65) \$ 100 \$

Subtotal-Criminal Assessment: \$ 549

4. Offsets of Assessments

- a. ☐ Public/Community Service (1 hour x current Illinois minimum wage subtracted from Criminal Assessment - Section 3 - only) (705 ILCS 135/5-20(b))
Number of Hours _____ x \$ _____ per hour \$()
b. ☐ Substance Abuse Treatment Program Credit (subtracted from Criminal Assessment - Section 3 - only) (705 ILCS 135/5-10(c-5)) \$()

Total Additional Offsets: \$()

Total Balance of Criminal Assessments: \$

5. Conditional Assessment(s) (Check all that apply)

Offense:

- a. ☐ Arson/Residential/Aggravated Arson (705 ILCS 135/15-70(1)) \$500 per conviction \$
b. ☐ Child Pornography (705 ILCS 135-15-70(2))
☐ State Police ☐ Other Arresting Agency \$500 per conviction \$
c. ☐ Crime lab drug analysis (705 ILCS 135/15-70(3)) \$ 100 \$
d. ☐ DNA analysis (705 ILCS 135/15-70(4)) \$ 250 \$
e. ☐ DUI analysis (705 ILCS 135/15-70(5)) \$ 150 \$

☐	f.	Street Value – Drug-related offense, possession/delivery (705 ILCS 135/15-70(6))	\$	
☐	g.	Street Value – Methamphetamine, possession/manufacture (705 ILCS 135/15-70(7))	\$	
☐	h.	Order of protection violation (705 ILCS 135/15-70(8))	\$200 per conviction	\$
☐	i.	Order of protection violation (705 ILCS 135/15-70(9))	\$ 25 per violation	\$
☐	j.	State's Attorney petty or business offense (705 ILCS 135/15-70(10)(A))	\$ 4	\$
☒	k.	State's Attorney conservation or traffic offense (705 ILCS 135/15-70(10)(B))	\$ 2	\$2
☐	l.	Speeding in a construction zone (705 ILCS 135/15-70(11))		
☐		☐ Interstate Highway ☐ County	\$ 250	\$
☐	m.	Supervision disposition under Vehicle Code (705 ILCS 135/15-70(12))	\$ 0.50	\$
☐	n.	Guilty plea or no contest, specified offense against family member		
☐		☐ Sentencing offense is Sexual Assault (705 ILCS 135/15-70(13))	\$ 200	\$
☐	o.	EMS response reimbursement, vehicle/snowmobile/boat violation (DUI/OUI) (705 ILCS 135/15-70(14))	Max. Amt. is \$1,000	\$
☐	p.	EMS response reimbursement, controlled substances violation (705 ILCS 135/15-70(15))	\$1,000	\$
☐	q.	EMS response reimbursement, reckless driving/aggravated reckless driving/speed in excess 26 mph violation (705 ILCS 135/15-70(16))	Max. Amt. is \$1,000	\$
☐	r.	Human Trafficking, Sex Offender Registration, or Soliciting a Sexual Act Violation (705 ILCS 135/15-70(17));	Not less than \$350 for each offense sentenced	\$
		This amount shall be the minimum amount of the fine, which shall be distributed pursuant to this act		
☐	s.	Weapons Violation, Trauma Center Fund (705 ILCS 135/15-70(18))	\$100 per conviction	\$
☐	t.	Scott's Law (705 ILCS 135/15-70(19)) ☐ State Police ☐ County	\$ 250	\$
			Subtotal – Conditional Assessment Amount:	\$
			TOTAL CRIMINAL AND CONDITIONAL ASSESSMENTS:	\$551.00

6. Assessment waiver (only applies to financial obligations under sections 3 and 5):

a. ☐ Waiver of Criminal Court Assessment granted _____ (does not apply to fines or IVC)

(Date)

☐ 100% ☐ 75% ☐ 50% ☐ 25% Waiver amount: \$(_____)

Balance of assessments and conditional assessments after credits are applied: \$_____

7. Other Assessments:

☐	a.	Restitution (See separate Restitution Order for details)	\$	
☒	b.	Probation/Supervision/Conditional Discharge Fee \$50/month x 30 months	\$1500	
☒	c.	Public Defender assessment	\$100	
☒	d.	Service Provider cost ☐ Urinalysis Testing \$125 ☒	\$125	
☐	e.	Therapeutic Intensive Monitoring Fee	\$	
☐	f.	Other: _____	\$	
☐	g.	Pretrial Bond Services Fee	\$	
☐	h.	Court Ordered Contribution: Agency & Address: _____	\$	
☐	i.	Roadside Memorial Fund	\$ 50	\$

8. Bond posted: _____ **minus 10% bond fee** _____ **= Bond Available:** \$_____


☐ SEE EXHIBIT A

BALANCE OF ALL FINES AND ASSESSMENTS MINUS BOND: \$2,251.00

I am the Defendant in the above case and I have read and understand this Financial Sentencing Order.

Dated: September 8, 2025

Entered this date: 09/08/2025, 20


Defendant's Signature



Judge Signature



EXHIBIT C

**Insurer record — \$16,557.00 paid; counsel retained to pay
the balance**

MAL-000008

*Allstate response to Illinois Department of Insurance Complaint No. 01124092, July 20, 2026: "no
one will respond or cooperate."*

July 20, 2026

RESPONSE SENT VIA: IL HELP CENTER

Attn: Maileen
Consumer Services Division
Illinois Department of Insurance
320 W. Washington Street
Springfield, IL 62767

IDOI File No.:	01124092
Complainant:	Ehab Allababidi
Policyholder:	Ehab Allababidi
Policy No.:	802 748 890
Product Type:	Automobile Policy
Policy Form:	ACR65-00
Respondent:	Allstate Fire and Casualty Insurance Company
Date of Loss:	May 22, 2022
Allstate Claim No:	0670868884

Response Due Date: July 17, 2026 (extension secured until July 24, 2026)

Dear Maileen:

Thank you for allowing Allstate Fire and Casualty Insurance Company (hereinafter "Allstate") the opportunity to respond to the instant IDOI Complaint filed by Ehab Allababidi in relation to a revocation of sentencing that was initiated by the States Attorney in behalf of the People of the State of Illinois in a pending criminal case. Allstate is being faulted for not paying a property damage claim as part of this restitution in behalf of Mr. Allababidi. Mr. Allababidi expects Allstate to now paid said unreported PD claim and now and brings this to the attention of the Illinois Department of Insurance. Allstate responds as follows:

A. Introduction and Background.

This IDOI Complaint submitted by the Allstate insured, Ehab Allababidi, stems from a motor vehicle accident on May 23, 2022 at or near Illinois Route 22 and Old Mill Road in Vernon Township, Lake County, Illinois, wherein he caused alleged property damage to several parties and/or entities.

Allstate opened the claim under 0670868884. Allstate did not deny coverage to anyone. In fact, as pointed out by claimant/insured, Allstate paid out the one property claim that was pressed by Sentry Insurance in the sum of \$16,557.00. No other claims to date were presented by any persons, individuals, or insurance companies for alleged property damage. Mr. Allababidi never put Allstate on notice of any other such property claims against him. While Allstate adjusted the Sentry Insurance property claim from the standpoint of assuming the insured's alleged civil liability, it did not nor could it be involved in any admission as to criminal conduct, charges, or sentencing.

At the time of the loss, the vehicle operated by Mr. Allababidi was covered by Allstate Policy No. 802 748 890, which carried \$100,000 in property damage limits.

Because the date of loss is May 23, 2022, any party seeking recovery for property damage would have 5 years to file suit. At the time of this IDOI complaint, no suits are pending and the SOL does not expire until May 23, 2027. If suits were filed, Allstate would have defended and indemnified the insured (Mr. Allababidi), and possibly even tried to settle. If suits were not settled, Allstate would retain house or panel counsel to defend the insured. Allstate did not dispute civil liability and it was a question of who was pressing recovery claims. No claims were ever pressed. Certainly at no time was Allstate presented with any property damage loss of O'Brien Landscape, an entity to whom restitution was awarded by the State, in the sum of \$2,670.86.

B. The Criminal Case and Restitution Order.

It appears from the Complaint and Allstate's investigation to date, that the State prosecuted a criminal case against Mr. Allababidi, Lake County Case No. 23 CF 00001145. Mr. Allababidi was charged with:

1. AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM 625 ILCS 5/11-503(a)(1)
Class 4 Felony;
2. SPEEDING 35+ MPH OVER LIMIT 625 ILCS 5/11-601.5(b)
Class A Misdemeanor.

This criminal suit was never tendered to Allstate, nor would it be as Allstate would not defend a criminal case. The policy's insuring agreement covers civil claims for alleged property damage and/or alleged bodily injury (including death). Defense of criminal cases are not covered

Allstate learned since the filing of this IDOI Complaint, that Mr. Allababidi was defended by a public defender in the criminal case. Mr. Allababidi pled guilty to AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM 625 ILCS 5/11-503(a)(1) (Class 4 Felony).

As part of that judgment order entered on September 8, 2025, the People (with the State's Attorney's agreement), entered a restitution order against Mr. Allababidi to compensate one property damage victim, **to wit:** O'Brien Landscaping for \$2,670.86. This was part of the plea deal agreed to by Mr. Allababidi. Mr. Allababidi agreed to these terms and restitution. He also agreed to 30 months' probation. Allstate cannot determine when the payment was due. The Insured may still have time because his probation was for 30 months.

C. The Restitution Was Not [Timely] Paid.

It is hard to interpret Mr. Allababidi's grievance against Allstate per se. It seems that Mr. Allababidi believed that this restitution would be paid directly by Allstate and the State's Attorney should have sought payment directly from Allstate. Because it was not timely paid, Mr. Allababidi was served on May 12, 2026 with a petition to revoke his probation and risks incarceration. There is no scheduled hearing date.

Again, Allstate was not involved in, nor aware until recently, of the outcome of Mr. Allababidi's criminal case or the details of same. Allstate has no obligation to pay this restitution claim. This was not a civil penalty of any kind. This was not tendered to Allstate to defend or pay at any time. This IDOI Complaint is Allstate's first notice of Mr. Allababidi's plea deal and this restitution judgment. From reading the IDOI Complaint, Mr. Allababidi expects and expected this to be paid by Allstate because Allstate paid a civil property damage settlement to Sentry Insurance property claim under the terms of Policy No. 802 748 890. That was not a restitution sentencing order.

It is not entirely clear if the insured is notifying the DOI to take any action against Allstate. He appears to want this Department to look into this further as to why the State's Attorney never sought to have this paid directly by Allstate. Surely, Allstate cannot be faulted for paying something it never was asked to pay, by the State's Attorney, by Mr. Allababidi or anyone in his behalf, or by O'Brien Landscape.

D. Restitution is Not a Claim for PD or BI.

As the IDOI is aware, a restitution claim is something that is part of a criminal sentencing to deter a defendant from future criminal conduct. It is not a claim for BI or PD covered in a personal auto policy.

Restitution is a legal remedy that requires a wrongdoer to give back what he/she gained or compensate for what the victim lost, with the goal of restoring the victim to his/her pre-loss position. It is most commonly ordered as part of a criminal sentence when defendant is found guilty of a crime and the court decides to impose payment to the victim. For example, in a criminal case for assault or theft, restitution might cover medical bills, property damage, or lost wages directly tied to the crime. Apparently in this criminal sentencing involved repayment of property damaged in the vehicle accident.

In the civil setting, a claim for BI or PD seeks compensation, not restitution through a judgment or settlement, not a restitution order as here. The restitution agreed to in this case involved payment owed by defendant (not his insurance company) as part of a sentence.

In the past when claimants or their criminal lawyer asked Allstate to pay the restitution, Allstate was at least aware of same. It was not aware here. This IDOI Complaint is the first notice of any such demand for payment. Mr. Allababidi complains that because Allstate covered the loss and because the State never sought it to be paid directly from Allstate, he knows will suffer the consequences of revocation of his plea deal. As we understand, there is a petition pending to do just that. This is what prompted the filing of this IDOI Complaint and also a federal discrimination case (1:26-cv-06738, Northern Dist. of Illinois), naming the State's Attorney and others. This has nothing to do with this IDOI complaint, Allstate is not named as a defendant in the discrimination case. It is named in the IDOI Complaint which it is now required to answer.

Actually, the policy very clearly forbids an insured to enter into any voluntary settlement or judgment and then seek repayment from Allstate. Specifically the policy provides:

Allstate is not denying coverage now for that reason since this was not even a civil settlement or judgment. Again, Mr. Allababidi agreed to the restitution terms and did nothing to pay it and never told Allstate about it. Mr. Allababidi's own conduct precipitated the pending petition for revocation. Neither did the public defender or the State. The fact that it is not paid as the insured agreed to by a date certain is why the insured now risks his plea deal and may face incarceration.

E. Allstate's Practice and Procedures as to Restitution.

More often than not, a restitution payment may be denied by personal liability insurer as not being covered without any repercussions. It is very rare for a criminal lawyer defending an insured in a criminal case with civil exposure as well, to seek payment of the restitution claim. Sometimes this is during the pendency of civil cases, sometimes not. For example, when there are murder charges pending against a driver and there is a likelihood of a restitution award (voluntary or not), Allstate is generally very careful in settling wrongful death cases not to release this remedy to the victim families in the criminal case by a broadly worded "any and all claims." It is not unprecedented for the People and Allstate (through its defense counsel) to get together to see if perhaps insurance payment could resolve this controversy. That is not what happened here.

Also, in the past when Allstate approached the parties, counsel, and the court in a criminal case to pay restitution, the judge was not willing to allow this because it was not paid out of pocket and served no deterrence to defendant from future conduct.

F. Allstate's Present Position in Connection with Reimbursing the Property Damage Victim the Restitution the Insured Himself Agreed to Pay.

Allstate does not know presently what the State's Attorney or the property damage victim, O'Brien Landscape, will agree to. Again, Allstate retained defense counsel upon receipt of the DOI Complaint to see if counsel could reach out to the State's Attorney and the public defender to resolve this for Mr. Allababidi, but no one will respond or cooperate. Further, Allstate is aware that in some instances the State's Attorney is not willing to accept payment from any insurance company, in lieu of a personal payment from defendant because of this sentencing. Again, this is not compensation. This is restitution and intended to be paid and financed by the criminal defendant in his own behalf.

Allstate is not unwilling still to take care of this payment if it can, even though this is not a civil judgment. Again, Allstate's counsel has not been able to reach the State's Attorney to see if it could even pay this and make this right before this IDOI response was due. Allstate has not been able to reach the judgment creditor (O'Brien Landscape) either. Allstate, through counsel, is attempting to see if payment can be made but there are variables and moving parts, and before the insured's federal discrimination case put a chilling effect on these communications.

Again, Allstate is not unwilling to pay the O'Brien Landscape PD claim (now that it is aware of same), but actually it does not know if: (1) it can, (2) the State's Attorney would let this happen; and (3) what proof could even be produced to the State's Attorney to even show this satisfaction.

Again, if the State's Attorney's entire sentencing was based on Mr. Allababidi paying this out of pocket as a penalty to prevent future conduct, then Allstate may not be able to make this right, even if it is willing to.

Additionally, it would seem precipitous too, for Allstate to pay anything without proof of the damages and seeing whether this "restitution" is in fact damages that were already reimbursed by the insurance company to O'Brien Landscape. Allstate knows nothing at this time about any of this and cannot obtain any information from any of the attorneys. Because of this IDOI Complaint, counsel for Allstate did not reach out to Mr. Allababidi personally about any of this, either.

G. The Time to Present Property Damage Claims Has Not Expired Yet.

At the time of answering this IDOI Complaint, Allstate is not in receipt of any subrogation claim by the insurer for O'Brien Landscape, which is believed to be Frankenmuth Mutual. Allstate is unaware if O'Brien Landscape submitted this property claim to Frankenmuth and if so whether it paid said claim. As Allstate is led to believe, the restitution claim in favor of O'Brien Landscape was for \$2,670.86. This should be for an amount not previously paid and is a loss or out of pocket claim of O'Brien Landscape to make things right for this creditor. It would not seem that the State's Attorney would set up any restitution to reimburse a subrogation insurer. No one from the State Attorney's Office will give any information to Allstate or its counsel.

Allstate is a member of intercompany arbitration with many insurers, including Frankenmuth Mutual. If Allstate were put on notice of this subrogation claim, it would have dealt with it through intercompany arbitration. No insurer filed such a demand for recovery.

If Allstate were put on notice of any out of pocket claim (not covered) pressed by O'Brien Landscape it would have dealt with these too. No person or entity including O'Brien Landscape or its insurer Frankenmuth Mutual reached out to Allstate with the claim, a demand to settle, or filed suit against the Allstate insured.

Allstate never had any opportunity to take care of any property claims except the claim by Sentry Insurance. In fact, in review of the claims file, Allstate after this accident reached out to possible bodily injury victim Manuel Rojo, and confirmed no injury. Allstate reached out to O'Brien Landscape and received no communication either.

The SOL for property damage does not expire until May 23, 2027. Allstate has the balance of \$83,443.00 to pay any such claims.

Allstate sought to identify claims and not hearing from anyone never pressed matters further. It paid Sentry since that property damage claim was pressed. No others were. Allstate has no obligation to prompt or remind parties to make claims and file suit. Not every claimant seeks recovery as IDOI is well aware. Allstate had no active letters of representation by any counsel for O'Brien Landscape and Frankenmuth Mutual. O'Brien Landscape was aware that Allstate covered this loss. Allstate routinely will settle and pay unrepudiated claimants. This did not happen here. Neither was Allstate put on any notice of the restitution agreement or request for payment either.

Allstate is not able to respond to why the insured believed Allstate was paying this and he did not have to.

H. Attachments.

For ease of reference, we include the following. Allstate can furnish any nonprivileged documents upon request:

Exhibit	Description
A	Policy
B	Illinois Traffic Crash Report
C	Proof of Payments of Sentry Subro Claim
D	Federal Court filing of Mr. Allababidi

I. Conclusion.

Allstate is not entirely sure what is being pressed at this time or what needs the IDOI's oversight and attention. IDOI is certainly not going to enter any finding compelling Allstate to pay a criminal case restitution which is not covered. The IDOI is certainly not going to compel Allstate either to seek out unknown property claims and pay them before they are presented and for which Allstate has no information, proof of damage, or documentation of any kind.

Allstate acted properly under Illinois law, the policy terms, and the Illinois Insurance Code, in its adjustment of this loss. Allstate has certain responsibilities of course under the dictates of the insuring agreement to settle, pay, and/or defend any civil claims for property damage once notified for recovery. This restitution claim agreed to by Mr. Allababidi is not a civil claim.

We appreciate the opportunity to clarify our position and are willing to assist the insured in making this right. It would not seem appropriate to front money to Mr. Allababidi to pay this restitution claim. Allstate would help Mr. Allababidi if it could with complete transparency to the States' Attorney's Office and O'Brien Landscaping if presented with an opportunity to pay and make this right.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the insured's concerns.

Best Regards,

Lourdes Krayser

Delivery Senior Manager



EXHIBIT D

**Transfer of supervision to Cook County, and arrears of
\$100.00**

MAL-000014

*AOIC form filed November 10, 2025 — supervision “transferred from Lake County and accepted by
Cook County as of 10/1/2025.”*

Client PIN: 227568

In the Circuit Court of the 19th Judicial Circuit
Lake County, Illinois

In Re: Probation Supervision of EHAB ALLABABIDI
{Defendant's Name}

Case No.

Address: 8516 W Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656

Date of Birth: 09/24/1996

FILED
NOV 10 2025

Adult Notification of Changes to the Probation Fee Schedule

Sentencing Information: Original Jurisdiction: Lake County

Original Case Number: 23CF00001146

Original Sentencing Date: 09/08/2025

Length of Original Probation Sentence: 30 MONTHS

Probation Fees Ordered at Sentencing: \$ 50 /month for 30 months

You are hereby notified of the following change(s) in the aforementioned defendant's probation fee schedule pursuant to 730 ILCS 5/5-6-3 and 730 ILCS 5/5-6-3.1:

1. The defendant's probation supervision has been transferred from Lake County and accepted by Cook County as of 10/1/2025. The defendant has been assessed a probation fee of \$ 50 /month for 2 months and has paid a total of \$ 0 prior to acceptance of transfer. The defendant is in arrears \$ 100.00 to Lake County. —
2. The defendant's probation supervision has been transferred from _____ County, and accepted by _____ County as of ____/____/____. The defendant has been assessed a probation fee of \$ ____/month and elected to pay probation fees due in a "lump sum" of \$ _____ leaving a balance of \$ _____ prior to acceptance of transfer.
3. Future probation fee payments will be paid to the Clerk of the Circuit Court in the receiving county of ____ in the amount of \$ ____ /month for ____ months. —
4. The probation department has re-evaluated the defendant's ability to pay, and the defendant's probation fee has been adjusted from \$ _____ per month to \$ _____ per month as of ____/____/____, and notice of such adjustment has been given to the defendant. The adjusted total probation fees due is \$ _____.

Signed: _____ Date: ____/____/____
{Defendant's Signature}

5. Other (please explain) _____

Printed: _____

Signed: _____ Date: 10/1/2025
{Director of Court Services/Chief Probation Officer/Designee}

c: ____ Court File ____ Probation Case File ____ Defendant

AOIC Form (Rev)-12/21

FILED

NOV 10 2025

2025

11



EXHIBIT E

**April 8, 2026 probation memorandum and the May 14, 2026
verified petition**

MAL-000016

The memorandum dates the screen 11/20/25; the sworn petition dates it 11/10/2025.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Division of Adult Probation Services

FILED

STATE OF ILLINOIS



Erin Cartwright, Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

Lake County, Illinois

215 West Water Street
Waukegan, IL 60085-5616
Phone: (847) 377-4504
Fax: (847)984-5790

MEMORANDUM

TO: STATE'S ATTORNEY, LAKE COUNTY, IL
ATTENTION: Ben Dillon COURT RM: T-611
RE: EHAB ALLABABIDI
ADDRESS: 8516 W Winona St, Chicago, IL 60656
FROM: MARISA CERVANTES, Probation Officer
DATE: 04/08/2026
CASE #: 23CF00001146

THE ABOVE REFERENCED WAS PLACED ON 30 MONTHS Probation by Judge CHRISTOPHER R. STRIDE on 09/08/2025 for AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM IN VIOLATION OF AFORESAID ORDER, TO WIT, PARAGRAPH(S) 2, 4, 12, 19, & 23 AS FOLLOWS:

2. Defendant is assessed \$2,531.00 in court cost and fees. The defendant has an outstanding balance of \$1,131.00.

4. Defendant tested positive for Amphetamines on 11/20/25. Defendant has not provided an updated prescription.

12. Defendant failed to report to probation on the following dates: 02/19/26, 02/27/26, 03/10/26, 03/11/26 & 03/26/26.

19. Defendant failed to complete 240 public service hours.

23. Defendant failed to complete the victim impact panel.

RECOMMENDATION: ☒ REQUEST THAT PETITION BE FILED
☐ Request hearing to determine status of case with Court
☐ Take no action
☐ Other/Comments: __

COPY: Judge
Defense Attorney
Probation File

OFFICER: MARISA CERVANTES PHONE: (847)377-3614

Approved By: LORI CARRIER

AOC-3-36-18-R-0399

FILED

~~LC 23CF00001146~~

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Erin Cartwright Weinstein
Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

vs.

EHAB ALLABABIDI

GEN. NO. 23CF00001146

PETITION FOR REVOCATION

NOW COMES the People of the State of Illinois by Eric F. Rinehart, Lake County State's Attorney, by and through, Nicholas Shepherd, Assistant State's Attorney, and petitions this Honorable Court to revoke the defendant's probation, pursuant to 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4. In support of this petition, the People of the State of Illinois state the following, upon information and belief:


1. That on or about September 8, 2025, the defendant was placed on 30 months of probation, for the offense of AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM, a Class 4 Felony.
2. That the defendant's probation, includes the following condition(s):
 - A. The defendant shall pay all fines, fees, court costs, assessments, and restitution.
 - B. The defendant shall not use any illegal substance.
 - C. The defendant shall report to Probation as directed.
 - D. The defendant shall perform 240 hours of public service at a minimum rate of 20 hours per month.
 - E. The defendant shall comply with a Live Victim Impact Panel.
3. The defendant failed to comply with the terms of their probation, and in support of this allegation, the People state the defendant violated the terms of their probation in the following manner:
 - A. The defendant willfully failed to pay court ordered financial obligations.
 - B. The defendant tested positive for Amphetamine (illegal substance) on or about 11/10/2025.
 - C. The defendant failed to report to Probation/Compliance on or about 02/19/2026, 02/27/2026, 03/10/2026, 03/11/2026, and 03/26/2026.
 - D. The defendant failed to provide proof of completion of 240 hours of public service.
 - E. The defendant failed to provide proof of completion of the Live Victim Impact Panel

WHEREFORE, The People of the State of Illinois pray this Honorable Court revoke the Defendant's probation of the said named defendant for failure to perform the conditions of the sentence heretofore entered, and further moves this Honorable Court to lift the stay on any jail sentence previously imposed or issue a warrant for the arrest and apprehension of the said named defendant, who shall be brought immediately to court for the purpose of setting a date of hearing on said petition or to order a summons to the offender to appear.

The undersigned, having been first duly sworn, states she is informed and believes the allegations of the above petition are true and correct.

ERIC F. RINEHART

LAKE COUNTY STATE'S ATTORNEY



Nicholas Shepherd
Assistant State's Attorney

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to before me
12th day of May, 2026



NOTARY PUBLIC





EXHIBIT F

**USPS Office of Inspector General referral — routing
memorandum**

MAL-000018

*July 28, 2026. Article 9402611898765528934061 carried the 82-page omnibus filing and has never
been delivered.*



EHAB ALLABABIDI

LEGAL CORRESPONDENCE

AGENCY-SPECIFIC ACTION ROUTING MEMORANDUM

8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656
(773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com

July 28, 2026

POSTAL-EMPLOYEE / CONTRACTOR MISCONDUCT INTAKE

ACTIONABLE ROUTING MEMORANDUM

USPS OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

ATTN: OIG HOTLINE

1735 North Lynn Street · Arlington, Virginia 22209-2020

CONTROLLED THRESHOLD CHRONOLOGY

July article 9402611898765521606811: accepted July 11 at 9:30 a.m.; picked up in Waukegan July 23 at 6:12 a.m.; court notice file-stamped at 11:59 a.m. the same day. June article 9402611898765528934061: last supplied event Palatine June 9; still in transit in the account record updated July 27. (**Master Exs. A, D, E.**)

WHY THIS OFFICE IS RECEIVING THE RECORD

The OIG publicly accepts allegations of mail destruction, theft, fraud, abuse, or misconduct by Postal Service employees and contractors. The attached record does not ask OIG to treat ordinary delay as misconduct; it asks OIG to determine whether any postal employee, contractor, device, or official record was knowingly used to divert, suppress, misstate, or conceal the two Lake County custody chains.

OFFICE-SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED

- 1 Log and evaluate this as a named Hotline allegation and provide the complaint or reference number.
- 2 Preserve or cause preservation of PTR events, manual corrections, scanner/device identifiers, C360 notes, exception records, employee or contractor assignments, and communications tied to both articles.
- 3 Determine whether the Indiana route, Palatine freeze, missing delivery confirmation, or any corrected/suppressed event reflects employee or contractor misconduct rather than an ordinary service failure.
- 4 Segregate service-delay issues for Consumer Affairs and refer any non-postal criminal predicate to USPIS without closing the employee-misconduct component by circular referral.

DISPOSITION REQUEST

Provide the Hotline/reference number, responsible component, and whether the matter was retained, referred, or closed. If referred, identify the receiving office and preserve the original submission and attachments.

SCOPE LIMITATION

No particular postal employee is identified as guilty. Intent and actor classification remain questions for native records and investigation.

Authority / routing source: Official route: usps.oig.gov/contact-us and usps.oig.gov/about-us/frequently-asked-questions

Respectfully and without waiver,

/s/ Ehab Allababidi · Pro Se · (773) 920-0030 · defcon5ready@gmail.com



EXHIBIT G

**The four orders that produced the custody — May 28 and
June 17, 2026**

MAL-000019

An arraignment at which neither the defendant nor any defense counsel appeared; a “Status” call at which 180 days was activated on an oral motion; a one-sentence order; and the discharge of ~~counsel nunc pro tunc to eight months earlier.~~



IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

People	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. 23CF00001146
v.	)	Location: Courtroom 611
	)	Event Date: May 28, 2026 9:00 AM
PEOPLE VS ALLABABIDI	)	Event Type: Arraignment On Petition To Revoke
Defendant.	)	
	)	Clerk: Johanna B

Charge(s):

Count 1 625 ILCS 5/11-503(a)(1) AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM 4 Guilty
09/08/2025

Count 2 625 ILCS 5/11-601.5(b) SPEEDING 35+ MPH OVER LIMIT A Nolle Prosequi
09/08/2025

Criminal/Traffic - Minutes

Christopher R Stride, Judge
Nicholas Shepherd, States Attorney
ECR Specialist, Lake County Court Reporters

Present in Court

MARISSA CERVANTES - Lake County Adult Probation Services

Nature of Proceedings:

Event Result: Case Called 05/28/2026.
Issue Warrant



IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

People	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	Case No. 23CF00001146
v.	)	Location: Courtroom 611
	)	Event Date: June 17, 2026 9:00 AM
PEOPLE VS ALLABABIDI	)	Event Type: Status
Defendant.	)	
	)	Clerk: Johanna B

Charge(s):

Count 1 625 ILCS 5/11-503(a)(1) AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM 4 Guilty
09/08/2025

Count 2 625 ILCS 5/11-601.5(b) SPEEDING 35+ MPH OVER LIMIT A Nolle Prosequi
09/08/2025

Criminal/Traffic - Minutes

Christopher R Stride, Judge
ECR Specialist, Lake County Court Reporters
Nicholas Shepherd, States Attorney
Bailey Russell, Public Defender

Present in Court

ALLABABIDI, EHAB, Appellant, Defendant present via video

Nature of Proceedings:

Event Result: Heard 06/17/2026.
Public Defender Discharged
WARRANT WILL NOT BE QUASHED
Oral Motion
TO LIFT STAY ON JAIL SENTENCE
Granted
Order Entered

FILED

6/18/2026 10:48 A

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Erin Cartwright Weinstein
Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

vs.

EHAB ALLABABIDI

GEN. NO. 23CF00001146


ORDER

This matter coming before this Honorable Court with the Court being fully advised of the premises. It is so ordered:

1. The stay of the 180 day Lake County Jail term of the defendant's sentence is hereby lifted.

Enter:

Dated: June 17, 2026



JUDGE

FILED

6/17/2026 2:50 PM

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
)SS
COUNTY OF LAKE)

Erin Cartwright Weinstein
Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS)

vs.)

General No. 23CF1146

Ehab Allababidi)

ORDER


Public Defender Withdraw/Discharge

It is Hereby Ordered that the Lake County Public Defenders is discharged as attorney of record in the above-entitled cause;

Nunc pro tunc to October 6, 2025

Dated at Waukegan, Illinois, this 17 day of June, A.D., 2026:

ENTERED


Judge

- ☐ Pursuant to a hearing held in this matter, a Public Defender Fee in the amount of \$ _____ is hereby ordered.
- ☐ Pursuant to a hearing held in this matter, it has been determined that no Public Defender Fee shall be assessed.