

IN THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
SECOND DISTRICT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

EHAB ALLABABIDI,
Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se.

APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
SECOND DISTRICT

Appeal No. **2-26-0352**

Appeal from the Circuit Court of
Lake County, No. **23 CF 1146**

The Honorable Christopher R. Stride,
Judge Presiding

**SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPORTING RECORD PURSUANT TO ILLINOIS SUPREME
COURT RULE 328**

*Exhibits AA and BB — in support of Appellant’s Emergency Motion to Supplement the Pending Omnibus Emergency
Motion*

WHY THIS RECORD IS FILED

Second District Local Rule 109(a) requires that a movant attach to an emergency motion every trial court and appellate court document relevant to it. The Supporting Record filed with Appellant’s Omnibus Emergency Motion carries Exhibits A through Z and contains the order under review, its minutes, the warrant of May 28, 2026, the petition for revocation of May 14, 2026, the sentencing order, the Notice of Court Date of July 23, 2026, and the notice docketing this appeal. The two instruments on which the accompanying motion turns are not among them. They are supplied here, in the same form, so that the record before this Court is complete without being duplicated.

VERIFICATION AND RULE 328 CERTIFICATION

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure (735 ILCS 5/1-109), I, EHAB ALLABABIDI, Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se, certify that the copies of documents contained in this Supplemental Supporting Record are true and correct copies of documents filed in the trial court and in the files maintained in my possession; that each is what the exhibit cover preceding it states it to be; that each is reproduced in full, no pages having been omitted; that no page has been altered other than by the addition of the exhibit cover and the sequential Bates footer; and that this record is submitted under Illinois Supreme Court Rules 328 and 361 in support of the emergency motion filed herewith.

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI

Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se

8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, Illinois 60656

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

Dated: July 29, 2026

Appeal	No. 2-26-0352, Appellate Court of Illinois, Second District
Circuit court	Nineteenth Judicial Circuit, Lake County, No. 23 CF 1146 (23CF00001146)
Relationship to the record on file	Supplemental to the Supporting Record (Exhibits A through Z) filed with the Omnibus Emergency Motion. Nothing in that record is reproduced here.
Exhibits	2, lettered AA and BB. Each reproduced in full.
Pagination	Sequential Bates numbering in the form SSR-000001 at the foot of every page, distinct from the SR- series of the record already on file.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

INDEX TO THE SUPPLEMENTAL SUPPORTING RECORD

Ex.	Document	Source	Pages
AA	July 23, 2026 file-stamped Verified Renewed Motion for Substitution of Judge for Cause	Circuit court filing	4–8
BB	July 23, 2026 file-stamped Verified Petition for Appointment of a Special Prosecutor	Circuit court filing	9–13

EXHIBIT AA

JULY 23, 2026 FILE-STAMPED VERIFIED RENEWED MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF JUDGE FOR CAUSE

WHAT THIS EXHIBIT ESTABLISHES

The motion the August 6, 2026 call is set in front of. It is the instrument that, under 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d), must be heard “by a judge not named in the motion,” and it is the reason Appellant asks that no further proceeding be conducted below until it is assigned.

VISIBLE ON THE FACE OF THE DOCUMENT

- Bears the circuit clerk’s file stamp of **July 23, 2026**.
- Is denominated a motion and is directed to 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d).
- States the specific cause relied on, rather than incorporating it by reference.
- Is verified by affidavit, satisfying the third of the threshold requirements identified in *In re Estate of Wilson*, 238 Ill. 2d 519 (2010).
- Bears no order, no notation of referral, and no ruling of any kind on its face.

HOW THIS EXHIBIT FITS THE RECORD

This exhibit and Exhibit R read together are the motion’s central fact. Exhibit R is the notice, generated at 11:59 a.m. on July 23, 2026, setting the August 6 call. This exhibit was file-stamped the same day. The cause was therefore set before the judge named in this motion after it was on file, and nothing has been entered on it since.

SOURCE AND AUTHENTICATION

SOURCE	Circuit court filing
PAGES	Complete document
AUTHENTICATION	Certified by Appellant under 735 ILCS 5/1-109 and Illinois Supreme Court Rule 328 as a true and correct copy of the identified record.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS — CRIMINAL DIVISION**

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

EHAB ALLABABIDI,

Defendant.

No. 23 CF 1146

Circuit Court, 19th Judicial Circuit
Lake County, Illinois

Hon. Christopher R. Stride

Presiding Judge

**VERIFIED RENEWED MOTION FOR SUBSTITUTION OF JUDGE
FOR CAUSE AND FOR ASSIGNMENT OF AN OUT-OF-CIRCUIT JUDGE**
725 ILCS 5/114-5(d); to be heard by a judge not named in this motion

REQUESTED DOCKET EVENT: Motion — Substitution of Judge for Cause (725 ILCS 5/114-5(d)). This document is a court filing tendered for docketing. It is not correspondence.

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

- (1) Immediate routing of this motion, as 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d) commands, for hearing “as soon as possible ... by a judge not named in the motion”;
- (2) After hearing, substitution of the Hon. Christopher R. Stride for cause in this cause;
- (3) Whether or not substitution is granted, a request by the presiding authority to the Supreme Court of Illinois, through the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and pursuant to the Court’s general administrative and supervisory authority (Ill. Const. art. VI, § 16), for assignment of a judge from outside the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit to preside over further proceedings in this cause; and
- (4) Pending the threshold hearing, no adverse substantive ruling by any judge named herein, as the statute’s routing command and *In re Dominique F.*, 145 Ill. 2d 311, 324 (1991), require.

II. PROCEDURAL STATUS: THIS DEMAND HAS BEEN PENDING, UNROUTED, SINCE JUNE 15

Defendant’s file-stamped June 15, 2026 omnibus filing contained a substitution-for-cause demand under section 114-5(d). It was entered on the public docket as “Correspondence”, was never routed to a not-named judge, and has never been heard — while, two days after its filing, the named judge granted the State’s oral motion to lift the stay of the 180-day jail term. (Apps. L, Q; companion docket-correction motion.) This verified motion renews the demand in standalone form so that no classification question can again prevent the statute from operating. Section 114-5(d) permits a for-cause motion “at any time”.

III. CAUSE, VERIFIED AND RECORD-BASED

Cause is pleaded from the record of this case, not from the fact of collateral litigation:

(1) **Custody without the statutory hearing, with the movant's motions pending unheard.** On June 17, 2026, the court activated a 180-day jail term at a status call — no witness, no exhibit, no evidence, no willfulness finding (Apps. L, Q) — while Defendant's file-stamped motions, including a motion to quash the warrant, sat docketed as correspondence. 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(b)—(d) commands otherwise.

(2) **Prejudgment of a motion never heard.** The same minutes record the declaration "WARRANT WILL NOT BE QUASHED" — a ruling in form on a motion that was never calendared, briefed, or heard, announced at the proceeding at which the movant's counsel was simultaneously discharged (App. Q).

(3) **Counsel discharged at the moment of custody.** The Public Defender was discharged at the same proceeding that activated custody, leaving the movant unrepresented at the precise point the statute guarantees counsel (730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(c); *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778 (1973)).

(4) **The disclosed setting.** In candor: the movant named the presiding judge in a Supreme Court of Illinois original action (No. 133301, denied June 26, 2026, without opinion) (App. P), and federal litigation arising from this prosecution is pending against circuit personnel (No. 1:26-cv-06738). Movant does not assert that being named in litigation is itself cause; the cause asserted is the June 17 record above. The litigation posture is disclosed so the not-named judge weighs the whole picture, including how these proceedings would appear to a reasonable, fully informed observer.

IV. WHY AN OUT-OF-CIRCUIT ASSIGNMENT IS THE CLEAN ANSWER

The entanglements here are not confined to one courtroom: the Circuit Clerk (an elected officer of this circuit) and her staff, and personnel of the circuit's probation division, are individual-capacity defendants in the pending federal action; the State's Attorney's office faces the conflict addressed in the companion special-prosecutor petition; the Chief Judge is respondent in a pending Supreme Court of Illinois original action (No. 133342, accepted July 6, 2026); and the movant's filings about those very actors must be docketed, calendared, and heard by the offices they concern. No individual impropriety by any unnamed judge is asserted — that is precisely the point: assignment of an outside judge protects the judgment that ultimately issues, whichever way it goes, from the argument that this circuit decided a case about itself. The Supreme Court routinely assigns judges across circuits under its article VI, section 16 authority; this motion asks only that the request be made.

V. ANTICIPATED GROUNDS OF DENIAL, EACH ANSWERED

(1) **"A for-cause motion after an adverse ruling is disfavored."** The demand was filed June 15 — before the June 17 order — and was never heard; the renewal cures a classification failure, not a tactical delay. And the statute permits the motion "at any time", with the additional cause here arising from the June 17 events themselves.

(2) **“Being sued is not cause; litigants cannot manufacture recusal.”** Agreed, and this motion does not rest on it: the cause pleaded is the June 17 record — custody without a hearing, prejudgment of an unheard motion, counsel discharged at the moment of custody. The collateral litigation is disclosed, not relied upon.

(3) **“The routing requirement does not apply / any judge may deny this.”** The text is categorical: a hearing “shall be conducted as soon as possible ... by a judge not named in the motion”. Orders entered after an improperly denied substitution motion are void, *In re Dominique F.*, 145 Ill. 2d at 324 — a defect that infects every later order in the case. Routing protects the record for both sides.

VERIFICATION (735 ILCS 5/1-109). Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, I certify that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters stated to be on information and belief, which I certify I verily believe to be true, and that documents cited from the Shared Appendix are true and correct copies of what they purport to be.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (Rule 12(b)(6); 735 ILCS 5/1-109). I certify that on July 10, 2026 I served a true copy of this filing and the Shared Appendix on the Lake County State’s Attorney, 18 N. County St., Waukegan, IL 60085, by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, and by email to statesattorney@lakecountyil.gov.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI, *Defendant, Pro Se*
8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656
(773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com
Dated: July 10, 2026

FILED
JUL 28 2026
Circuit Court
Clerk's Office

EXHIBIT BB

JULY 23, 2026 FILE-STAMPED VERIFIED PETITION FOR APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL PROSECUTOR

WHAT THIS EXHIBIT ESTABLISHES

The petition under 55 ILCS 5/3-9008(a-10) alleging that the Assistant State’s Attorney who personally swore the May 14, 2026 petition for revocation has an actual conflict of interest. It is undecided, and Appellant asks only that its disposition not be worked by default at a call conducted before the judge named in Exhibit AA.

VISIBLE ON THE FACE OF THE DOCUMENT

- Bears the circuit clerk’s file stamp of **July 23, 2026**.
- Is brought under 55 ILCS 5/3-9008(a-10), which permits an interested person in a cause, civil or criminal, to allege an actual conflict of interest.
- Is verified.
- Bears no order and no ruling on its face.

HOW THIS EXHIBIT FITS THE RECORD

Exhibit J is the petition for revocation, bearing the personal oath of the assistant. This exhibit is the challenge to his continued prosecution of it. The two are read together: the truth of what he swore in Exhibit J is the subject of the collateral federal action in which he is named in his individual capacity.

SOURCE AND AUTHENTICATION

SOURCE	Circuit court filing
PAGES	Complete document
AUTHENTICATION	Certified by Appellant under 735 ILCS 5/1-109 and Illinois Supreme Court Rule 328 as a true and correct copy of the identified record.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS — CRIMINAL DIVISION

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

EHAB ALLABABIDI,

Defendant.

No. 23 CF 1146

Circuit Court, 19th Judicial Circuit
Lake County, Illinois

Hon. Christopher R. Stride
Presiding Judge

VERIFIED PETITION FOR APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL
PROSECUTOR

55 ILCS 5/3-9008(a-10) — actual conflict of interest of the State's Attorney's office in this proceeding

REQUESTED DOCKET EVENT: Petition — Appointment of Special Prosecutor (55 ILCS 5/3-9008). This document is a court filing tendered for docketing. It is not correspondence.

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Under 55 ILCS 5/3-9008(a-10), which authorizes “any person” to petition for the appointment of a special prosecutor upon an “actual conflict of interest” of the State’s Attorney in a cause or proceeding, Defendant petitions the Court to appoint a special prosecutor — a competent attorney unaffiliated with the Lake County State’s Attorney’s office — to represent the People in the revocation proceeding in this cause, including the pending petition for revocation, the warrant, and the stay and conferral decisions those matters entail. The petition is narrow: it concerns this proceeding only and asserts no office-wide disqualification in unrelated matters.

II. THE ACTUAL CONFLICT, IN ONE PARAGRAPH

The operative charging instrument in this revocation proceeding is a petition **personally sworn** by an assistant State’s attorney of this office on May 14, 2026 (App. C). That same assistant State’s attorney is now a defendant, in his individual capacity, in Allababidi v. Shepherd, No. 1:26-cv-06738 (N.D. Ill.), in claims arising from that very oath (App. N); a second assistant of the same office is likewise sued in his individual capacity over a personally verified 2024 petition in this same case. Every discretionary decision the People must now make in this proceeding — whether to concede the supervising officer’s written clearance of the drug-test predicate (App. E), whether to correct the sworn nonpayment allegation against the zero-dollar restitution record (App. G), whether to consent to a stay, whether to proceed to the statutory hearing at all — is simultaneously a decision about the personal litigation exposure of the office’s own members. A prosecutor’s duty is to the People; here the office cannot perform that duty without adjudicating its own defense. That is an actual conflict of interest within section 3-9008(a-10), not an appearance.

III. THE SEQUENCE, PLEADED AS DATED FACT

- (1) December 10, 2025 — the supervising officer clears the amphetamine screen in writing as lawful prescribed Adderall (App. E);
- (2) May 14, 2026 — the office files the sworn petition alleging that same screen as an “illegal substance” and alleging willful nonpayment, with no ability-to-pay inquiry (App. C);
- (3) June 6, 2026 — Defendant submits the federal civil-rights action arising from this prosecution, naming the swearing assistant in his individual capacity;
- (4) June 15, 2026 — Defendant’s omnibus filing attaching that federal complaint is file-stamped, served, and entered on this docket as “Correspondence”; and
- (5) June 17, 2026 — on the office’s oral motion at a status call, with Defendant’s motions unheard and his counsel discharged in the same minutes, the 180-day jail term is activated (Apps. L, Q).

Defendant pleads the sequence and its dates; their characterization is for the appointed prosecutor and, ultimately, the courts. What the sequence indisputably shows is that since at latest June 15, 2026, the office has litigated this revocation proceeding with knowledge that its conduct in this very proceeding is the subject of pending federal claims against its own members.

IV. ANTICIPATED GROUNDS OF DENIAL, EACH ANSWERED

- (1) **“The conflict must be actual, not speculative.”** It is actual and present: named individual-capacity defendants, an operative sworn instrument they authored, and live discretionary decisions that price their own exposure. Nothing contingent remains.
- (2) **“A defendant cannot manufacture a conflict by suing the prosecutor.”** The oath (May 14) and the record contradicting it (December 10) both predate the federal filing (June 6). The conflict was created by the swearing, not by the remedy the injured party sought for it; a rule to the contrary would immunize precisely the conduct section 3-9008 police.
- (3) **“No prejudice has been shown.”** Section 3-9008(a-10) requires an actual conflict, not completed prejudice; and the record supplies the demonstration anyway — custody was activated on the conflicted office’s oral motion, without the statutory hearing, while the movant’s filings sat unprocessed.
- (4) **“This is for the appellate court.”** Appointment of a special prosecutor is a circuit-court function committed to this Court by statute; no reviewing court can make the appointment in the first instance.

V. REQUESTED ORDER

Defendant requests entry of an order (1) finding that the Lake County State’s Attorney’s office labors under an actual conflict of interest in this revocation proceeding; (2) appointing a special prosecutor for the People for all further proceedings on the May 14, 2026 petition, the May 28, 2026 warrant, and related matters; and (3) staying further prosecution of the revocation proceeding by the

conflicted office pending the appointment.

VERIFICATION (735 ILCS 5/1-109). Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, I certify that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters stated to be on information and belief, which I certify I verily believe to be true, and that documents cited from the Shared Appendix are true and correct copies of what they purport to be.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (Rule 12(b)(6); 735 ILCS 5/1-109). I certify that on July 10, 2026 I served a true copy of this filing and the Shared Appendix on the Lake County State's Attorney, 18 N. County St., Waukegan, IL 60085, by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, and by email to statesattorney@lakecountyil.gov.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI, *Defendant, Pro Se*
8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656
(773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com
Dated: July 10, 2026

FILED

JUL 23 2026

2nd Circuit Court
Clerk's Office
San Francisco, CA