

NOT A FILING - ADMINISTRATIVE PRESERVATION NOTICE - NO JUDICIAL RELIEF REQUESTED

August 17, 2026

Via e-mail

Jeffrey H. Kaplan, Clerk of the Appellate Court
Illinois Appellate Court, Second District
55 Symphony Way
Elgin, Illinois 60120

Re: People v. Allababidi, No. 2-26-0352 - Envelope 39528818 - Rule 9(h) rejection record and litigation hold

Mr. Kaplan:

This notice is deliberately narrow. It is **not** a motion, pleading, request for judicial relief, request to accept the rejected document, or attempt to bypass the July 31 order. I am not asking clerk personnel to decide the merits of anything or to transmit an unauthorized filing to the panel. I am preserving the administrative record of a rejection that now makes appointed counsel the only channel through which the relief identified in the rejected tender can reach the Court.

The record is now exact.

On August 17, eFileIL rejected Envelope 39528818, which had been submitted on August 14 at 11:48 p.m. CST as a Motion - Stay. The stated reason was "Rejection by Clerk," with the comment: "Per the court's order of July 31, "appellant himself shall file nothing further with this court."" The same rejection notice directs the filer to Rule 9 and states that a motion seeking the original submission date must be filed within five court days if needed.

Separately, on August 14, you wrote that because I am represented, "only your counsel is permitted to make requests of the court or my office on your behalf." Those two positions together leave no administrative ambiguity: while OSAD remains appointed, I am not being treated as an accepted filing channel.

Rule 9 and Rejection Standard 22.

Illinois Supreme Court Rule 9(h) provides that electronically filed documents may be rejected by the clerk only as authorized by the published Electronic Filing Rejection Standards. The current Reviewing Courts Electronic Filing Rejection Standards, updated April 1, 2026, include Reason 22, "Rejection by Clerk (see comments)," but instruct that the comment supply the **specific reason for rejection and how to correct**.

The August 17 notice supplies a reason - the July 31 filing prohibition - but it supplies no correction path that can be performed by me while that prohibition remains in force and while your August 14 instruction treats counsel as the exclusive request channel. Rule 9(f)(1), meanwhile, supplies a five-court-day mechanism for preserving an original submission date and directs that a timely compliant motion be granted. The resulting issue is therefore not whether clerk staff should adjudicate the July 31 order. They should not. The issue is preserving exactly how Envelope 39528818 was processed so that counsel and, if necessary, a reviewing tribunal can address the procedural choke point on an accurate record.

Preservation demand.

Please preserve, in native form and without deletion, overwriting, alteration, or routine purge, all records within the Clerk's Office possession, custody, or control concerning Envelope 39528818, including:

- the complete eFileIL/EFM audit trail, transaction history, event log, timestamps, rejection reason code, editable comments, status changes, and routing history;
- the identity, role, user/account identifier, and access level of each person who reviewed, routed, modified, or rejected the envelope, together with the date and time of each action;
- any clerk-office notes, queue entries, workflow flags, case-management entries, templates, macros, or instructions used in connection with the rejection;
- communications among clerk personnel concerning this envelope and any nonprivileged record of direction received concerning how the July 31 order was to be implemented as to e-filings;
- records showing whether the rejection was based solely on the July 31 order, on a standing clerk-office workflow implementing that order, on a case-specific instruction, or on any additional ground;
- retention schedules, deletion logs, and system logs sufficient to determine whether any of the foregoing has been altered, deleted, or automatically purged after August 14, 2026.

This preservation request does **not** assert a present right to inspect privileged, confidential, deliberative, or judicial communications, and it is not a discovery request or FOIA request. It asks only that potentially material records not be destroyed while the rejection, Rule 9 remedy, and access-channel issue remain live.

Administrative confirmation requested.

Please confirm by close of business today only that this preservation notice has been routed to the appropriate records/system custodian and that routine deletion or overwrite of responsive administrative e-filing records will be suspended to the extent reasonably available. No merits response from you is requested. Any judicial relief will be sought through appointed counsel or another procedure authorized by the courts.

I am intentionally not accusing a clerk of having made a judicial decision where the present record shows a clerk implementing an express court order. If the audit trail later shows something different, the record can speak for itself. Preserving that record now is the point of this notice.

Respectfully,

Ehab Allababidi
Defendant-Appellant
(773) 920-0030
defcon5ready@gmail.com

EXHIBIT A

eFileIL rejection notice for Envelope 39528818 - received August 17, 2026

Filing Rejected

Envelope Number	39528818
Case Number	2-26-0352
Case Name	People v. Allababidi, Ehab
Court	Appellate Court - 2nd District
Rejection Reason	Rejection by Clerk.
Rejection Comments	Per the court's order of July 31, "appellant himself shall file nothing further with this court."
Date/Time Submitted	8/14/2026 11:48 PM CST
Filing Type	EFileAndServe
Filing Description	Verified Emergency Motion to Vacate July 31 Restrictions, for Immediate Rule 609(a) Stay, Warrant Relief, and Rule 607(b) Order
Filing Code	Motion - Stay
Filed By	Ehab Allababidi

Notice text concerning Rule 9:

The rejection notice states that the document was rejected and should be corrected and resubmitted. It further states that, if the corrected document will be late, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 9 permits a motion asking the court to treat the corrected document as filed on the original submission date, and that such a motion must be filed within five court days of the notice.

Source authentication: This exhibit reproduces the material fields and operative text of the Tyler eFileIL rejection notice forwarded on August 17, 2026. The original native email is preserved.

EXHIBIT B

Identification and substance of the rejected August 14, 2026 tender - not a filing

Rejected instrument: Verified Emergency Motion to Vacate the Restrictions Entered July 31, 2026, for an Immediate Stay Under Rule 609(a) and Recall of the Warrant, and for an Order Under Rule 607(b).

The rejected motion asked the Second District, in substance, for the following relief:

1. Vacate the second sentence of the July 31, 2026 order in its entirety.
2. Alternatively, construe the restriction not to reach required appellate service, communications with the Lake County State's Attorney concerning circuit-court matters, specified federal-case service/communications, FOIA requests, or ARDC communications.
3. Immediately stay under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 609(a) the 180-day condition of imprisonment activated by the circuit court's June 17, 2026 order, pending appeal.
4. As to Warrant No. 314270, either suspend enforcement pending review of the June 17 refusal to quash or direct expedited briefing on the reviewing court's authority.
5. Alternatively to immediate stay relief, direct appointed counsel to state on the record whether a Rule 609(a) motion will be filed and, if not, why.
6. Order preparation of the May 28 and June 17, 2026 reports of proceedings under Rule 607(b).
7. Address the effect of appointed counsel on appellant's ability to appear and defend in person and confirm whether the motion can be heard.
8. Clarify that the July 31 restrictions do not rest on communications to the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission.
9. Grant further relief authorized by Rule 615(b).

Purpose of this digest: identification and preservation only. This exhibit is not a substitute filing, not a request that clerk personnel adjudicate the motion, and not an attempt to circumvent the July 31 order.