

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

**APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST DISTRICT**

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, <i>Plaintiff-Appellee,</i>	APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS FIRST DISTRICT
V.	Appeal No. 1-26-0055
EHAB ALLABABIDI, <i>Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se.</i>	Appeal from the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Criminal Division, No. 23 CR 0241301
	Notice of appeal filed January 12, 2026

SUPPORTING RECORD
Ill. S. Ct. R. 328 — authenticated under 735 ILCS 5/1-109

Authentication under Rule 328

I, Ehab Allababidi, Defendant-Appellant, pro se, certify under 735 ILCS 5/1-109 and Illinois Supreme Court Rule 328 that the documents assembled in this Supporting Record are true and correct copies of the records and papers they purport to be. Each is either an order of a court served on me, a record of the electronic filing manager transmitted to me, or a document I filed. No document has been altered.

/s/ Ehab Allababidi — **EHAB ALLABABIDI**, Defendant-Appellant, pro se — August 14, 2026

Index of the supporting record

Ex. 1D-A	Order of this Court entered July 31, 2026 by Presiding Justice James Fitzgerald Smith SR1D-000003 to SR1D-000003 · 1 p. · Order of the Appellate Court, First District
Ex. 1D-B	Notice of rejection, envelope No. 39310613, August 4, 2026, 3:49 p.m. SR1D-000005 to SR1D-000006 · 2 p. · Record of the electronic filing manager
Ex. 1D-C	Motion for Original Submission Date under Rule 9(f)(1), filed pro se August 4, 2026 — PENDING AND UNDECIDED SR1D-000008 to SR1D-000011 · 4 p. · Pleading of the appellant, filed pro se in this appeal

Note on the exhibit sequence and the Bates prefix

The pages of this record are numbered SR1D-000001 forward, a prefix used by no other record on file in this appeal. This record is confined to No. 1-26-0055. It contains no order, pleading, or record of any other appeal, and this motion asks this Court for no ruling, finding, or comment concerning any other court.

EXHIBIT 1D-A

ORDER OF THIS COURT ENTERED JULY 31, 2026 BY PRESIDING JUSTICE JAMES FITZGERALD SMITH

WHAT THIS EXHIBIT ESTABLISHES

The operative order. It is four lines long and is reproduced whole.

VISIBLE ON THE FACE OF THE DOCUMENT

- Operative text, entire: “Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi is given an extension of time to **September 9, 2026** to properly file the record in this Court, and the Office of the State Appellate Defender is appointed to represent Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi in this appeal.”
- It fixes a date and names the appellant. **It does not state who prepares or transmits the record**, and it does not purport to displace Rule 608(a).
- **It imposes no restriction on the appellant of any kind.**
- Entered by Presiding Justice James Fitzgerald Smith, stamped JUL 31 2026.

SOURCE AND AUTHENTICATION

SOURCE	Order of the Appellate Court, First District
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
APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST DISTRICT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Trial Ct. No. 23CR0241301
	)	
EHAB ALLABABIDI,	)	
	)	
Defendant-Appellant.	)	

ORDER

This cause coming to be heard on Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi's "Motion to Direct Immediate Preparation and Transmission of the Record, to Direct Settlement of the Rule 323(c) Report, for Leave to Accept the Record Instantly Upon Transmission, and to Reset Briefing," with this Court being fully advised in the premises;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi's motion is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT:

Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi is given an extension of time to September 9, 2026 to properly file the record in this Court, and the Office of the State Appellate Defender is appointed to represent Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi in this appeal.

ORDER ENTERED

JUL 31 2026

APPELLATE COURT FIRST DISTRICT

James Fitzgerald Smith
Presiding Justice

EXHIBIT 1D-B

NOTICE OF REJECTION, ENVELOPE NO. 39310613, AUGUST 4, 2026, 3:49 P.M.

WHAT THIS EXHIBIT ESTABLISHES

The act this motion is directed at, reproduced whole. The question presented is which of the published Electronic Filing Rejection Standards supplied its basis.

VISIBLE ON THE FACE OF THE DOCUMENT

- Court: “Appellate Court – 1st District.” Envelope No. 39310613, submitted **August 2, 2026 at 1:46 p.m.**, rejected **August 4, 2026 at 3:49 p.m.**
- Rejection Reason: **“Rejection by Clerk.”** That is the caption of Standard No. 22 of the Electronic Filing Rejection Standards: *“Rejection by Clerk (see comments).”*
- Rejection Comments, in their entirety: **“Contact your attorney at the State Appellate Defenders office.”**
- **No Standard is identified by number. No rule is cited. No corrective action is stated.**
- Filing Description: “Appellant’s Emergency Motion to Reconsider July 31, 2026 Order, Vacate or Limit Appointment of Counsel, and Key September 9 Record Deadline to Clerk’s Transmission.”

SOURCE AND AUTHENTICATION

SOURCE	Record of the electronic filing manager
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.



Filing Rejected for Envelope Number: 39310613 in Case: 1-26-0055, PEOPLE v. EHAB ALLABABIDI for filing Motion - Reconsider

1 message

<no-reply@efilingmail.tylertech.cloud>
To: ehabhilfiger@gmail.com

Tue, Aug 4, 2026 at 3:49 PM

Filing Rejected



Envelope Number: 39310613
Case Number: 1-26-0055
Case Name: PEOPLE v. EHAB ALLABABIDI

The document below has been rejected for the reason(s) stated. Please correct and resubmit. If the corrected document will be late, [Illinois Supreme Court Rule 9](#) permits you to file a motion asking the court to treat the corrected document as filed on the date/time it was originally submitted. If you intend to do so, you must file that motion within 5 court days of this notice.

If you need further information, contact the [court clerk](#).

Rejection Reason(s) from Clerk's Office		
Court		Appellate Court – 1st District
Rejection Reason		Rejection by Clerk.
Rejection Comments		Contact your attorney at the State Appellate Defenders office.

Document Details	
Case Number	1-26-0055
Case Name	PEOPLE v. EHAB ALLABABIDI
Date/Time Submitted	8/2/2026 1:46 PM CST
Filing Type	EFileAndServe
Filing Description	Appellant???s Emergency Motion to Reconsider July 31, 2026 Order, Vacate or Limit Appointment of Counsel, and Key September 9 Record Deadline to Clerk???s Transmission
Filing Code	Motion - Reconsider
Filed By	Ehab Allababidi
Filing Attorney	

To learn how to copy the rejected filing so that you can make changes to refile, [click here](#).

If you are not represented by a lawyer, we want to improve your e-filing experience. Please [click here](#) to fill out a short survey.

EXHIBIT 1D-C

MOTION FOR ORIGINAL SUBMISSION DATE UNDER RULE 9(F)(1), FILED PRO SE AUGUST 4, 2026
— PENDING AND UNDECIDED

WHAT THIS EXHIBIT ESTABLISHES

The timely cure motion this Court has not yet decided. Paragraph 2 of the relief requested asks only that it be ruled upon.

VISIBLE ON THE FACE OF THE DOCUMENT

- Filed within the five court days allowed by Rule 9(f)(1)(A), and **pending as of the date of this motion.**
- It quotes Rule 9(f)(1)(B): **“If the filer establishes that the original filing was rejected for reasons not in conformity with those permitted under Rule 9(f), the corrected document need not vary from the original submission.”**
- **It states that Rule 608(a) and First District Local Rule 10(a) place preparation, certification and transmission of the record on the clerk of the circuit court.** This motion adopts that statement and does not depart from it.
- It is produced entire, including its Part V, which states that no clerk and no attorney of the Office of the State Appellate Defender had failed in any duty. **Nothing in it is withdrawn.**

SOURCE AND AUTHENTICATION

SOURCE	Pleading of the appellant, filed pro se in this appeal
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.

APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST DISTRICT

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

EHAB ALLABABIDI,
Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se.

APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST DISTRICT

Appeal No. **1-26-0055**

Appeal from the Circuit Court of Cook
County, Illinois,
Criminal Division,
No. **23 CR 0241301**

Notice of appeal filed
January 12, 2026

MOTION FOR ORIGINAL SUBMISSION DATE UNDER ILLINOIS SUPREME
COURT RULE 9(F)(1), AND TO DEEM THE EMERGENCY MOTION
SUBMITTED AUGUST 2, 2026 FILED AS OF THAT DATE

Ill. S. Ct. R. 9(f)(1)(A) and 9(f)(1)(B) · filed within five court days of the notice of rejection

THE DOCUMENT ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT 1 IS UNCHANGED FROM THE ONE SUBMITTED
AUGUST 2, 2026.

Defendant-Appellant EHAB ALLABABIDI, self-represented, moves under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 9(f)(1) for an order establishing that the effective date of filing of the document attached as Exhibit 1 is **August 2, 2026**, the date of its original submission. Rule 9(f)(1)(A) requires that four things be set forth. They are set forth first, in the order the rule states them.

(i) Date of original submission	August 2, 2026, at 1:46 p.m. — envelope No. 39310613, filing type EFileAndServe, filed in this Court.
(ii) Date of the rejection	August 4, 2026, at 3:49 p.m. — notice transmitted by the electronic filing manager.
(iii) Reason for the rejection	As stated on the notice, in full and without omission. Rejection Reason: “Rejection by Clerk.” Rejection Comments: “Contact your attorney at the State Appellate Defenders office.”
(iv) The document to be deemed filed	Exhibit 1 — “Appellant’s Emergency Motion to Reconsider July 31, 2026 Order, Vacate or Limit Appointment of Counsel, and Key September 9 Record Deadline to Clerk’s Transmission,” as identified in the Filing Description on the notice. It is attached in full and contains no changes from the original submission , for the reason stated in Part III.

I. The rule, and the two sentences that govern

If a document is rejected **for any reason**, the filing party may, within 5 court days of the notice of rejection, file a motion requesting that the later-filed document be deemed to have been filed on the original submission date.

Ill. S. Ct. R. 9(f)(1)(A).

The court **shall grant** a timely motion for original submission date that satisfies the foregoing requirements and enter an order establishing that the effective date of filing of the corrected document shall be the date of the original submission. **If the filer establishes that the original filing was rejected for reasons not in conformity with those permitted under Rule 9(f), the corrected document need not vary from the original submission.**

Ill. S. Ct. R. 9(f)(1)(B).

This motion is timely. The notice of rejection issued August 4, 2026, at 3:49 p.m.; five court days from that notice runs to Tuesday, August 11, 2026. The four required statements appear above. What remains is the second sentence of Rule 9(f)(1)(B), and Part III addresses it.

II. What the order of July 31, 2026 says, and what the comment says

The order under which the appointment was made was entered July 31, 2026 by Presiding Justice James Fitzgerald Smith. Its operative paragraph reads in full:

Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi is given an extension of time to September 9, 2026 to **properly file the record in this Court**, and the Office of the State Appellate Defender is appointed to represent Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi in this appeal.

Order, People v. Allababidi, No. 1-26-0055 (Ill. App. Ct., 1st Dist., July 31, 2026).

Appellant sets that paragraph beside the comment on the notice of rejection, and does nothing to either of them.

The order of July 31, 2026	The comment of August 4, 2026
The order gives Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi an extension of time “to properly file the record in this Court.”	The comment directs that Appellant “[c]ontact your attorney at the State Appellate Defenders office” rather than file.
The order bars Appellant from filing nothing . It contains no direction that Appellant file nothing further, no restriction on his appearing or being heard, and no limitation of any kind on what he may submit.	The rejection prevented Appellant from filing at all.
The order names Appellant as the person on whom the September 9 deadline operates.	The comment treats Appellant as a person who may not submit a document to this Court.

Appellant does not ask this Court to find that anyone acted improperly, and Part V states that expressly. He asks it to note only that the order and the comment cannot both be followed by the same person, and that of the two it is the order that this Court entered.

III. The stated reason is not a ground permitted under Rule 9(f), and the document therefore need not vary

Rule 9 governs electronic filing. Its subject matter throughout is the mechanics of submission: paragraph (c) excepts original wills; paragraph (d) exempts documents filed by incarcerated litigants, documents under the Juvenile Court Act, documents filed by persons with a disability preventing e-filing, and documents covered by a certification of good cause; paragraph (e) governs how an exempt document may be filed; and paragraph (f) governs timeliness, rejection, and technical failure. **No provision of Rule 9 authorizes rejection of a document because the filing party is represented by counsel.**

That is the entire argument, and appellant does not enlarge it. Whether a represented appellant may file and be heard in this Court on his own behalf is a question for this Court. **It is also the precise question that Exhibit 1 asks this Court to decide** — paragraphs 1, 2 and 7 of its prayer seek vacatur of the appointment, confirmation that the appointment does not displace Appellant’s right to file, and confirmation that the motion is properly before the Court. A document that asks a court to decide whether its author may file cannot be answered by an intake determination that he may not.

Because the stated reason is not a ground permitted under Rule 9(f), the second sentence of Rule 9(f)(1)(B) applies by its terms and **the corrected document need not vary from the original submission**. Exhibit 1 is therefore identical to the document submitted in envelope No. 39310613. Nothing has been added, removed, or altered. Appellant states this so that the Court may compare the two without taking his word for it.

IV. Why the date matters, and why the motion is brought rather than the filing abandoned

The order of July 31, 2026 sets September 9, 2026 as the date by which the record is to be filed. Exhibit 1 asks this Court, among other things, to key that date to the circuit clerk’s transmission of the record, on the ground pleaded at paragraph 10 of the motion the order denies: that under Rule 608(a) and First District Local Rule 10(a) the circuit clerk, and not the appellant, prepares, certifies and transmits the record. The nearer September 9, 2026 comes, the less useful that relief becomes.

Appellant does not argue the merits of Exhibit 1 here and asks this Court not to reach them on this motion. He states the point only to show that the loss of the August 2 submission date is not formal. **The relief sought in Exhibit 1 is time-sensitive, and the interval between August 2 and the date this motion is decided is interval it cannot spare.**

V. What this motion does not assert

- A. It does not assert that the Clerk of this Court, any deputy clerk, or any employee of the electronic filing manager acted improperly, in bad faith, or with any intent to obstruct. **A ministerial officer applying an intake practice is not a wrongdoer**, and nothing in this motion is offered as a predicate for any proceeding against anyone.
- B. It does not assert that the Office of the State Appellate Defender, or any attorney of that Office, has failed in any duty. No complaint, referral, or disciplinary proceeding is threatened or contemplated by this motion.
- C. It does not ask this Court to reconsider the order of July 31, 2026. That relief is sought in Exhibit 1, which is attached to be filed rather than argued.
- D. It does not assert that the order of July 31, 2026 barred Appellant from filing. **It did not, and that is the point of Part II.** Appellant reads the order as written.

VI. Relief requested

WHEREFORE, Defendant-Appellant EHAB ALLABABIDI respectfully asks that this Court:

- 1. **ENTER** an order under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 9(f)(1)(B) establishing that the effective date of filing of the document attached as Exhibit 1 is **August 2, 2026**, the date of its original submission in envelope No. 39310613;

2. **DIRECT** the Clerk to accept and docket Exhibit 1 as of that date;
3. **CONFIRM**, so that the question does not recur on the next submission, that the appointment entered July 31, 2026 does not by itself bar Appellant from filing documents in this appeal, the order containing no such direction; and
4. **GRANT** such further relief as the case may require under Rule 366(a)(5).

Verification

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure (735 ILCS 5/1-109), I certify that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I certify that I verily believe them to be true. Every description of a court record in this instrument is drawn from the document identified for it in the supporting record filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI

Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se

8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, Illinois 60656

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

Dated: August 4, 2026