

SEPARATE FILING INDEX AND CLERK INSTRUCTIONS

People v. Allababidi, No. 23 CF 1146

Circuit Court of Lake County, Nineteenth Judicial Circuit — Criminal Division

Submitted by: Ehab Allababidi, Defendant, Pro Se 8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656 (773) 920-0030 defcon5ready@gmail.com	Date: July 10, 2026 Packet: 80 pages, submitted by U.S. Mail with tracking Purpose: file and docket each lead document below separately, under its requested docket event. This submission is a set of court filings; none of it is correspondence.
---	--

Instruction to the Clerk: Please docket each lead document separately, in the order below, under the requested docket event (or the closest available filing event), each bearing this submission's date. Document 1 contains a written request under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 606(a), upon which the clerk "*must forthwith prepare, sign, and file a notice of appeal for the defendant*". If any item cannot be filed as requested, please issue a written rejection or explanation identifying the item and the asserted defect, as would issue for an electronic filing under Rule 9(f).

#	Lead document	Requested docket event	Packet page	Pages
1	Renewed Rule 606(a) Written Request to Appeal and Notice of Appeal	Notice of Appeal — Criminal	2	3
2	Emergency Rule 609(a) Motion to Stay Custody Order, Recall Warrant or Convert to Summons, and for Recognizance Bail (with proposed order)	Emergency Motion	5	7
3	Motion to Correct the June 15, 2026 Docket Classification and Set the Pending Motions for Hearing or Ruling	Motion	12	2
4	Motion for the Rule 607 Determinations: Indigency, Appointment of Counsel on Appeal, and Free Report of Proceedings	Motion	14	2
5	Verified Renewed Motion for Substitution of Judge for Cause and for Assignment of an Out-of-Circuit Judge (725 ILCS 5/114-5(d))	Motion — Substitution of Judge	16	3
6	Verified Petition for Appointment of a Special Prosecutor (55 ILCS 5/3-9008(a-10))	Petition	19	3
7	Shared Appendix, Appendices A—R, with Index, 1-109 Certification, and Petition Allegation Matrix	Appendix / Exhibits	22	59

Service: Each filing carries its own certificate of service; the filings and the Shared Appendix are served on the Lake County State's Attorney by U.S. Mail and email.

Note: This index is the only instruction page; the lead filings begin immediately after it.

**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

**RENEWED RULE 606(a) WRITTEN REQUEST TO APPEAL AND
TENDER OF NOTICE OF APPEAL FOR MINISTERIAL FILING
*Ill. S. Ct. Rules 604(b), 606(a), 606(d), 9(f), 373(c)***

**REQUESTED DOCKET EVENT: Notice of Appeal — Criminal (with written request under Rule 606(a)).
This document is a court filing tendered for docketing. It is not correspondence.**

I. THE WRITTEN REQUEST AND THE NONDISCRETIONARY DUTY

Defendant Ehab Allababidi is unrepresented: the Public Defender was discharged on the record on June 17, 2026, at the same proceeding at which the stay of his 180-day jail term was lifted. He wishes to appeal from the June 17, 2026 order. This instrument is his **written request to appeal under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 606(a)**, which commands: “If the defendant does not have an attorney and ... requests ... in writing that the defendant wishes to appeal, the clerk of the trial court must forthwith prepare, sign, and file a notice of appeal for the defendant.” The duty is the Clerk’s own, it is ministerial, and it is not conditioned on counsel, leave of court, or any fee. A completed Notice of Appeal in the form required by Rule 606(d) and the Article VI Forms Appendix follows at page 3 of this instrument; the Clerk may file it as tendered or prepare, sign, and file her own to identical effect. The appeal is taken as of right under Rule 604(b), which authorizes appeal “from an order modifying the conditions of or revoking” a probation sentence.

II. THE APPELLATE COURT HAS ALREADY FIXED THE ROUTE

On July 9, 2026, the Appellate Court, Second District, rejected Defendant’s appellate submissions (Envelope No. 38927349) with this instruction:

“You must file your notice of appeal in the circuit court. Once you receive an appeal number, you may file your other documents into that appeal.” (Shared Appendix, App. A.)

Every step of the appeal therefore runs through this Clerk’s intake. The 30-day period of Rule 606(b) ends **July 17, 2026**. Upon filing, Rule 606(b) directs transmission of a copy of the notice to the Appellate Court within 5 days, and Rule 606(e)(1) directs that notice be sent to the State’s Attorney.

III. THE FILING DATE IS PRESERVED AGAINST EVERY INTAKE OUTCOME

This request and notice are also being submitted electronically. Three rules independently preserve the date: Rule 9(f) (a timely motion for original submission date after a rejection **shall** be granted); Rule 373(c) (the tender date controls a notice of appeal filed in the trial court); and Rule 606(c) (the Appellate Court may grant leave and order its clerk to transmit the notice to the trial court for filing on a showing of reasonable excuse). An intake outcome other than prompt filing does not defeat the appeal; it only documents how the appeal had to be perfected.

IV. THE MINISTERIAL ACTS REQUESTED

- (1) File the Notice of Appeal at page 3 in No. 23 CF 1146, effective as of its tender;
- (2) Docket it as **Notice of Appeal — Criminal**, not as correspondence or any other classification;
- (3) Transmit a copy to the Clerk of the Appellate Court, Second District, within 5 days (Rule 606(b)), and send notice to the Lake County State’s Attorney (Rule 606(e)(1)); and
- (4) Confirm the filing and transmission in writing to defcon5ready@gmail.com.

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

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

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

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi appeals to the Appellate Court of Illinois, Second District, from the order described below:

1. Court to which appeal is taken:

Appellate Court of Illinois, Second District

2. Name of appellant and address:

Ehab Allababidi, 8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656

3. Name and address of appellant's attorney on appeal:

None — Appellant is self-represented (Public Defender discharged June 17, 2026); appointment of counsel on appeal is requested under Ill. S. Ct. Rule 607(a)

4. Date of the judgment or order appealed from:

June 17, 2026

5. Offense of which convicted:

Aggravated reckless driving / bodily harm, Class 4 felony (625 ILCS 5/11-503(a)(1)) — Count 1, judgment of September 8, 2025, as reflected in the circuit court record

6. Sentence:

30 months' probation with a 180-day Lake County Jail term stayed; the stay was lifted by the order of June 17, 2026

7. Nature of the order appealed from:

Order and minute orders of June 17, 2026 lifting the stay of the 180-day jail term (an order modifying the conditions of, or revoking, a probation sentence, Ill. S. Ct. Rule 604(b)), declining to quash the outstanding arrest warrant, and discharging the Public Defender.

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI, Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se

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

Dated: July 10, 2026

**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

**EMERGENCY MOTION UNDER RULE 609(a) FOR STAY OF THE
JUNE 17, 2026 CUSTODY ORDER PENDING APPEAL, FOR RECALL OF THE
MAY 28, 2026 WARRANT OR ITS CONVERSION TO A SUMMONS, AND
FOR ADMISSION TO BAIL ON RECOGNIZANCE**

Ill. S. Ct. Rules 609(a), 604(b), 606; 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4; presented to any judge authorized to act

REQUESTED DOCKET EVENT: Emergency Motion. This document is a court filing tendered for docketing. It is not correspondence.

I. RELIEF REQUESTED, PRECISELY

- (1) A stay, under Rule 609(a), of the June 17, 2026 order lifting the stay of the 180-day Lake County Jail term, pending disposition of the appeal perfected by the Notice of Appeal tendered with the accompanying Rule 606(a) written request;
- (2) Admission to bail on Defendant's own recognizance — Rule 609(a) authorizes a stay “with or without bond” — subject to the September 8, 2025 probation conditions;
- (3) Recall or quashal of the May 28, 2026 no-bond warrant while the stay is in effect, or, in the alternative, its conversion to a summons or notice to appear — the instrument 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(a) equally authorizes — with Defendant's verified commitment to appear in person or by remote appearance on any date set;
- (4) Immediate transmission of any stay or recall order to the Lake County Sheriff, the Lincolnshire Police Department, and the LEADS/warrant custodian; and
- (5) If the Court does not grant the stay on the papers, an emergency hearing at which Defendant may appear by video, as he did on June 17, 2026.

II. THE EMERGENCY

A 180-day jail term is active and a no-bond warrant is outstanding, so Defendant is subject to arrest at any hour, and every act of self-help the law offers — including appearing in a courthouse to be heard — carries custody as its price. The Rule 606(b) period for the appeal ends **July 17, 2026**. Absent a stay, an indigent probationer will serve a substantial part of a 180-day term before any reviewing court can act — a harm no later order can undo.

III. THIS COURT’S AUTHORITY IS EXPRESS, AND THIS MOTION THREATENS NO PART OF THE APPEAL

Rule 609(a) provides in terms:

“If an appeal is taken ... from an order revoking or modifying the conditions attached to a sentence of probation or conditional discharge and imposing a sentence of imprisonment or periodic imprisonment, the defendant may be admitted to bail and the sentence or condition of imprisonment or periodic imprisonment stayed, with or without bond, **by a judge of the trial or reviewing court.**” Ill. S. Ct. Rule 609(a).

The trial court is therefore an expressly proper stay forum *after* the appeal is taken. Nor does this motion disturb appellate jurisdiction: a Rule 609(a) stay application is collateral to the judgment appealed from, and a circuit court retains authority over matters collateral or incidental to the judgment after a notice of appeal is filed. *General Motors Corp. v. Pappas*, 242 Ill. 2d 163, 173—74 (2011). For the same reason, **this motion is not a postjudgment motion directed against the June 17 judgment** within the meaning of Rule 606(b): it does not ask this Court to reconsider, vacate, or modify that order — those questions belong to the Appellate Court in the perfected appeal — and it therefore has no effect on the notice of appeal. Defendant expressly reserves all merits challenges for the reviewing court.

IV. GOOD CAUSE: THE ORDER STANDS ON A RECORD THE STATUTE FORBIDS

A. The statute. Section 5-6-4 of the Unified Code of Corrections governs the activation of custody on an alleged probation violation, and it speaks in commands. On the hearing:

“The court shall conduct a hearing of the alleged violation.” 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(b).

On the State’s burden and the offender’s rights at that hearing:

“The State has the burden of going forward with the evidence and proving the violation by the preponderance of the evidence. ... The offender shall have the right to be represented by counsel and shall have the right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses.” 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(c).

And on nonpayment — the predicate the State swore here:

“Probation, conditional discharge, periodic imprisonment and supervision shall not be revoked for failure to comply with conditions of a sentence or supervision, which imposes financial obligations upon the offender **unless such failure is due to his willful refusal to pay.**” 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(d).

The federal floor is the same: *Gagnon v. Scarpelli*, 411 U.S. 778, 786 (1973), and *Morrissey v. Brewer*, 408 U.S. 471, 488—89 (1972), require notice, an evidentiary hearing, and written findings before conditional liberty becomes custody; *Bearden v. Georgia*, 461 U.S. 660, 672—73 (1983), forbids jailing for nonpayment without an inquiry into ability to pay and a willfulness finding; *Mempa v. Rhay*, 389 U.S. 128 (1967), and *Gagnon* secure counsel at the proceeding; Illinois has followed this line since *People v. Beard*, 59 Ill. 2d 220, 226 (1974).

1
2 **B. The record.** The June 17, 2026 minutes describe a **status call**, not a hearing: no witness, no
3 exhibit, no evidence received, no willfulness finding. The entirety of what the minutes record, in the
4 same breath (Apps. L, Q):

5 “Public Defender Discharged”

6 “WARRANT WILL NOT BE QUASHED”

7 “Oral Motion TO LIFT STAY ON JAIL SENTENCE Granted” (June 17, 2026 minute
8 record, App. Q.)

9 Custody was thus activated at a proceeding at which the statutory rights to a hearing, to the State’s
10 proof, and to counsel were simultaneously absent — the offender lost his lawyer at the very moment the
11 statute guaranteed him one. If a transcript later supplies process the minutes omit, the State can produce
12 it in response to this motion; on the record that exists, the silence is the emergency.

13 **C. The predicates.** The sworn petition’s two custodial predicates are contradicted by the State’s
14 own files, mapped allegation-by-allegation in the Petition Allegation Matrix (Shared Appendix, page
15 3): the supervising officer adjudicated the identical amphetamine screen in writing on December 10,
16 2025, five months before the petition swore it was an “illegal substance”:

17 “Your drug test results were positive for amphetamine, but **it is all negative in my eyes**
18 **because I know you are still taking the Adderall.**” (Officer Adison Weeks, Dec. 10, 2025,
19 App. E.)

20 Meanwhile, the willful-nonpayment allegation was sworn against a sentencing record that set the
21 principal restitution claim at zero dollars after an insurer paid \$16,557 on the loss (App. G), with no
22 ability-to-pay inquiry of any kind — the precise practice section 5-6-4(d) and Bearden prohibit. These
23 points are recited to show probable merit and good cause for a stay, not to ask this Court to adjudicate
24 them.

25 **D. The setting, stated as dated fact.** On June 6, 2026, Defendant submitted for filing a federal
26 civil-rights action arising from this prosecution, now Allababidi v. Shepherd, No. 1:26-cv-06738 (N.D.
27 Ill.), naming as individual-capacity defendants — among others — the assistant State’s attorney who
28 personally swore the May 14, 2026 petition. On June 15, 2026, Defendant’s file-stamped omnibus
filing, which attached that federal complaint, was served and entered on this docket as
“Correspondence”. The notice was neither single nor subtle: a litigation-hold notice concerning these
matters was served on the office and on the swearing assistant personally by email on May 22–23,
2026; at 7:00 a.m. on May 28, 2026 — two hours before the warrant hearing — Defendant emailed the
swearing assistant and the office the Weeks clearance itself (App. I); and further written notices
followed on June 7 and June 8, 2026. Two days after the June 15 service, on June 17, custody was
activated on the State’s oral motion at a status call. Defendant pleads the sequence and its dates; their
weight is for the reviewing court. The structural consequences travel on their own instruments filed
herewith: a verified petition for appointment of a special prosecutor under 55 ILCS 5/3-9008(a-10), and
a verified renewed motion for substitution of judge for cause under 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d). Neither is a
condition of the stay; the stay is warranted on the statutory defects alone.

V. THE WARRANT: THE STATUTE OFFERS A LESS DESTRUCTIVE INSTRUMENT

Section 5-6-4(a) lets a court secure an alleged violator’s appearance by **notice or summons as readily as by warrant**. Defendant is not a flight risk on this record: his address has been verified and of record throughout; he appeared by video at the June 17 proceeding itself (App. Q, minutes: defendant “present via video”); he transmitted the exculpatory records to the court and the State at 7:00 a.m. on the morning of the warrant hearing (App. I); and he has litigated openly and continuously in every forum since. A no-bond warrant against a documented, reachable, appearing defendant serves no statutory purpose a summons would not serve without the custody. The Court is asked to recall the warrant during the stay or convert it to a summons/notice to appear with a date certain.

VI. THRESHOLD ROUTING UNDER 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d)

The June 15, 2026 file-stamped omnibus filing (docketed as “Correspondence”; see the companion docket-correction motion) includes a substitution-for-cause demand under 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d). By its text, such a motion “shall be heard as soon as possible by a judge not named in the motion”, and orders entered after an improperly denied substitution motion are void. In re Dominique F., 145 Ill. 2d 311, 324 (1991). Defendant therefore does not ask any judge named in that demand to decide it or to make any adverse merits ruling before the threshold routing occurs. But section 114-5(d) is a routing rule, not a paralysis rule: it does not disable **a judge not named** — the presiding judge, a duty judge, or any other authorized judge — from entering the collateral, status-quo-preserving relief this motion seeks. This motion is addressed to any judge lawfully able to act on it.

VII. PRIOR AND RELATED PROCEEDINGS, DISCLOSED

So that no ruling issues on an incomplete picture: the Supreme Court of Illinois denied discretionary leave for an original mandamus (No. 133295, July 6, 2026) and denied an emergency supervisory order (No. 133301, June 26, 2026), both without opinion, after allowing fee waivers on indigency in both matters on June 25, 2026 (Apps. O, P); a mandamus petition, No. 133342, is pending there; two federal actions are pending in the Northern District of Illinois (Nos. 1:26-cv-06738 and 1:26-cv-01077), the latter of which abstained in deference to the state courts; and the Supreme Court of the United States denied an emergency application (No. 25A1406, June 22, 2026) (App. R). **No court anywhere has adjudicated the validity of the June 17, 2026 order or ruled on any motion Defendant has filed in this case.** Discretionary denials adjudicate nothing. This motion is the first Rule 609(a) application presented to any judge of this circuit.

VIII. ANTICIPATED GROUNDS OF DENIAL, EACH ANSWERED

(1) “The appeal divests this Court of authority.” Rule 609(a) says the opposite in terms: the stay may issue “by a judge of the trial or reviewing court” when the appeal is taken, and stay applications are collateral matters over which the circuit court retains jurisdiction. Pappas, 242 Ill. 2d at 173—74.

(2) **“No appeal is perfected yet.”** The Notice of Appeal is tendered with a Rule 606(a) written request that obligates the Clerk to file it forthwith; Rule 373(c) fixes the tender date; and warrant-recall/summons-conversion relief rests independently on 730 ILCS 5/5-6-4(a) and the Court’s inherent authority over its own process, which require no appeal at all.

(3) **“No relief while a warrant is outstanding.”** Any disentitlement principle addresses flight. This record shows the opposite of flight: a verified address, a video appearance at the June 17 proceeding itself, same-morning evidentiary transmissions to the court and the State, and continuous open litigation. The warrant is also itself the contested process; conditioning review of it on surrender to it is the Catch-22 the stay power exists to prevent.

(4) **“The substitution demand means no judge can act.”** Section 114-5(d) bars the *named* judge from deciding the substitution and from adverse merits rulings; it does not bar a not-named judge from collateral, temporary relief. In re Dominique F. makes the cost of ignoring the routing rule — voidness — a reason to route, not a reason to deny.

(5) **“These arguments belong to the Appellate Court.”** The merits do, and this motion sends them there. The stay does not: Rule 609(a) makes this Court a proper stay forum, and the statutory defects are recited only as good cause. A written ruling either way creates the reviewable record; what the rules do not contemplate is no ruling at all.

IX. CONCLUSION

The stay requested restores the exact status quo of June 16, 2026 — probation, out of custody — while a reviewing court examines an order that activated 180 days of jail at a status call, without evidence, without findings, and without counsel. The People lose nothing a summons cannot protect; Defendant loses months of liberty no reversal can return. The proposed order follows.

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

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

People v. Allababidi, No. 23 CF 1146

PROPOSED ORDER — RULE 609(a) STAY PENDING APPEAL

This matter coming before the Court on Defendant's Emergency Rule 609(a) Motion, due notice having been given, and the Court being advised, IT IS ORDERED:

1. The Emergency Motion is: ___ ALLOWED ___ DENIED.
2. Enforcement of the June 17, 2026 order lifting the stay of the 180-day jail term is STAYED pending disposition of Defendant's appeal or further order. Defendant is admitted to bail: ___ on his own recognizance, without bond ___ upon bond of \$_____, subject to the September 8, 2025 probation conditions.
3. The May 28, 2026 warrant is: ___ recalled/quashed while the stay is in effect ___ converted to a summons/notice to appear on _____, 2026, at which Defendant may appear in person or by video.
4. If the assigned judge is named in the pending June 15, 2026 substitution-for-cause demand, that threshold demand is routed under 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d) for hearing by a judge not named; the relief above remains in effect pending that routing.
5. The Clerk shall immediately transmit this order to the Lake County Sheriff, the Lincolnshire Police Department, the LEADS/warrant custodian, and the Lake County State's Attorney, and shall confirm transmission on the docket.
6. Entered without prejudice to any party's right to seek modification under Rule 609(a).

ENTERED: _____, 2026

JUDGE

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

MOTION TO CORRECT THE JUNE 15, 2026 DOCKET
CLASSIFICATION AND TO SET THE PENDING MOTIONS FOR
HEARING OR RULING

Ministerial docket correction; 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d) routing preserved

REQUESTED DOCKET EVENT: Motion. This document is a court filing tendered for docketing. It is not correspondence.

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

An order directing that the file-stamped June 15, 2026 omnibus filing be docketed according to its substance rather than as “Correspondence”, and that each motion within it be set for hearing, ruled upon, or denied by written order, so that a reviewable record exists. This motion addresses a ministerial classification and calendaring failure only. It is not directed against the June 17, 2026 order and seeks no reconsideration of it.

II. THE DOCUMENTED RECORD

(1) June 8, 2026: the Clerk’s office refused in writing to add Defendant’s motion to the call because “the motion must be filed by your attorney”.

(2) June 15, 2026: the Public Defender’s office confirmed in writing that it did not represent Defendant (App. K).

(3) June 15, 2026: the omnibus filing — containing a motion to quash the warrant and dismiss/strike the revocation petition, an invocation of self-representation, and a substitution-for-cause demand under 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d) — was stamped “FILED JUN 15 2026” and then entered on the public docket as a single event typed “Correspondence”.

(4) June 17, 2026: custody was activated. To this day, no order grants or denies any motion within the June 15 filing.

III. WHY CORRECTION IS COMPELLED

Docketing, classification, and calendaring are ministerial acts; a clerk holds no authority to decide, by labeling, which filings a judge will ever see. A file-stamped motion entered as correspondence is a

motion no judge is asked to rule on — and none ever was, though custody was activated two days later with those motions pending. The classification also has a statutory consequence: the substitution-for-cause component “shall be heard as soon as possible by a judge not named in the motion” (725 ILCS 5/114-5(d)), and orders entered after an improperly denied substitution motion are void, *In re Dominique F.*, 145 Ill. 2d 311, 324 (1991) — a risk to every subsequent order in this case that only correct docketing and routing can remove. Correction protects the record for both sides.

IV. REQUESTED ORDER

- (1) The Clerk shall re-docket the June 15, 2026 filing according to its substance, as at minimum:
 - (a) Motion to Quash/Recall Warrant and to Dismiss or Strike the Petition for Revocation; (b) Invocation of the Right of Self-Representation; and (c) Motion for Substitution of Judge for Cause, 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d), each with the June 15, 2026 file date;
- (2) The substitution-for-cause component shall be routed for hearing by a judge not named in it, as section 114-5(d) directs;
- (3) Each remaining motion shall be set for hearing, ruled upon, or denied by written order; and
- (4) The Clerk shall preserve the original June 15 filing, its envelope and scanning records, operator identifiers, classification history, and related correspondence.

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

**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

**MOTION FOR THE INDIGENCY AND REPRESENTATION
DETERMINATIONS RULE 607 REQUIRES: APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
ON APPEAL AND FREE REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**

Ill. S. Ct. Rules 607(a), 607(b); Griffin v. Illinois; Douglas v. California

REQUESTED DOCKET EVENT: Motion. This document is a court filing tendered for docketing. It is not correspondence.

I. RELIEF REQUESTED

Upon the filing of the Notice of Appeal tendered with the accompanying Rule 606(a) written request, Defendant asks the Court to perform the determinations Rule 607 makes mandatory in exactly this posture: (1) find Defendant indigent; (2) appoint counsel on appeal — the Office of the State Appellate Defender is the ordinary appointee; and (3) order the court reporting personnel to transcribe, certify, and file, without cost to Defendant, the report of proceedings for June 17, 2026 and May 28, 2026.

II. THE DUTY IS MANDATORY AND THE POSTURE IS EXPRESS IN THE RULE

Rule 607(a) applies by name to a case “in which a sentence of probation ... has been revoked or the conditions attached to such a sentence modified and a sentence of imprisonment or periodic imprisonment imposed”: upon the filing of a notice of appeal, “the circuit court shall determine whether the defendant is represented by counsel on appeal”, and if the defendant is indigent and desires counsel, “the court shall appoint counsel on appeal”. Rule 607(b) then directs that, upon a finding of indigency, court reporting personnel “shall transcribe, certify, and file the report of proceedings”. The constitutional floor is half a century older: an indigent criminal appellant is entitled to a free transcript, *Griffin v. Illinois*, 351 U.S. 12, 19 (1956), and to appointed counsel on a first appeal of right, *Douglas v. California*, 372 U.S. 353, 357 (1963).

III. THE INDIGENCY RECORD IS ALREADY MADE

The Supreme Court of Illinois adjudicated Defendant’s indigency twice within the past three weeks, allowing his applications for waiver of that Court’s fees by orders of June 25, 2026 in Nos. 133295 and 133301 (Apps. O). The county’s own probation system suspended \$1,400 of his service

fees for indigency on November 10, 2025. Defendant is unrepresented because the Public Defender was discharged on June 17, 2026 — at the same proceeding that activated the custody now under appeal — and he desires counsel on appeal. Every element of Rule 607(a) is therefore satisfied on existing records, and the June 17 and May 28 transcripts are the core of the appellate record: they will show what the minute orders show or they will not, and either answer is indispensable to review.

IV. REQUESTED ORDER

- (1) Defendant is found indigent for purposes of Rules 607(a) and 607(b);
- (2) The Office of the State Appellate Defender (or other counsel) is appointed to represent Defendant on appeal;
- (3) Court reporting personnel shall transcribe, certify, and file the report of proceedings for June 17, 2026 and May 28, 2026 without cost to Defendant, as directed by Rule 607(b); and
- (4) The Clerk shall prepare and certify the record on appeal and transmit notice of these determinations to Defendant and appointed counsel.

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

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

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 polices.
- (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

1
2 conflicted office pending the appointment.

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

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

10 Respectfully submitted,

11 /s/ Ehab Allababidi

12 **EHAB ALLABABIDI**, Defendant, Pro Se
13 8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656
14 (773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com
Dated: July 10, 2026

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

No. 23 CF 1146

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, Plaintiff,

v.

EHAB ALLABABIDI, Defendant.

Shared appendix for separately docketed filings in 23 CF 1146

SHARED APPENDIX

APPENDIX INDEX AND APPENDICES

Appendices A through N — certified under 735 ILCS 5/1-109

Do not docket as correspondence; docket as shared appendix materials.

*Submitted with the Rule 606(a) request, Rule 609(a) stay motion,
and motion to correct the June 15 docket classification.*

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

July 9, 2026

APPENDIX INDEX AND 735 ILCS 5/1-109 CERTIFICATION

I, Ehab Allababidi, Defendant, Pro Se, certify under penalties as provided by law pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109 that this Shared Appendix contains true and correct copies or true excerpts of the records identified below, to the best of my knowledge. Excerpts are labeled as excerpts and the complete originals will be supplied on request. This appendix is filed to support the separately docketed Rule 606(a) request, Rule 609(a) stay motion, and docket-classification motion.

/s/ Ehab Allababidi — July 9, 2026

App.	Document	What it establishes
A	Appellate Court rejection notice, Envelope No. 38927349 [Appx. 4—6]	The complete July 9 rejection notice from the Second District: wrong court, file the notice of appeal in the circuit court first, then return to the appellate court after an appeal number issues.
B	Rule 606(d) Notice of Appeal submitted for clerk processing [Appx. 7—8]	The docketable notice of appeal for 23 CF 1146, identifying the June 17, 2026 order lifting the jail-stay as the appealed order.
C	May 14, 2026 sworn Petition for Revocation of Probation [Appx. 9—11]	The two-page sworn petition itself: the source of the five violation categories later used to obtain the warrant and activate custody.
D	April 8, 2026 Adult Probation violation memorandum [Appx. 12—13]	The one-page probation memorandum that fed the petition: dated 04/08/2026, reporting officer Marisa Cervantes, approval by Lori Carrier, and five violation categories.
E	December 2025 Weeks Adderall / amphetamine compliance emails [Appx. 14—16]	Selected pages 3-4 of the Weeks email thread: the actual Adderall clearance and the related statement that the results were all negative.
F	February 19, 2026 reporting memorialization email [Appx. 17—19]	The complete two-page February 19 email memorializing the probation call, the unidentified officer issue, the March 10 remote-reporting window, and notice copied to the State and Clerk.
G	Financial sentencing order, restitution order, and Allstate payment-record excerpt [Appx. 20—25]	The exact financial record kept here: sentencing pages 1-2, the one-page restitution order, and IDOI/Allstate excerpt pages 11-12 showing the \$16,557 Allstate payment record.
H	September 8, 2025 probation referral slip [Appx. 26—27]	The one-page referral slip showing probation special conditions, 180-day jail amount, 240-hour public-service amount, and the 03/07/2028 return date.
I	May 28, 2026 pre-hearing notice transmitting Weeks records [Appx. 28—30]	The complete May 28 email printout sent at 7:00 a.m., before the 9:00 a.m. warrant proceeding, identifying the Weeks Adderall clearance and listing the attached proof.
J	May 28, 2026 arraignment minutes and warrant [Appx. 31—33]	The one-page May 28 minutes and the first page of the warrant: the event result was issue warrant, and the warrant commands arrest/custody for First Appearance Court.
K	June 15, 2026 Public Defender non-representation email [Appx. 34—35]	The one-page Public Defender email confirming the office had not been reappointed, did not represent Defendant, and that the clerk was incorrect to believe the PD was attorney of record.

App.	Document	What it establishes
L	June 17/18, 2026 order lifting stay of 180-day jail term [Appx. 36—37]	The one-page order entered June 17 and file-stamped June 18 lifting the stay of the 180-day Lake County Jail term.
M	June 17, 2026 rejected eFile envelope No. 38550660 [Appx. 38—40]	The complete two-page rejection notice for Envelope No. 38550660, including the clerk comment requiring separate lead documents.
N	Stamped First Amended Complaint excerpt, Doc. 19 pages 5-14 [Appx. 41—51]	The actual First Amended Complaint excerpt, not the motion-for-leave wrapper: complaint pages 1-10 as stamped in federal Doc. 19.

PETITION ALLEGATION MATRIX

The May 14, 2026 petition contains five operative violation categories. This matrix maps each petition allegation to the record materials in this appendix. The purpose is not to ask the Clerk to decide merits; it is to give the Court a docketable, appendix-linked merits map for the emergency stay and docket-correction requests.

Pet.	Allegation	Record defect / contradiction	Proof
A	Willfully failed to pay court ordered financial obligations.	No ability-to-pay inquiry or willfulness finding is reflected in the record materials included here. The restitution/financial records and Allstate claim-payment excerpt make the financial premise disputed and non-custodial absent a proper hearing and findings.	Apps. G, L, N
B	Tested positive for Amphetamine (illegal substance) on or about 11/10/2025.	Weeks adjudicated the same amphetamine result as lawful Adderall compliance in writing. The probation memo dates the screen 11/20/25, while the petition swears 11/10/25, and the memo omits the Weeks clearance.	Apps. D, E, I, N
C	Failed to report to Probation/Compliance on 02/19/2026, 02/27/2026, 03/10/2026, 03/11/2026, and 03/26/2026.	The February 19 memorialization shows active written engagement, a remote-reporting window, and notice copied to the State and Clerk. The record also shows disrupted supervision/contact rather than a clean absconding record.	Apps. F, D, N
D	Failed to provide proof of completion of 240 hours of public service.	The referral slip shows public service as a probation condition within a term running to the 03/07/2028 return date. The record included here shows no evidentiary hearing or finding converting a proof issue into a custodial violation.	Apps. H, J, L
E	Failed to provide proof of completion of the Live Victim Impact Panel.	This is a proof/compliance allegation, not an adjudicated custodial violation. The warrant and June 17 order materials included here do not reflect testimony, evidence, or findings on this condition.	Apps. C, J, L

APPENDIX A

Appellate Court rejection notice, Envelope No. 38927349

The appellate clerk's own rejection notice supplies the procedural answer. It says the notice of appeal belongs first in the circuit court, then appellate filings may follow after an appeal number issues. These two pages are kept because they are the complete rejection email and filing details, not commentary.



Ehab Hilfiger <ehabhilfiger@gmail.com>

Filing Rejected for Envelope Number: 38927349 in Case: 38927349, for filing Docketing Statement (Fee Waived)

1 message

no-reply@efilingmail.tylertech.cloud <no-reply@efilingmail.tylertech.cloud> Thu, Jul 9, 2026 at 2:06 PM
To: ehabhilfiger@gmail.com

Filing Rejected

EFile State Logo

Envelope Number: 38927349
Case Number: 38927349
Case Name:

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 – 2nd District
Rejection Reason		Wrong Court.

Rejection Comments		: You must file your notice of appeal in the circuit court. Once you receive an appeal number, you may file your other documents into that appeal.

Document Details	
Case Number	38927349
Case Name	
Date/Time Submitted	7/9/2026 6:23 AM CST
Filing Type	EFile
Filing Description	Docketing Statement (Criminal) pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 606(g) for a Rule 604(b) appeal of right from the Circuit Court of Lake County, case number 23 CF 1146, appealing the order entered on June 17, 2026.
Filing Code	Docketing Statement (Fee Waived)
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

APPENDIX B

Rule 606(d) Notice of Appeal submitted for clerk processing

This is the jurisdictional instrument. It identifies the June 17 custody order, preserves the Rule 606 appeal, and gives the Clerk a docketable notice to process rather than a letter to classify. The full standalone notice is kept because it is the exact document the Rule 606(a) request asks the Clerk to file.

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

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

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Defendant-Appellant Ehab Allababidi appeals to the Appellate Court of Illinois, Second District, from the order described below:

1. Court to which appeal is taken:

Appellate Court of Illinois, Second District

2. Name of appellant and address:

Ehab Allababidi, 8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656

3. Name and address of appellant's attorney on appeal:

None — Appellant is self-represented (Public Defender discharged June 17, 2026); appointment of counsel on appeal is requested under Ill. S. Ct. Rule 607(a)

4. Date of the judgment or order appealed from:

June 17, 2026

5. Offense of which convicted:

Aggravated reckless driving / bodily harm, Class 4 felony (625 ILCS 5/11-503(a)(1)) — Count 1, judgment of September 8, 2025, as reflected in the circuit court record

6. Sentence:

30 months' probation with a 180-day Lake County Jail term stayed; the stay was lifted by the order of June 17, 2026

7. Nature of the order appealed from:

Order and minute orders of June 17, 2026 lifting the stay of the 180-day jail term (an order modifying the conditions of, or revoking, a probation sentence, Ill. S. Ct. Rule 604(b)), declining to quash the outstanding arrest warrant, and discharging the Public Defender.

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

EHAB ALLABABIDI, *Defendant-Appellant, Pro Se*

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

Dated: July 9, 2026

APPENDIX C

May 14, 2026 sworn Petition for Revocation of Probation

The petition is the predicate document. Its five allegations are fixed on these two pages, and the rest of this appendix tests each one against the record: payment, amphetamine, reporting, public service, and victim-impact proof. The complete petition is kept so the Court can compare the sworn allegations against the records without relying on summary.

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



APPENDIX D

April 8, 2026 Adult Probation violation memorandum

The memorandum is the feeder record. It dates the amphetamine screen 11/20/25 while the sworn petition says 11/10/25, omits the Weeks clearance, and identifies the probation actors who transmitted and approved the violation record. The whole memorandum is kept because it is only one page and is the cleanest source-to-petition comparison.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE NINETEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

FILED

4/8/2026 10:38 AM



Erin Cartwright
Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

Division of Adult Probation Services

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

APPENDIX E

December 2025 Weeks Adderall / amphetamine compliance emails

These are the operative pages of the Weeks thread. Page 3 clears the amphetamine result as Adderall compliance; page 4 records that the results were treated as all negative and sets the next report. Other thread pages are omitted because these two pages contain the relevant supervision adjudications.

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

APPENDIX F

February 19, 2026 reporting memorialization email

This is the reporting record the petition does not account for. It shows active written engagement, a remote reporting window, and notice to the State and Clerk. Both pages are kept because together they show the call, the contact problem, the proposed compliance window, and service to the relevant state actors.



Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

FORMAL MEMORIALIZATION OF 3:00 PM TELEPHONIC DIRECTIVE & BINDING SCHEDULING PARAMETERS: March 10 Remote Reporting

1 message

Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Thu, Feb 19, 2026 at 10:59 PM

To: "Matthew T. Junkin" <mjunkin@lakecountyl.gov>, "Destiny Lee (Adult Probation)" <destiny.lee@cookcountyl.gov>

Cc: Lake County State's Attorney <statesattorney@lakecountyl.gov>, Circuit Clerk <circuitclerk@lakecountyl.gov>

To Officer Junkin and the Newly Assigned Probation Officer:

This correspondence formally memorializes the telephone call I received today at approximately 3:00 PM from the newly assigned probation officer. Because her identity and direct contact information were not clearly established during the call, Director Junkin is formally requested to forward this communication to her immediately and instruct her to utilize this direct email address for all future correspondence to ensure the unassailable integrity of the record.

I. Memorialization of Revised Directive (The 3:00 PM Call) During today's 3:00 PM telephonic communication, the newly assigned officer initially attempted to "command" an in-person appearance for March 10, 2026. However, upon my explicit request that she clarify her legal definition of "command" for the record, she formally revised and downgraded her instruction, stating: "*Well, if you are able to make it here on March 10, 2026, I would appreciate it.*"

Consistent with prior memorializations on the record, I am legally and physically unable to be present on March 10. As established below, I am operating under a compulsory federal mandate, my physical transport remains disabled by documented sabotage (Predicate Act 6), and a government-certified Endangerment Finding (Case No. 1:25-cv-15786) precludes the use of public transit.

II. Compulsory Federal Mandate & Jurisdictional Supremacy Pursuant to a binding Minute Order issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois in *Allababidi v. Advocate Health and Hospitals Corporation et al.*, I am under a compulsory judicial mandate to appear telephonically before the Honorable Jorge L. Alonso on March 10, 2026, at 9:30 a.m..

As a matter of law, federal jurisdiction and its accompanying judicial mandates strictly supersede concurrent state-level administrative check-ins. Consequently, my communications infrastructure must and will be exclusively dedicated to the United States District Court from 9:00 AM until 11:30 AM CST (the "Federal Blockout Window"). I am legally precluded from receiving or engaging in probation communications during this interval.

III. Establishment of Constructive Compliance Window It is my intention to ensure full and proactive compliance with all supervisory requirements without running afoul of a federal tribunal. Because I am unable to fulfill the discretionary request for an in-person visit on that date, I am formally accommodating the remote check-in requirement by making myself fully available for a telephonic or secure video conference on March 10, 2026, at any point between **12:00 PM (Noon) and 4:00 PM CST**.

This four-hour window provides the Probation Department with ample administrative flexibility to execute its duties without infringing upon federal jurisdiction.

IV. Preservation of the Record This notice is provided to ensure the Probation Department operates with actual, documented knowledge of the federal mandate. I have concurrently served notice of this conflict upon the Lake County Circuit Clerk and the State's Attorney regarding the concurrent 9:00 AM state court motion call.

Should the Probation Department attempt to initiate contact during the expressly delineated Federal Blockout Window, such action will be formally documented as an administrative nullity. Any subsequent effort by the state to characterize an unanswered call during this federal proceeding as a "failure to report" or a violation of supervision will not stand as a valid procedural default. Rather, it will be immediately submitted to the presiding federal judge as *prima facie* evidence of state interference with a federal tribunal and an arbitrary deprivation of liberty under color of law (18 U.S.C. § 1512).

V. Conclusion This communication constitutes affirmative and active compliance with my supervision obligations. The

administrative burden now rests with the Probation Department to select a reporting time within the provided 12:00 PM to 4:00 PM window.

Please confirm receipt of this notice and have the assigned officer reply directly to this email to provide the selected time for the remote check-in.

Respectfully submitted,

Ehab Allababidi Plaintiff, *Pro Se* (Case No. 1:25-cv-15800) Defendant (Lake County Case No. 23 CF 1146)

(Enclosures: Federal Minute Order)

--



Ehab Allababidi

Personal Signature

Phone: 773-920-0030

Email: defcon5ready@gmail.com

LEGAL NOTICE & CONFIDENTIALITY

This email (and any attachments) is intended solely for the named recipient and may contain confidential, privileged, or proprietary information. Disclosure, distribution, copying, or use without the sender's prior written consent is prohibited. If you received this in error, delete it and notify the sender immediately.

1. Unauthorized use may violate privacy, contract, and intellectual-property laws.
2. No rights, privileges, or defenses are waived by this transmission.
3. Instructions and directives herein constitute written notice for compliance and recordkeeping.
4. This communication is restricted to the designated recipient and is not to be forwarded or archived without authorization.



**Gmail - Activity in Case 1_25-cv-15800 Allababidi v. Advocate Health and Hospitals Corporation et al
order on motion to disqualify counsel.pdf**

76K

APPENDIX G

Financial sentencing order, restitution order, and Allstate payment-record excerpt

The financial allegation cannot be converted into custody by label. These pages show the court's financial orders, the O'Brien restitution amount, and the Allstate payment record for the same accident context. Only the operative financial pages are kept: sentencing pages 1-2, the restitution order, and the two-page Allstate settlement/payment excerpt.

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

FILED

9/8/2025 9:09 AM

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:

☒	Schedule 1: Generic Felony (705 ILCS 135/15-5)	\$ 549	\$ 549
☐	Schedule 2: Felony DUI/OUI (705 ILCS 135/15-10)	\$1,709	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 3: Felony Drug Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-15)	\$2,215	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 4: Felony Sex Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-20)	\$1,314	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 5: Generic Misdemeanor Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-25)	\$ 439	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 6: Misdemeanor DUI/OUI (705 ILCS 135/15-30)	\$1,381	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 7: Misdemeanor Drug Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-35)	\$ 905	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 8: Misdemeanor Sex Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-40)	\$1,184	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 9: Major Traffic Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-45)	\$ 325	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 10: Minor Traffic Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-50)	\$ 226	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 10.5: Truck Weight/Load Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-52)	\$ 260	\$ _____
☐	Schedule 11: Conservation Offense (705 ILCS 135/15-55)	\$ 195	\$ _____
☐	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:

☐	Arson/Residential/Aggravated Arson (705 ILCS 135/15-70(1))	\$500 per conviction	\$ _____
☐	Child Pornography (705 ILCS 135-15-70(2))		
☐	☐ State Police ☐ Other Arresting Agency	\$500 per conviction	\$ _____
☐	Crime lab drug analysis (705 ILCS 135/15-70(3))	\$ 100	\$ _____
☐	DNA analysis (705 ILCS 135/15-70(4))	\$ 250	\$ _____
☐	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	\$ <u>2</u>
_____ l.	☐	Speeding in a construction zone (705 ILCS 135/15-70(11))		
	☐	Interstate Highway	☐	County
_____ m.	☐	Supervision disposition under Vehicle Code (705 ILCS 135/15-70(12))	\$ 250	\$ _____
_____ n.	☐	Guilty plea or no contest, specified offense against family member	\$ 0.50	\$ _____
	☐	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: \$ <u>551.00</u>		

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 \$ <u>50</u> /month x <u>30</u> months	\$ <u>1500</u>
c.	☒	Public Defender assessment	\$ <u>100</u>
d.	☒	Service Provider cost ☐ Urinalysis Testing \$125 ☒	\$ <u>125</u>
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

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

Erin Cartwright Weinstein
Clerk of the Court
Lake County, Illinois

State of Illinois

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Ehab Allababidi

Defendant(s)

General No. **23CF1146**

ORDER FOR RESTITUTION

This cause coming to be heard before this Honorable Court, the parties being duly represented, and the Court being fully apprised, it is hereby ordered that Restitution be paid as follows:

Restitution shall be paid to:

Name O'Brien Landscape
Address 5700 Howard St.
City, Skokie State, IL Zip 60077

In the total amount of \$2,670.86 to be paid through the Circuit Clerk's office.

☒


All money paid shall apply to restitution first.

☐

Joint and several with

case number

ENTER:



JUDGE

Dated this 8 day of September, 2025.

Prepared by:

Name: Bailey C. Russell
Address: 15 S. County St.
City: Waukegan
Phone:
Fax
ARDC: 6340962

State: IL
Zip Code:

EXHIBIT A

Allstate Settlement Confirmation — \$16,557.00 Paid on Claim 0670868884

Allstate Fire and Casualty — Date of Loss May 23, 2022

ALLSTATE CLAIMS & LEGAL DEMAND — CLAIM 0670868884

WHY THIS EXHIBIT MATTERS:

Allstate's own written confirmation that it paid \$16,557.00 to Sentry Insurance for the Smith Printing property-damage subrogation on this claim and accident. It establishes that this policy is active and responsive to property losses from the May 23, 2022 collision—the same collision that produced the O'Brien Landscape \$2,670.86 loss now being prosecuted as a criminal debt.

KEY CONTENT:

- “we paid Sentry Insurance for their subrogation for the property damage of James W Smith Printing”
- “We paid a total of \$16,557.00 for supported damages submitted to us”
- Claim No. 0670868884 | Loss Date May 23, 2022 | Rep: Connie O'Connor, (630) 972-7357
- Proves active, responsive coverage on the same accident as the O'Brien loss



Allstate Fire and Casualty Insurance Company
PO Box 660636
Dallas, TX 75266

EHAB ALLABABIDI
8516 W WINONA ST
CHICAGO, IL 60656-2720

Page 1 of 1

Information as of June 03, 2025

Claim number: 0670868884**Date of loss:** May 23, 2022**Insured:**

Ehab Allababidi

Dedicated claim contact:

Connie Oconnor

Direct phone:

630-972-7357

Visit us anytime at [MyClaim.com](https://myclaim.com)

Go Paperless! Scan or visit
Allstate.com/PaperlessNow

Per Your Request

Hello Ehab Allababidi,

As we discussed, we paid Sentry Insurance for their subrogation for the property damage of James W Smith Printing. We paid a total of \$16,557.00 for supported damages submitted to us.

We're here to help. If you need additional information, please visit [MyClaim.com](https://myclaim.com) or contact us.

State-specific communications:

Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud any insurance company or other person files an application for insurance or statement of claim containing any materially false information or conceals for the purpose of misleading, information concerning any fact material thereto commits a fraudulent insurance act, which is a crime and subjects such person to criminal and civil penalties.

GEN001



APPENDIX H

September 8, 2025 probation referral slip

The referral slip fixes the term and the listed conditions. Public service appears as a probation condition within a term returning in 2028, not as an adjudicated violation already capable of supporting a custodial warrant. The single page is kept because it contains the condition and return-date information needed for the matrix.

ADULT PROBATION SERVICES REFERRAL SLIP

ATTENTION: IMMEDIATELY AFTER THIS COURT APPEARANCE

You are **REQUIRED** to take this slip to

ADULT PROBATION SERVICES

215 WEST WATER STREET

WAUKEGAN, ILLINOIS

Name: EHAB ALLABABIDI

Case Number: 23CF00001146

Address: 8516 W. WINONA ST.

Phone: (773) 920-0030

City: CHICAGO

Email:

State: IL

Zip: 60656

☐ Approve text messaging
correspondence

DOB: 09/24/1996

Charge: AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARM

In Custody: No

Interpreter Required: [] Yes [X] No

Language:

DEFENDANT SENTENCED TO:

[X] Probation Special Conditions 30 Month Amount

[X] Lake County Jail 180 Day Amount

[X] Public Service 240 Hour Amount

DEFENDANT IS REFERRED BY COURT FOR THE FOLLOWING:

Next Court Date: 03/07/2028

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Courtroom: Courtroom 611

Judge:

APPENDIX I

May 28, 2026 pre-hearing notice transmitting Weeks records

Before the warrant issued, the court and State received written notice of the Weeks clearance. This appendix establishes notice: the amphetamine defect was not obscure, unavailable, or discovered after the fact. The email printout is kept, not the attachment stack, because Appendix E already supplies the operative Weeks pages.



Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

EMERGENCY SPECIAL APPEARANCE (COURTROOM T-611): Notice of Fraud on the Court, Napue Perjury, and Pending Seventh Circuit Injunction (Case 23 CF 1146)

1 message

Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Thu, May 28, 2026 at 7:00 AM

To: Circuit Clerk <CircuitClerk@lakecountyil.gov>, courts@lakecountyil.gov, Lake County State's Attorney <statesattorney@lakecountyil.gov>, nshepherd@lakecountyil.gov

Cc: "Destiny Lee (Adult Probation)" <destiny.lee@cookcountyil.gov>, "Matthew T. Junkin" <mjunkin@lakecountyil.gov>, pin@usdoj.gov

URGENT: MANDATORY ROUTING TO THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER STRIDE (COURTROOM T-611)

To the Clerk of the Circuit Court, ASA Nicholas Shepherd, and the Presiding Judge:

This communication constitutes an Emergency Special Appearance and formal Notice of Fraud on the Court regarding the 9:00 AM Arraignment scheduled today, May 28, 2026, in Case No. 23 CF 1146. The Petition for Revocation of Probation submitted by Assistant State's Attorney Nicholas Shepherd contains objective, verified prosecutorial perjury. The State is requesting a bench warrant based on a fabricated allegation of an "illegal amphetamine substance" for a November 10, 2025 test. Attached hereto is the written, documentary proof from Cook County Adult Probation Officer Adison Weeks, dated December 8 and 10, 2025, officially adjudicating this test as compliant and verifying it as a lawful Adderall prescription.

ASA Shepherd's suppression of this exculpatory evidence and subsequent presentation of false material facts to this Court constitutes a textbook violation of *Napue v. Illinois*, 360 U.S. 264 (1959), and operates as a fraud upon this tribunal.

Furthermore, this Court is formally notified of the following jurisdictional conflicts:

1. **Federal Appellate Invocation:** Emergency Rule 8 Injunction and Mandamus proceedings have been initiated in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals to stay this exact 9:00 AM proceeding due to its retaliatory sequencing eight days prior to a federal habeas deadline (N.D. Ill. Case No. 1:26-cv-01077).
2. **Federal District Court Confirmation:** On May 27, 2026, the Courtroom Deputy for the Honorable John Robert Blakey formally confirmed on the federal record that an Article III order regarding this exact arraignment is currently being drafted.
3. **Civil RICO Evidence Spoliation:** The execution of a custodial warrant today operates as an overt act of witness tampering (18 U.S.C. § 1512(b)) designed to permanently sever Petitioner's access to the digital infrastructure utilized in active Civil RICO litigation (N.D. Ill. Case No. 1:25-cv-15800). Formal Litigation Holds and ESI Quarantines have been served on the State.

RELIEF DEMANDED: If this Court issues a bench warrant at 9:00 AM based on a prosecuting instrument infected by a documented *Napue* perjury violation, while a coordinate Article III tribunal is actively drafting an injunction, this Court transitions from a neutral arbiter to an active participant in a federal witness tampering conspiracy.

Petitioner demands an immediate stay of the 9:00 AM arraignment, the striking of the fraudulent Petition for Revocation, and the immediate preservation of all state routing metadata. The formal Notice of Special Appearance and the verified federal evidentiary exhibits are attached.

Ehab Allababidi, Defendant / Pro Se Petitioner 8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656 (773) 920-0030 | defcon5ready@gmail.com

--

**Ehab Allababidi**

Personal Signature

Phone: 773-920-0030 (**CAGE 16QC7**)**Email:** defcon5ready@gmail.com**LEGAL NOTICE & CONFIDENTIALITY**

This email (and any attachments) is intended solely for the named recipient and may contain confidential, privileged, or proprietary information. Disclosure, distribution, copying, or use without the sender's prior written consent is prohibited. If you received this in error, delete it and notify the sender immediately.

1. Unauthorized use may violate privacy, contract, and intellectual-property laws.
2. No rights, privileges, or defenses are waived by this transmission.
3. Instructions and directives herein constitute written notice for compliance and recordkeeping.
4. This communication is restricted to the designated recipient and is not to be forwarded or archived without authorization.

5 attachments**NOTICE_OF_SPECIAL_APPEARANCE_AND_FRAUD_ON_THE_COURT.pdf**

44K

**DKT16.pdf**

20139K

**EMERGENCY_PETITION_WRIT_MANDAMUS_05272026.pdf**

55K

**AG_LITIGATION_HOLD_DOERSCH_05232026.pdf**

76K

**LITIGATION_HOLD_LAKE_COUNTY_05222026.pdf**

58K

APPENDIX J

May 28, 2026 arraignment minutes and warrant

The minutes and warrant are kept together because they show both the event and the custody instrument. The minutes record Cervantes present and the result as issue warrant; the warrant commands arrest and custody. What is missing is just as important: no witnesses, no evidence, no ability-to-pay finding, and no adjudication of the five petition allegations.



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

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

CASE
NUMBER(S)

23CF00001146

VS.

EHAB ALLABABIDI
8516 W. WINONA ST.
CHICAGO, IL 60656

WARRANT OF ARREST - VIOLATION


To all Peace Officers of the State of Illinois:

You are hereby commanded to arrest **EHAB ALLABABIDI** and bring said person without unnecessary delay before the judge sitting in First Appearance Court in the Circuit Court of the 19th Judicial Circuit, Lake County, Illinois, to answer a charge made against said person for a technical violation while on for the following offense(s):

AGG RECKLESS DRVG/BODILY HARMSPEEDING 35+ MPH OVER LIMIT

The defendant shall be held in custody for First Appearance Court.

Issued at Lake County, Illinois on 05/28/2026



JUDGE

PD APPOINTED
ARRESTING
AGENCY:
Lincolnshire



DOB: 09/24/1996	Race:	Sex: Male	Hair: Brown	Eyes: Brown	HGT: 6	WGT: 200
Driver's License: A41120096272		DL State: IL		SSN:	State ID:	
Vehicle Reg:		Veh Make:		Year:	License Plate:	

APPENDIX K

June 15, 2026 Public Defender non-representation email

This record closes the counsel loop. The Public Defender did not represent Defendant, so intake rules premised on attorney filing cannot justify burying a pro se motion package as correspondence. The full email is kept because it contains the representation status and the clerk-error statement in one page.



Ehab Hilfiger <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Response to Request for Assistance

1 message

Bailey Russell <BRussell@lakecountyl.gov>

Mon, Jun 15, 2026 at 7:24 PM

To: "defcon5ready@gmail.com" <defcon5ready@gmail.com>

Cc: "Gregory C. Ticsay" <GTicsay@lakecountyl.gov>

Dear Ehab,

We have reviewed our records that show that you proceeded pro se on October 6, 2025.

Since that date our office has not been reappointed to represent you. This is the reason we have not responded. We do not represent you at this time.

Regarding the clerk refusing to accept your pleadings, the clerk is incorrect in believing that we are the attorney of record at this time.

Sincerely,

Bailey C. Russell

APPENDIX L

June 17/18, 2026 order lifting stay of 180-day jail term

This is the order that turns the stayed jail term into active custody. On its face it supplies the emergency and the appellate target; it does not supply merits findings curing the petition defects. The order is kept alone because it is the operative custody order.

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

APPENDIX M

June 17, 2026 rejected eFile envelope No. 38550660

This rejection is part of the access record. It shows why the present submission is built as separate docketable filings with a shared appendix, not an undifferentiated communication. Both pages are kept because the first contains the rejection reason and the second contains the submitted filing details.



Ehab Hilfiger <ehabhilfiger@gmail.com>

Filing Rejected for Envelope Number: 38550660 in Case: 38550660, for filing Complaint

1 message

no-reply@efilingmail.tylertech.cloud <no-reply@efilingmail.tylertech.cloud> Wed, Jun 17, 2026 at 3:34 PM
To: ehabhilfiger@gmail.com



Filing Rejected

Envelope Number: 38550660
Case Number: 38550660
Case Name:

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		Lake County
Rejection Reason		Multiple documents submitted as one PDF.
Rejection Comments		The Complaint needs to be the first page of this document. The Docketing statement needs to be a separate lead document. YA

Document Details	
Case Number	38550660
Case Name	
Date/Time Submitted	6/14/2026 6:18 PM CST
Filing Type	EFileAndServe
Filing Description	Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus and Declaratory Relief (735 ILCS 5/14-101)
Filing Code	Complaint
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.

APPENDIX N

Stamped First Amended Complaint excerpt, Doc. 19 pages 5-14

This is the clean chronological federal pleading excerpt. It begins with the First Amended Complaint itself, then moves through jurisdiction, parties, the sentence and financial record, Weeks, the February reporting problem, the April probation memorandum, the sworn petition, the warrant, and the June 15 docket-classification issue.

The motion-for-leave pages are omitted because the appendix needs the operative factual pleading, not the wrapper.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS — EASTERN DIVISION**

EHAB ALLABABIDI,
Plaintiff,

v.

NICHOLAS SHEPHERD, Assistant State’s Attorney, Lake County, in his individual capacity;
FRANCIS P. DEROSA IV, Assistant State’s Attorney, Lake County, in his individual capacity;
MARISA CERVANTES, Adult Probation Officer, Lake County, in her individual capacity;
LORI CARRIER, Supervisor, Division of Adult Probation Services, 19th Judicial Circuit, in her individual capacity;
MARGARET K. FONTANA, Director, Division of Adult Probation Services, 19th Judicial Circuit, in her individual capacity;
ERIN CARTWRIGHT WEINSTEIN, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Lake County, in her individual capacity;
HANNA BECERRA, Court Services Representative, Office of the Circuit Clerk, in her individual capacity;
DOES 1—3, personnel of the Office of the Circuit Clerk whose acts are recorded, with operator identifiers, in the court’s electronic-filing audit logs, in their individual capacities; and
LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, *joined solely for indemnification under 745 ILCS 10/9-102,*
Defendants.

Case No. **1:26-cv-06738**

Hon. Matthew F. Kennelly
Magistrate Judge Karyn L. Bass Ehler

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

42 U.S.C. § 1983 — First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments — submitted with Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to Amend pursuant to the Court’s Order of July 6, 2026 (Dkt. 17)

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Absolute prosecutorial immunity terminates the moment an advocate swears an oath to material facts. Twice in this prosecution, Lake County assistant State’s attorneys abandoned their protected functions to act as complaining witnesses under penalty of perjury. In September 2024, Defendant Francis P. DeRosa IV personally verified, under penalty of perjury, a petition to revoke Plaintiff’s pretrial release on a drug allegation; five weeks later the State withdrew it on its own motion, without findings, and the ensuing minutes record negative testing. (Ex. I.) In May 2026, Defendant Nicholas Shepherd took the same oath to the same kind of allegation — that Plaintiff had tested positive for “Amphetamine (illegal substance)” — with one difference: this time the State’s own file already held the answer, in its own officer’s plain written words, five months old: “*it is all negative in my eyes because I know you are still taking the Adderall.*” (Exs. A, B.) Shepherd *swore through* that sentence. On his oath a no-bond warrant issued; on his oath it stands today, forty days later, while the man it names cannot enter a courthouse without being taken into custody at the door.

The Supreme Court has already named what each prosecutor did. Personal attestation to facts is “the function of the witness, not of the lawyer,” and for it “absolute immunity is unavailable.” *Kalina v. Fletcher*, 522 U.S. 118, 129—31 (1997). This complaint sues the *oath*, not the *office* — and it sues the people who built and buried the record beneath the oath: the probation officer whose investigative memorandum transmitted the allegation while omitting the clearance (*Buckley v. Fitzsimmons*, 509 U.S. 259 (1993)); the

supervisors who had written notice and chose inertia; and the clerk's-office employees who, in the same weeks, told Plaintiff in writing that his motions "must be filed by your attorney," docketed his file-stamped motion to quash as "Correspondence," and rejected the lawsuit that named their own office — **ministerial acts**, never immune (*Antoine v. Byers & Anderson, Inc.*, 508 U.S. 429 (1993); *Lowe v. Letsinger*, 772 F.2d 308 (7th Cir. 1985)) — so that when the 180-day jail term was activated, no motion of his had ever been heard. Not one has been ruled on to this day.

The arithmetic of this case is short, and every number in it has a document. An insurer paid **\$16,557.00** on the loss underlying this prosecution; the sentencing court accordingly set restitution to the principal claimant at **zero dollars**; eight months later Defendant Shepherd swore that Plaintiff's failure to pay was *willful*. (Exs. B, P.) **Five months** separated the State's written clearance of the drug result from the oath that called it an illegal substance. **Two hours** separated Plaintiff's morning email delivering that clearance to the court and the State from the issuance of the no-bond warrant. (Exs. D, E.) **Ten days** separate the two dates the State's own documents give for the same drug test. **Thirty-nine days** is the age of the warrant as this complaint is filed; **180 days** is the jail term activated at a proceeding for which none of Plaintiff's motions had ever been calendared; and **one thousand five hundred six days** have now passed since the traffic accident from which all of this grows — a case that ran more than three years without a trial setting before it ended in a negotiated plea. These are not characterizations; they are immutable facts. Every count in this complaint is pleaded directly against the State's own authenticated records, stripping the defendants of plausible deniability at the pleading stage.

The defendants will answer with immunity; the Court's July 6 order anticipates it, and this pleading was drafted *after* — and *to* — that order. Where the order marked absolute immunity, no claim treads: no defendant is sued for initiating, arguing, or deciding anything. Where the law leaves the function unprotected — the **oath** (*Kalina; Malley v. Briggs*, 475 U.S. 335 (1986); *Rehberg v. Paulk*, 566 U.S. 356 (2012)), the **investigation** (*Buckley; Fields v. Wharrie*, 740 F.3d 1107 (7th Cir. 2014)), the **docket** (*Antoine; Lowe*) — this complaint stands, and it asks for nothing but damages. Qualified immunity is answered in the body of the pleading itself: the Seventh Circuit holds that there is none for evidence fabrication, *Armstrong v. Daily*, 786 F.3d 529, 555 (7th Cir. 2015), and every right invoked here was clearly established decades before the conduct at issue. This architecture is deliberate. It executes the exact functional demarcations required by this Court's July 6, 2026 Order (Dkt. 17). Where the Court marked absolute immunity, no claim treads; where the Supreme Court has stripped it, this complaint operates.

This amended complaint is therefore *deliberately narrow*. It sues no judge; it asks this Court to enjoin, stay, or declare nothing about any state proceeding; it pleads no municipal policy claim; it abandons every theory the order found speculative. Seven named individuals — and three Doe members of the Clerk's staff whose identities the court's own audit logs record — are sued for money damages, each strictly within a function the law does not immunize, and Lake County is joined solely because Illinois law directs it to pay judgments against its employees. 745 ILCS 10/9-102. The proof is **documentary** — every load-bearing allegation rests on a court record, a government email, a carrier record, or the State's own file, attached as Exhibits A through Q and cited in place, each behind a cover page stating what it establishes. A prosecution can be mistaken and still be lawful; what is pleaded here is different in kind. The State swore against its own records, and when Plaintiff tried to show the courts those records, the courthouse's own staff closed the channels one by one. Plaintiff does not ask this Court to take his word for any of it. He asks the Court to read the State's. The complaint is **built to be checked**.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT (cover page)	1
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	4
II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE	5
III. POSTURE UNDER YOUNGER AND HECK: DAMAGES ONLY	5
IV. PARTIES	5
V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS	6
A. The sentence, the zero-dollar restitution, and the insurer's payment	6
B. The Weeks adjudication: the State cleared the test in writing	7
C. The 2024 rehearsal: DeRosa's verified petition and its withdrawal	7
D. The February 19 anonymous-officer call and the notice to Fontana	7
E. The April 8 memorandum: the clearance omitted	8
F. The sworn petition of May 14, 2026	8
G. The warrant of May 28, 2026	9
H. The Clerk's office: three channels, three failures	9
I. June 17—18, 2026: the jail term activated while the motions sat unheard	10
J. Notice, and the choice not to correct	11
K. Timeline	11
VI. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF	12
Count I — First Amendment Retaliation	12
<i>Against Defendant Shepherd (complaining-witness function)</i>	
<i>Against Defendant Cervantes (investigative & administrative functions)</i>	
Count II — Fourteenth Amendment: Fabricated Evidence in Sworn Process	13
<i>Defendant Cervantes's material omissions in the violation record</i>	
<i>Defendant Shepherd's false attestation in the sworn petition</i>	
Count III — Fourth Amendment: Unreasonable Seizure by Wrongful Legal Process	14
<i>Lack of probable cause and material omissions under Franks</i>	
<i>Pleaded in the alternative, with candor, to preserve the claim</i>	
Count IV — Fourth & Fourteenth Amendments: the 2024 Verified Petition	14
<i>Defendant DeRosa's personally verified 2024 petition, withdrawn without findings</i>	
Count V — Supervisory Liability Through Personal Involvement	15
<i>Defendant Fontana's administrative facilitation and knowledge</i>	
<i>Defendant Carrier's approval role internal to the Division</i>	
Count VI — Denial of Access to the Courts	15
<i>Defendants Weinstein, Becerra, and Does 1—3 (Clerk's-office personnel)</i>	
<i>Barricading the local forum and refusal to calendar</i>	
Count VII — Indemnification (Lake County)	17
<i>Lake County's statutory liability under 745 ILCS 10/9-102</i>	
Clearly Established Law: Qualified Immunity Is Foreclosed on This Record	17
VII. DAMAGES	17
VIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF	18
IX. JURY DEMAND	18
X. VERIFICATION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1746	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Antoine v. Byers & Anderson, Inc.</i> , 508 U.S. 429 (1993)	1, 2, 16
<i>Armstrong v. Daily</i> , 786 F.3d 529 (7th Cir. 2015)	2, 13, 17
<i>Avery v. City of Milwaukee</i> , 847 F.3d 433 (7th Cir. 2017)	13
<i>Bearden v. Georgia</i> , 461 U.S. 660 (1983)	8, 13
<i>Betker v. Gomez</i> , 692 F.3d 854 (7th Cir. 2012)	14
<i>BeVier v. Hucal</i> , 806 F.2d 123 (7th Cir. 1986)	12
<i>Bielanski v. County of Kane</i> , 550 F.3d 632 (7th Cir. 2008)	14
<i>Bounds v. Smith</i> , 430 U.S. 817 (1977)	16, 17
<i>Bridges v. Gilbert</i> , 557 F.3d 541 (7th Cir. 2009)	12
<i>Buckley v. Fitzsimmons</i> , 509 U.S. 259 (1993)	1, 2, 13, 17
<i>Camm v. Faith</i> , 937 F.3d 1096 (7th Cir. 2019)	14
<i>Carver v. Sheriff of LaSalle County</i> , 324 F.3d 947 (7th Cir. 2003)	6, 17
<i>Christopher v. Harbury</i> , 536 U.S. 403 (2002)	16
<i>Deakins v. Monaghan</i> , 484 U.S. 193 (1988)	5
<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.</i> , 544 U.S. 280 (2005)	5
<i>Fields v. Wharrie</i> , 740 F.3d 1107 (7th Cir. 2014)	2, 13, 17
<i>Franks v. Delaware</i> , 438 U.S. 154 (1978)	9, 12, 13, 14, 17
<i>Gomez v. Randle</i> , 680 F.3d 859 (7th Cir. 2012)	12
<i>Guajardo-Palma v. Martinson</i> , 622 F.3d 801 (7th Cir. 2010)	16
<i>Hartman v. Moore</i> , 547 U.S. 250 (2006)	12
<i>Heck v. Humphrey</i> , 512 U.S. 477 (1994)	5
<i>Jones v. City of Chicago</i> , 856 F.2d 985 (7th Cir. 1988)	15
<i>Jones v. Cunningham</i> , 371 U.S. 236 (1963)	
<i>Kalina v. Fletcher</i> , 522 U.S. 118 (1997)	1, 2, 8, 12, 13, 14, 17
<i>Kemp v. Liebel</i> , 877 F.3d 346 (7th Cir. 2017)	15
<i>Lewis v. City of Chicago</i> , 914 F.3d 472 (7th Cir. 2019)	13, 14
<i>Locke v. Haessig</i> , 788 F.3d 662 (7th Cir. 2015)	15
<i>Lowe v. Letsinger</i> , 772 F.2d 308 (7th Cir. 1985)	1, 2, 16, 17
<i>Malley v. Briggs</i> , 475 U.S. 335 (1986)	2, 13, 17
<i>Manuel v. City of Joliet</i> , 580 U.S. 357 (2017)	14
<i>McDonough v. Smith</i> , 588 U.S. 109 (2019)	5, 15
<i>Morrissey v. Brewer</i> , 408 U.S. 471 (1972)	13
<i>Napue v. Illinois</i> , 360 U.S. 264 (1959)	13, 17
<i>Nieves v. Bartlett</i> , 587 U.S. 391 (2019)	12
<i>Perez v. Fenoglio</i> , 792 F.3d 768 (7th Cir. 2015)	12
<i>Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corp. Retiree Med. Benefits Trust v. Walgreen Co.</i> , 631 F.3d 436 (7th Cir. 2011)	
<i>Rainsberger v. Benner</i> , 913 F.3d 640 (7th Cir. 2019)	13, 17
<i>Rehberg v. Paulk</i> , 566 U.S. 356 (2012)	2, 13, 17
<i>Simpson v. Rowan</i> , 73 F.3d 134 (7th Cir. 1995)	
<i>Smith v. Wade</i> , 461 U.S. 30 (1983)	17
<i>Snyder v. Nolen</i> , 380 F.3d 279 (7th Cir. 2004)	16
<i>T.E. v. Grindle</i> , 599 F.3d 583 (7th Cir. 2010)	15
<i>Thompson v. Clark</i> , 596 U.S. 36 (2022)	15
<i>Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski</i> , 592 U.S. 279 (2021)	15, 17
<i>Wallace v. Kato</i> , 549 U.S. 384 (2007)	5, 14
<i>Whitlock v. Brueggemann</i> , 682 F.3d 567 (7th Cir. 2012)	13, 17
<i>Young v. Harper</i> , 520 U.S. 143 (1997)	13

Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Rules

U.S. Const. amends. I, IV, XIV	
42 U.S.C. § 1983 — passim	
28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(3), 1367(a), 1746	
745 ILCS 10/9-102	
725 ILCS 5/114-5(d)	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a), 10(c), 11(b)(3), 15(a)(2), 38(b)	
Fed. R. Evid. 201	

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This action arises under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendments. The Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(3), and supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law indemnification count under 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

2. Venue lies in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b): every defendant resides or works in this District, and every act alleged occurred here.

III. POSTURE UNDER YOUNGER AND HECK: DAMAGES ONLY

3. Plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages for completed acts: a sworn statement made on May 14, 2026; investigative documents finalized on April 8, 2026; docketing acts of June 8 through June 19, 2026; a verified petition of September 20, 2024 that the State itself withdrew. No count asks this Court to quash the warrant, to intervene in *People v. Allababidi*, No. 23 CF 1146 (19th Jud. Cir.), or to disturb the 2025 judgment of conviction, and no count's success would necessarily imply the invalidity of any conviction or sentence. *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486—87 & n.7 (1994) (claims of this type may proceed because they do not necessarily impugn any outcome); *Wallace v. Kato*, 549 U.S. 384, 393—94 (2007). The Court can grant complete relief on every count without touching the state proceeding at all — that is not an accident of drafting; it is its first principle — and the state court remains as free the day after judgment here as the day before it to rule on every motion pending before it.

4. Three adjacent doctrines are answered in the same breath. *Rooker-Feldman* does not apply: Plaintiff does not ask this Court to review or reject any state-court order; he seeks damages for the defendants' own antecedent conduct — the oath, the investigative record, the docket — injuries the defendants inflicted, not injuries a judgment did. *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Industries Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005). *Accrual*: to whatever extent *McDonough v. Smith* defers accrual of a fabrication theory until the revocation proceeding concludes, the remedy those very authorities prescribe is a stay, not dismissal. *Wallace*, 549 U.S. at 393—94; *Deakins v. Monaghan*, 484 U.S. 193, 202 (1988). And the access-to-courts injury (Count VI) is the lost opportunity to be heard itself — a completed process injury that is compensable however the state court ultimately rules, and that requires this Court to hold no state order invalid.

5. The state-forum posture is included only so the record is complete: on June 26, 2026, the Supreme Court of Illinois denied Plaintiff's emergency supervisory-order request. (Ex. Q.) Plaintiff does not ask this Court to review that denial; Exhibit Q is cited only to show exhaustion/posture and to confirm that the damages claims pleaded here do not seek prospective interference with any state proceeding.

IV. PARTIES

6. **Plaintiff Ehab Allababidi** is a resident of Chicago, Illinois, and the defendant in *People v. Allababidi*, No. 23 CF 1146. He has been under that prosecution's authority — pretrial conditions, then probation — since 2023.

7. **Defendant Nicholas Shepherd** is an Assistant State's Attorney of Lake County. He is sued in his individual capacity, and only for conduct in the function of a complaining witness: his personal attestation, under oath, to the factual allegations of the May 14, 2026 Petition for Revocation. (Ex. B.) He is not sued for filing the petition, arguing it, or any other advocacy.

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

8. Defendant Francis P. DeRosa IV is an Assistant State’s Attorney of Lake County and was the principal prosecutor of record below, appearing on nineteen documented court dates. He is sued in his individual capacity, and only for the complaining-witness function: his personal verification, under penalty of perjury, of the September 20, 2024 Petition to Revoke Pretrial Release. (Ex. I.)

9. Defendant Marisa Cervantes is an Adult Probation Officer of the Lake County Division of Adult Probation Services. She is sued in her individual capacity for investigative and administrative conduct: gathering and reporting the purported factual basis for violation proceedings while omitting the controlling exculpatory adjudication; withholding her identity and contact information from the person she supervised; and her administrative communications. She is not sued for the decision to seek revocation or for the issuance of any warrant.

10. Defendant Lori Carrier is, on information and belief, a supervisor within the Division who reviewed and approved the April 8, 2026 violation memorandum. **Defendant Margaret K. Fontana** is the Director of the Division. Each is sued in her individual capacity for her own acts and omissions — not vicariously, and not for any revocation decision.

11. Defendant Erin Cartwright Weinstein is the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Lake County. **Defendant Hanna Becerra** is a Criminal/Traffic Court Services Representative in the Clerk’s office. Each is sued in her individual capacity for ministerial docketing conduct — the intake, classification, calendaring, and rejection of filings — functions that are not judicial and carry no absolute immunity.

12. Defendants Does 1—3 are personnel of the Office of the Circuit Clerk who performed three recorded acts whose operators Plaintiff cannot yet name: the classification of his file-stamped June 15, 2026 omnibus motion as “Correspondence”; the ingestion and docketing of that 82-page filing; and the June 17, 2026 rejection of e-filing Envelope No. 38550660. Each act was executed through the Odyssey / eFileIL system, which records an operator identifier and timestamp for every such transaction; the Does are sued in their individual capacities and will be named upon initial disclosure or subpoena of those audit logs. To the extent any Doe proves to be Defendant Becerra or another named defendant, the designations will merge.

13. Defendant Lake County, Illinois is joined solely pursuant to 745 ILCS 10/9-102 and *Carver v. Sheriff of LaSalle County*, 324 F.3d 947 (7th Cir. 2003), as the public entity obligated to pay tort judgments entered against its employees acting within the scope of employment. No *Monell* claim is asserted, and no theory of respondeat superior liability is advanced.

14. At all relevant times each individual defendant acted under color of state law. Defendants Destiny Lee and Cook County, named in the original complaint, are not parties to this amended pleading.

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The sentence, the zero-dollar restitution, and the insurer’s payment

15. This prosecution arises from a three-vehicle traffic collision on May 23, 2022. On September 8, 2025, Plaintiff pleaded guilty to one count; the second count was dismissed. He was sentenced to thirty months’ probation with a 180-day jail term stayed, and ordered to pay \$2,670.86 in restitution to one claimant. As to the principal property claimant, the sentencing court set restitution at **zero dollars** — because the loss had already been paid: Allstate had paid **\$16,557.00** on Claim No. 0670868884 to that claimant’s insurer, a payment confirmed in writing before sentencing. (Ex. P.)

16. Those two figures — \$16,557 paid, \$0 owed — matter because eight months later the State swore that Plaintiff’s failure to pay was a “willful” violation of probation warranting his arrest. The debt the petition treated as willfully unpaid was, as to the principal loss, a debt the court itself had extinguished as already-compensated. Three separate tribunals have adjudicated Plaintiff indigent; the county’s own probation system suspended \$1,400.00 of his service fees for indigency on November 10, 2025. No inquiry into ability to pay preceded the sworn willfulness allegation.

B. The Weeks adjudication: the State cleared the test in writing

17. In November 2025, Plaintiff submitted to a drug screen through Cook County Adult Probation, which supervised him by courtesy for the Lake County case. (The sworn petition would later date the screen November 10; the memorandum that fed the petition dates it November 20.) The screen detected amphetamine — which is what a screen detects in a patient taking Adderall, the ADHD medication Plaintiff has been lawfully prescribed for years.

18. The supervising officer, Adison Weeks, adjudicated the result in writing. On December 8, 2025, she wrote:

“You will NOT have to drug test this time, since your drug test results were all negative.”

Exhibit A (email of Dec. 8, 2025, 12:14 p.m.).

19. On December 10, 2025, she wrote again, in the sentence on which much of this case turns:

“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.”

Exhibit A (email of Dec. 10, 2025, 12:37 p.m.).

20. That is the State’s own supervising authority acknowledging the positive screen and adjudicating it compliant, in writing, in December 2025. Every enforcement document in this case postdates that adjudication. December 10, 2025 is therefore the dividing line of this record: before it, the State could be wrong about Plaintiff; after it, the State had to *choose* to be.

C. The 2024 rehearsal: DeRosa’s verified petition and its withdrawal

21. The office had run this play before. On September 19, 2024, a pretrial supervision violation memorandum issued; the next day, September 20, 2024, Defendant DeRosa — the case’s principal prosecutor — filed a Petition to Revoke Pretrial Release whose factual allegations he **personally verified under penalty of perjury**. (Ex. I.)

22. On October 29, 2024, the minutes record the disposition:

“State’s Petition to Revoke Pretrial Release WITHDRAWN.”

Exhibit I (minutes, Oct. 29, 2024) — withdrawn on the State’s own motion, without findings. The minutes of November 26, 2024 record that Plaintiff tested negative.

23. The 2024 sequence establishes three things. First, that verifying revocation petitions personally — the witness function — was the practice of the prosecutors on this file, not an aberration. Second, that when the office’s sworn drug allegations against this defendant were tested, they did not survive. Third, that by May 2026 the office knew both of those things — and swore anyway.

D. The February 19 anonymous-officer call and the notice to Fontana

24. On February 19, 2026, Plaintiff received a telephone call from a newly assigned Lake County probation officer who declined to give her name, her supervising authority, or any direct contact

information. Plaintiff memorialized the call the same day in a written email to Director Fontana, the State's Attorney's Office, and the Circuit Clerk, asking that his verified contact information be forwarded to the unidentified officer. (Ex. G.)

25. No officer was ever identified to him. No call, email, letter, or field contact followed — including during the four-hour availability window (12:00 to 4:00 p.m., March 10, 2026) that Plaintiff's memorialization had offered. The next communication from the Division that identified an officer by name arrived on May 29, 2026 — the day after the warrant, from Defendant Cervantes, who was the officer assigned to his case throughout. (Ex. F.)

26. Fontana received the February 19 memorialization and took no documented action: she did not identify the officer, did not direct contact through the verified channels Plaintiff supplied, and did not correct the supervision record that would later be described as a failure to report.

E. The April 8 memorandum: the clearance omitted

27. On April 8, 2026, a Probation Violation Memorandum issued from the Division. (Ex. C.) It reported the November screen — dating it November 20, 2025 — and the payment status. It did not disclose, mention, or account for the December 2025 Weeks adjudication clearing the same result. The memorandum is an investigative and reporting document: it collects and transmits purported facts. The purported facts it transmitted were false by omission, and the omission was of a record in the State's own possession.

28. On information and belief, Defendant Cervantes authored or supplied the memorandum's factual content, and Defendant Carrier reviewed and approved it. The memorandum became the factual spine of everything that followed.

F. The sworn petition of May 14, 2026

29. On May 14, 2026, Defendant Shepherd filed a Petition for Revocation of Probation and **personally swore to its factual allegations.** (Ex. B.) The petition's first predicate:

That Plaintiff “tested positive for Amphetamine (illegal substance) on or about 11/10/2025.”

Exhibit B, sworn May 14, 2026.

30. Both halves of the sworn sentence were contradicted by the State's own records when Shepherd swore it: the substance had been adjudicated a lawful prescription in writing five months earlier (Ex. A), and even the date was wrong — the memorandum that fed the petition reports the test as November 20, not November 10. The second predicate — “willful” failure to pay — was contradicted by the \$0 restitution order and the \$16,557 indemnification payment described above (Ex. P), and by the three indigency adjudications no one had disturbed. Shepherd swore to both predicates roughly half a year after the screen, without conducting the mandatory inquiry into ability to pay and willfulness required by *Bearden v. Georgia*, 461 U.S. 660, 672—73 (1983), and — on the face of the State's file — without reconciling either predicate against the documents that refuted it.

31. In swearing personally to those facts, Shepherd stepped out of the advocate's function and performed “an act that any competent witness might have performed” — the function of a complaining witness. *Kalina v. Fletcher*, 522 U.S. 118, 129—31 (1997). This complaint sues him for that act alone.

32. The petition's timing is itself a pleaded fact: on April 13, 2026, a judge of this District set June 5, 2026 deadlines in Plaintiff's pending federal habeas litigation. The petition followed on May 14; its hearing was set for May 28 — eight days before the federal deadline; and the mailed notice, metered May

15, did not reach Plaintiff until May 21. (Ex. B.) Plaintiff pleads the sequence and its dates; their weight is for the trier of fact.

G. The warrant of May 28, 2026

33. To be precise about what is *not* alleged: Plaintiff does not contend that a probable-cause hearing, live testimony, or a merits adjudication was required before an arrest warrant could issue on the petition. What he alleges is what *Franks v. Delaware*, 438 U.S. 154 (1978), condemns: that the probable-cause showing itself was built on a statement its maker had sworn while in possession of records refuting it. A warrant application that survives only by omitting the government’s own written clearance of the central allegation is not a lawful predicate for custody.

34. Materiality is pleaded on the face of the instrument. Under *Franks*, the false statements are excised and the residue is examined for probable cause. Excise the two sworn predicates the State’s own records refute, and what remains is a reporting lapse — one the Division’s own concealment of its officer’s identity had produced (§ V.D) — which no affiant could reasonably present, and no issuing judge would plausibly accept, as grounds for a **no-bond** warrant against a probationer with verified contact information on file. The oath did not embellish the case for custody. It was the case for custody.

35. On the morning of May 28, 2026 — two hours before the hearing — Plaintiff emailed the Circuit Clerk, Shepherd, and the State’s Attorney’s Office an emergency notice attaching the Weeks correspondence itself. The 9:00 a.m. minutes (Ex. E) record Defendant Cervantes present for the Division, no defense counsel present for the accused, and the result: issue warrant. The Warrant of Arrest (Ex. D) issued that morning commands that Plaintiff be arrested and “held in custody for First Appearance Court.” It remains outstanding as of this filing — its fortieth day.

36. On May 29, 2026 — one day after the warrant — Defendant Cervantes sent Plaintiff her first identified communication of record:

“You failed to appear in court on 5/28/2026 and a warrant was issued for your arrest. I encourage you to turn yourself in to the Lake County Jail to resolve this warrant immediately.”

Exhibit F (letter of May 29, 2026, disclosing for the first time her name, email, and direct telephone number).

37. A supervision failure that the Division itself manufactured — an officer who would not identify herself, a Director on written notice who did not intervene, and a first contact that arrived only after the warrant — became the “failure to report” and “failure to appear” narrative recited against Plaintiff. These are administrative and investigative acts, and they are pleaded as such.

H. The Clerk’s office: three channels, three failures

38. What a citizen in Plaintiff’s position is supposed to do is file motions. Between June 8 and June 19, 2026, Plaintiff tried every channel the courthouse offers, and the Clerk’s office closed each one.

39. **The written refusal (June 8).** Plaintiff asked that his motion be added to the call. The Clerk’s office answered in writing, over Defendant Becerra’s signature:

“Unfortunately we cannot add this case to the call because we do not have the original motion copy and the motion must be filed by your attorney. I would reach out to your public defender to have this matter added to the call.”

Exhibit J (email of June 8, 2026, Clerk of the Circuit Court, per Hanna Becerra).

1
2
3
4
40. Plaintiff had no attorney to file through: the Public Defender’s office confirmed in writing that it did not represent him, and his contemporaneous filings invoked his right of self-representation. A rule that a pro se criminal defendant’s motions will be accepted only from a lawyer is a rule that his motions will not be accepted at all.

5
6
7
8
41. **The mislabeled motion (June 15).** Plaintiff’s verified omnibus filing — a Motion to Quash Warrant and Dismiss Revocation, a *Faretta* invocation, a substitution demand under 725 ILCS 5/114-5(d), with his federal complaint attached — was file-stamped “FILED JUN 15 2026” (Ex. K), and then entered on the public docket as a single entry typed “**Correspondence**” (Ex. L). It was never placed on any calendar, though its second page expressly directed calendaring. A motion docketed as a letter is a motion no judge will ever be asked to rule on — and none ever was: no order of the circuit court grants or denies it to this day. Docketing, classification, and calendaring are ministerial acts.

9
10
11
12
13
42. **The rejected self-suit (June 14—17).** Plaintiff e-filed a verified complaint for a writ of mandamus against Weinstein and Becerra themselves (Envelope No. 38550660, submitted June 14, 2026, 6:18 p.m.). Its object was a single ministerial act: an order compelling the office to docket Plaintiff’s verified omnibus petition for post-conviction relief — a filing of more than four hundred pages that the office had never placed on the docket, and that remains undocketed in the circuit court to this day. On June 17, 2026, the Clerk’s office rejected the envelope. (Ex. M.) The office rejected for filing the lawsuit that named the office — a lawsuit whose only object was to make the office file another.

14
15
16
17
18
19
43. **The undelivered mail (June 7 to the present).** The paper copy of the same 82-page omnibus filing — the only document Plaintiff sent this courthouse by mail in this period — went by certified mail addressed to the Clerk under a label created June 7, 2026, and was never delivered: USPS shows it last scanned June 9 at the Palatine distribution center, “in transit to the destination”, still undelivered at the tracking report’s June 19 update (Ex. N) — and, per the same tracking number, still undelivered as of the date of this complaint, the thirtieth day after mailing. Plaintiff does not allege that any defendant caused the postal failure; he alleges its consequence — that with the electronic channel refused (June 8), the e-filed motion mislabeled (June 15), and the e-filed suit rejected (June 17), no channel into that courthouse functioned for him at the precise time the State was moving to jail him.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
44. **The provenance question the audit logs will answer.** The two preceding facts cannot both be taken at face value. On June 15, 2026, the Clerk’s office docketed Plaintiff’s 82-page omnibus filing — yet the only paper copy of that filing in existence was in a package the Postal Service’s own records say has never arrived, and the office had declared on June 8 that it could not accept the electronic copy without an attorney. One of two things is therefore true. Either the office docketed the very electronic submission it had told Plaintiff it “cannot” accept — in which case the June 8 refusal was pretext from the start, and the office possessed, and could at any moment have docketed and calendared, everything Plaintiff had been trying to file — or the office received and processed a mailed package whose delivery no postal record reflects to this day, in which case it held the original while its docket buried the filing as a letter and its rejection of the electronic copy stood unrevisited. Plaintiff need not choose between these alternatives, and this complaint does not: the Odyssey / eFileIL audit trail records the source, operator, and timestamp of every ingestion, and it will identify which occurred and at whose hands. Does 1—3 are the operators those logs will name. On either branch, the office had what it claimed not to have; the man asking was never heard; and docketing the filing as a letter completed, rather than cured, the obstruction.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX INDEX — APPENDICES O THROUGH R

People v. Allababidi, No. 23 CF 1146 — Shared Appendix, continued

I, Ehab Allababidi, certify under penalties as provided by law pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109 that Appendices O and P are true and correct copies of orders of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Illinois received by me, and that Appendix Q is a true and correct copy of this Court’s own June 17, 2026 minute record and order discharging the Public Defender, and that Appendix R is a true and correct copy of the letter of the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States received by me. They are included so that the indigency findings supporting the Rule 607 motion, the prior discretionary denials disclosed in the Rule 609(a) motion, and the June 17 minute record quoted in it are before the Court in full.

/s/ Ehab Allababidi — July 10, 2026

App.	Document	What it establishes
O	Supreme Court of Illinois fee-waiver orders of June 25, 2026, Nos. 133295 and 133301 (2 pages)	Two indigency adjudications by the state’s highest court within the past three weeks — the factual basis for the Rule 607(a)/(b) determinations.
P	Supreme Court of Illinois orders: No. 133295 denied July 6, 2026; No. 133301 denied June 26, 2026 (2 pages)	The discretionary denials disclosed for completeness in the Rule 609(a) motion; neither adjudicated any merits.
Q	June 17, 2026 minute record and order discharging the Public Defender (2 pages)	The minutes of the proceeding at which custody was activated: a status event, defendant “present via video”, “Public Defender Discharged”, “WARRANT WILL NOT BE QUASHED”, oral motion to lift the jail stay granted. No witness, exhibit, evidence, or willfulness finding appears.
R	Supreme Court of the United States, Office of the Clerk, letter of June 22, 2026, Application No. 25A1406 (1 page)	Justice Barrett’s denial of the emergency application — disclosed for completeness in the Rule 609(a) motion. It confirms that Defendant has pursued every superior forum and that no court has yet reviewed the June 17 order on the merits; the appeal and the relief sought in this packet are the review that remains.



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

SUPREME COURT BUILDING
200 East Capitol Avenue
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701-1721

CYNTHIA A. GRANT
Clerk of the Court

(217) 782-2035
TDD: (217) 524-8132

June 25, 2026

FIRST DISTRICT OFFICE
160 North LaSalle Street, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601-3103
(312) 793-1332
TDD: (312) 793-6185

Ehab Allababidi
8516 W. Winona St.
Chicago, IL 60656

In re: Allababidi v. Cartwright Weinstein
133295

Today the following order was entered in the captioned case:

Application by Petitioner, *pro se*, for waiver of court fees. Allowed.

Order entered by Justice Rochford.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cynthia A. Grant".

Clerk of the Supreme Court



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

SUPREME COURT BUILDING
200 East Capitol Avenue
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701-1721

CYNTHIA A. GRANT
Clerk of the Court

(217) 782-2035
TDD: (217) 524-8132

June 25, 2026

FIRST DISTRICT OFFICE
160 North LaSalle Street, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601-3103
(312) 793-1332
TDD: (312) 793-6185

Ehab Allababidi
8516 W. Winona St.
Chicago, IL 60656

In re: Allababidi v. Stride
133301

Today the following order was entered in the captioned case:

Application by movant, *pro se*, for waiver of court fees. Allowed.

Order entered by Justice Rochford.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cynthia A. Grant".

Clerk of the Supreme Court



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

SUPREME COURT BUILDING
200 East Capitol Avenue
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701-1721

CYNTHIA A. GRANT
Clerk of the Court

(217) 782-2035
TDD: (217) 524-8132

July 06, 2026

FIRST DISTRICT OFFICE
160 North LaSalle Street, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601-3103
(312) 793-1332
TDD: (312) 793-6185

Ehab Allababidi
8516 W. Winona St.
Chicago, IL 60656

In re: Allababidi v. Cartwright Weinstein
133295

Today the following order was entered in the captioned case:

Motion by Petitioner, *pro se*, for leave to file a petition for an original writ of mandamus. Denied.

Order entered by the Court.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cynthia A. Grant".

Clerk of the Supreme Court

cc: Attorney General of Illinois - Criminal Division
Bailey Clare Russell
Eric Frederick Rinehart
Erin Cartwright Weinstein
Francis Paul DeRosa
Gregory R. Ticsay
Lake County Adult Probation
Lake County Sheriff
Nicholas Shepherd
State's Attorney Lake County
State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor - Second District



SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

SUPREME COURT BUILDING
200 East Capitol Avenue
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701-1721

CYNTHIA A. GRANT
Clerk of the Court

(217) 782-2035
TDD: (217) 524-8132

June 26, 2026

FIRST DISTRICT OFFICE
160 North LaSalle Street, 20th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601-3103
(312) 793-1332
TDD: (312) 793-6185

Ehab Allababidi
8516 W. Winona St.
Chicago, IL 60656

In re: Allababidi v. Stride
133301

Today the following order was entered in the captioned case:

Emergency motion by Movant, *pro se*, for a supervisory order. Denied.

Order entered by the Court.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Cynthia A. Grant".

Clerk of the Supreme Court

cc: Attorney General of Illinois - Criminal Division
Bailey Clare Russell
Hon. Christopher R. Stride
Eric Frederick Rinehart
Francis Paul DeRosa
Gregory R. Ticsay
Lake County Adult Probation
Lake County Circuit Court
Lake County Sheriff
Nicholas Shepherd
State's Attorney Lake County
State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor - Second District



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

6/17/2026 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.)

Ehab Allababidi)

General No. 23CF1146


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.

Supreme Court of the United States
Office of the Clerk
Washington, DC 20543-0001

June 22, 2026

Scott S. Harris
Clerk of the Court
(202) 479-3011

Mr. Ehab Allababidi
8516 W. Winona St.
Chicago, IL 60656

Re: Ehab Allababidi
v. Matt Junkin, et al.
Application No. 25A1406

Dear Mr. Allababidi:

The application injunction in the above-entitled case has been presented to Justice Barrett, who on June 22, 2026, denied the application.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

by

Robert Meek
Emergency Applications Attorney