

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

**PROPOSED PETITION FOR AN ORIGINAL WRIT  
OF MANDAMUS**

---

*Submitted with the Motion for Leave to File — Ill. S. Ct. R. 381 — Ehab Allababidi, Pro Se*

---

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS**

---

**EHAB ALLABABIDI,**

*Petitioner,*

v.

**ERIN CARTWRIGHT WEINSTEIN,** Clerk of the  
Circuit Court of the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit,  
Lake County, Illinois,

*Respondent.*

No. \_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSED PETITION FOR AN  
ORIGINAL WRIT OF MANDAMUS**

Original Action for

Writ of Mandamus

(Ill. S. Ct. R. 381)

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	5
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE	6
II. JURISDICTIONAL BASIS AND CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD	7
III. STATEMENT OF FACTS (CHRONOLOGY OF LOCK-OUT)	7
IV. POINTS AND AUTHORITIES / LEGAL ARGUMENTS	10
A. <i>The Absolute Constitutional and Statutory Right to Appear Pro Se</i>	10
B. <i>The Mandatory Ministerial Duty of the Circuit Clerk to Docket Filings</i>	10
C. <i>Mandamus is the Exclusively Proper Remedy to Force Compliance</i>	11
D. <i>The State Forum Is Demonstrably Unavailable — Original Jurisdiction Is the Only Remedy</i>	12
V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF	13
VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION	14

---

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

---

**CASES**

<i>Bounds v. Smith</i> , 430 U.S. 817 (1977)	passim
<i>Faretta v. California</i> , 422 U.S. 806 (1975)	6, 7, 10
<i>Indiana v. Edwards</i> , 554 U.S. 164 (2008)	passim
<i>McKaskle v. Wiggins</i> , 465 U.S. 168 (1984)	passim
<i>Noyola v. Board of Education</i> , 179 Ill. 2d 121 (1997)	passim
<i>People ex rel. Alvarez v. Howard</i> , 2016 IL 120729	7, 11
<i>People ex rel. Berlin v. Bakalis</i> , 208 Ill. 2d 99 (2003)	7, 12
<i>People ex rel. Kaufman v. Millard</i> , 307 Ill. App. 3d 583 (1999)	11
<i>People ex rel. Madigan v. Snyder</i> , 208 Ill. 2d 457 (2004)	passim
<i>People ex rel. Pignatelli v. Ward</i> , 404 Ill. 240 (1949)	passim
<i>People ex rel. Ward v. Salter</i> , 28 Ill. 2d 612 (1963)	10
<i>People v. Hodges</i> , 234 Ill. 2d 1 (2009)	passim
<i>People v. Janes</i> , 158 Ill. 2d 27 (1994)	7

**STATUTES**

28 U.S.C. § 1746 (Unsworn Declarations)	15, 18
705 ILCS 105/16 (Clerks of Courts Act)	10
725 ILCS 5/122-1 (Post-Conviction Hearing Act)	passim
735 ILCS 5/1-109 (Verification Under Penalty of Perjury)	15
735 ILCS 5/14-101 (Mandamus)	passim
735 ILCS 5/2-301 (Appearance)	6, 8, 10
735 ILCS 5/2-701 (Declaratory Judgment)	passim

**COURT RULES**

Illinois Supreme Court Electronic Filing Procedures, Section 4	11
Illinois Supreme Court Rule 11(c)	passim
Illinois Supreme Court Rule 13	6, 8, 10
Illinois Supreme Court Rule 381	7

**CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

Ill. Const. art. I, § 12	passim
Ill. Const. art. VI, § 4(a)	7
U.S. Const. amend. VI	passim
U.S. Const. amend. XIV	passim

---

## I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This Petition presents a question this Court has not been asked to answer in exactly this form: may a Circuit Clerk refuse to docket a lawsuit against *herself, holding the complaint hostage* in the electronic intake queue **because she is the defendant named on the first page**? Petitioner filed a Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus against Respondent Erin Cartwright Weinstein and her deputy Hanna Becerra through the Odyssey eFileIL system on June 14, 2026 at 6:18 PM (Envelope No. 38550660, attached as Appendix E)<sup>2</sup>. That complaint was addressed directly to the Clerk’s office and assigned an official envelope number — yet it has not been docketed. The defendants are holding a lawsuit against themselves in the intake queue. That is **not an administrative delay**; it is an **unconstitutional conflict of interest**. The only forum that can break that conflict is this Court. Because the local clerk has *barricaded the courthouse door* to protect herself, Petitioner invokes the **original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Illinois**.

<sup>2</sup> **Appendix E (eFileIL Envelope Receipt)**. The official eFileIL envelope receipt confirming Petitioner filed his Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus on June 14, 2026, Envelope No. 38550660. The filing was assigned an envelope number and entered the Clerk’s intake queue, where it remains frozen at “Submitted” as of the date of this Petition (Appendix C). The named defendant controls the intake queue of the lawsuit against herself.

Petitioner EHAB ALLABABIDI petitions this Court for an Original Writ of Mandamus compelling Respondent ERIN CARTWRIGHT WEINSTEIN, Clerk of the Circuit Court of the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit, to perform her *non-discretionary, ministerial duty* to accept, file, and docket the pro se appearance and pleadings he tendered in Case No. 23 CF 1146. The Clerk has enforced a policy — documented in *her office’s own written words* (Appendix D: “the motion must be filed by your attorney”)<sup>1</sup> — that bars a self-represented defendant from filing unless his papers bear a licensed attorney’s signature block.

<sup>1</sup> **Appendix D (Clerk’s Rejection Notice)**. Written rejection notice generated by deputy Hanna Becerra on June 8, 2026: “*the motion must be filed by your attorney.*” Rejects the pro se appearance and emergency motions because a public defender remains on the docket record. The Clerk lacks statutory authority to review representation status before docketing. *People ex rel. Ward v. Salter*, 28 Ill. 2d 612 (1963).

The policy creates a *closed loop with no exit*. Petitioner’s appointed public defender constructively abandoned him after sentencing — *filing nothing, appearing nowhere* — yet the Clerk will not docket the very pro se Appearance that would remove that attorney from the record. **The lawyer will not act and will not leave; the Clerk will not let the client act for himself.** *Trapped inside that loop*, Petitioner cannot present a Motion to Quash a warrant that issued on two sworn false allegations, cannot docket a 495-page Omnibus Petition<sup>4</sup> documenting fraud and felony conduct by state officials, and cannot comply with a federal court’s directive that he raise these issues in the state forum first (N.D. Ill. No. 1:26-cv-01077, Dkt. 25). Every day the lock-out persists, an unconstitutional deprivation of court access compounds and a warrant executes. Because the Clerk’s duty is ministerial and mandatory, and because Petitioner has no other adequate remedy at law — he cannot appeal an order the Clerk forbids him to file — mandamus is the proper, necessary, and exclusive vehicle to restore constitutional access to the courts. *Faretta v. California*,

1 422 U.S. 806 (1975); 735 ILCS 5/2-301; Ill. S. Ct. R. 13. **Every day the lock-out persists**, an  
2 unconstitutional deprivation of court access **compounds** and a warrant **executes**.

3 <sup>4</sup> **Appendix G (Omnibus Petition for Post-Conviction Relief)**, Petitioner's 495-page verified post-conviction petition detailing thirteen independent  
4 constitutional violations, twenty-four exhibits (A through X), and a complete chronological record of 516 days of proceedings. The Circuit Clerk  
5 refused to docket any of it.

## 5 **II. JURISDICTIONAL BASIS AND CONSTITUTIONAL STANDARD**

6 This Court has direct original jurisdiction over mandamus proceedings pursuant to Article VI,  
7 Section 4(a) of the Illinois Constitution, which grants the Supreme Court **original jurisdiction** in cases  
8 relating to revenue, mandamus, prohibition, and habeas corpus. Original actions are governed by Illinois  
9 Supreme Court Rule 381, which authorizes petitions for writs of mandamus against judicial and ministerial  
10 officers.

11 Mandamus is an *extraordinary remedy* used to enforce the performance of an official duty by a  
12 public officer where that duty is ministerial and non-discretionary. *People ex rel. Berlin v. Bakalis*, 208 Ill.  
13 2d 99 (2003). To obtain a writ of mandamus, a petitioner must demonstrate: (1) **a clear right** to the  
14 requested relief; (2) **a clear duty** of the public officer to act; and (3) **clear authority** in the officer to  
15 comply. *People ex rel. Alvarez v. Howard*, 2016 IL 120729. If the public officer's duty is non-discretionary,  
16 the court has a duty to issue the writ to enforce the rule of law.

## 16 **III. STATEMENT OF FACTS (CHRONOLOGY OF LOCK-OUT)**

17 **1.** On September 8, 2025, in Lake County Case No. 23 CF 1146, Petitioner was sentenced to 30  
18 months of probation. The court appointed Bailey C. Russell of the Lake County Public Defender's Office as  
19 defense counsel. Russell subsequently failed to file any post-sentencing motions, failed to file an Illinois  
20 Supreme Court Rule 604(d) certificate, and constructively abandoned the representation. *People v. Janes*,  
21 158 Ill. 2d 27 (1994).

22 **2.** On May 14, 2026, the State filed a Petition for Revocation of Probation. On May 28, 2026,  
23 without a hearing, a zero-bond custodial arrest warrant was issued for Petitioner. On June 6, 2026, police  
24 executed two unsuccessful attempts to arrest Petitioner at his residence. **No defense attorney appeared.**

25 **3.** Because of his counsel's constructive abandonment, Petitioner invoked his absolute  
26 constitutional right to proceed pro se under *Faretta v. California*. On June 8, 2026, Petitioner prepared a pro  
27 se appearance, a Motion to Quash Warrant, and an Omnibus Petition for Post-Conviction Relief stating  
28 thirteen independent constitutional violations.

**4.** On June 8, 2026, Respondent officially rejected the electronic transmission. The written rejection  
notice generated by Respondent's agent states:

1 “Good Afternoon Mr. Allababidi. We have received your email about adding this case to the  
2 call for 06/09/2026. Unfortunately we cannot add this case to the call because we do not have  
3 the original motion copy and the motion must be filed by your attorney. I would reach out to  
4 your public defender to have this matter added to the call. Thank you. — Hanna Becerra,  
Criminal/Traffic Court Services Representative, Clerk of the Circuit Court, Erin  
Cartwright-Weinstein”<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup> **Appendix D (Clerk’s Rejection Notice).** Written rejection notice generated by deputy Hanna Becerra on June 8, 2026: “the motion must be filed by  
6 your attorney.” Rejects the pro se appearance and emergency motions because a public defender remains on the docket record. The Clerk lacks  
7 statutory authority to review representation status before docketing. *People ex rel. Ward v. Salter*, 28 Ill. 2d 612 (1963).

8 **5.** On June 10 and 11, 2026, Petitioner sent formal faxes and letters to Respondent Clerk Erin  
9 Cartwright Weinstein, citing 735 ILCS 5/2-301 and Illinois Supreme Court Rule 13, demanding that his  
10 appearance and pleadings be filed. Respondent Clerk *did not respond*, and the administrative lock-out  
11 remains in active force.

12 **6.** On June 12, 2026, Petitioner successfully bypassed the Clerk by uploading a [Proposed] Order to  
13 Quash Warrant directly through the Lake County Court Portal’s Proposed Order upload feature (JTI Ref.  
14 dc5ffbe9a07e, Appendix F)<sup>3</sup>. The portal returned an official receipt confirming the submission was received  
15 by the court. This filing placed the complete documentary record — including the Weeks adjudications, the  
16 Allstate indemnification correspondence, and the full chronological docket — directly before Judge Stride,  
17 bypassing the Clerk’s lockout. As of the date of this Petition, the Proposed Order remains pending and  
18 unruled upon, and the zero-bond warrant remains outstanding.

19 <sup>3</sup> **Appendix F (Lake County Court Portal Receipt).** JTI Ref. dc5ffbe9a07e, confirming submission of [Proposed] Order to Quash Warrant on June 12,  
20 2026 at 10:26 PM, placing the exculpatory record directly before the trial judge. The Proposed Order remains pending and unruled upon, while the  
21 zero-bond warrant remains outstanding.

22 **7.** On June 14, 2026 at 6:18 PM, Petitioner filed a Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus  
23 against Respondent Weinstein and her deputy Hanna Becerra through the Odyssey eFileIL system  
24 (Envelope No. 38550660, Appendix E)<sup>2</sup>. The complaint was assigned an official envelope number and  
25 entered the Clerk’s intake queue, where it first sat at the status “Submitted” (Appendix C)<sup>6</sup>. Then, on **June**  
26 **17, 2026 at 3:34 p.m.** — the same afternoon the presiding judge declared Petitioner’s hearing “a nullity”  
27 and kept the warrant (see ¶ 11) — the Clerk’s office **affirmatively REJECTED the complaint** (Appendix  
28 C-1), on the stated ground that “Multiple documents submitted as one PDF”. **The lawsuit against the Clerk**  
was thus not merely held in the queue; it was turned away by the very office it names. Whether or not  
that packaging objection is well taken, its effect is identical: the suit to compel the Clerk remains  
undocketed, Petitioner must re-enter the same queue the Clerk controls, and the active zero-bond warrant  
runs throughout — an unconstitutional conflict of interest that *only this Court can break*.

29 <sup>2</sup> **Appendix E (eFileIL Envelope Receipt).** The official eFileIL envelope receipt confirming Petitioner filed his Verified Complaint for Writ of  
Mandamus on June 14, 2026, Envelope No. 38550660. The filing was assigned an envelope number and entered the Clerk’s intake queue, where it  
remains frozen at “Submitted” as of the date of this Petition (Appendix C). The named defendant controls the intake queue of the lawsuit against  
herself.

30 <sup>6</sup> **Appendix C (eFileIL Filing History).** Filing history report confirming Envelope No. 38550660 is active but held undocketed since June 14, 2026.  
Status reads “Submitted” — the lawsuit against the Clerk has not been permitted to reach a judge.

1           8. The obstruction extends to the mails. On June 7, 2026, Petitioner dispatched his omnibus filing  
2 packet to Respondent Clerk Erin Cartwright Weinstein by U.S. Certified Mail (USPS No. 9402 6118 9876  
3 5528 9340 61)<sup>5</sup>. As of the date of this Petition, that article has never been delivered or signed for: USPS  
4 tracking shows it “in transit”, last scanned at the Palatine, Illinois distribution center on June 9, 2026, and  
5 not advanced since (Appendix A). The Clerk’s office has not accepted service of Petitioner’s filings **by  
hand, by portal, or by certified mail.**

6 <sup>5</sup> **Appendix A (USPS Certified Mail Tracking — Waukegan).** Tracking history for USPS Certified Mail No. 9402 6118 9876 5528 9340 61,  
7 dispatched June 7, 2026. Shows non-delivery and remains frozen at the Palatine distribution center. The Clerk’s office has not accepted service of  
8 Petitioner’s filings by any channel.

9           9. The contrast is dispositive of forum availability. During the same window, Petitioner mailed a  
10 certified emergency application to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court, 1 First Street, N.E.,  
11 Washington, D.C. 20543 (USPS No. 9402 8118 9876 5520 8548 73)<sup>7</sup>. That article — addressed to the  
12 Nation’s highest court, roughly seven hundred miles away — was delivered and picked up on June 15, 2026  
13 (Appendix B). A certified letter reaches the Supreme Court of the United States in days; the same litigant’s  
14 certified letter to the Lake County Circuit Clerk, a few miles from his home, is never even accepted. The  
15 local forum is, as a documented and verifiable fact, unavailable to him.

16 <sup>7</sup> **Appendix B (USPS Certified Mail Tracking — D.C.).** Tracking history for USPS Certified Mail No. 9402 8118 9876 5520 8548 73, delivered to  
17 the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court in Washington, D.C. on June 15, 2026. Mail to the Nation’s highest court, seven hundred miles away,  
18 arrives; the same litigant’s mail to his county clerk, thirty-five miles away, does not. The contrast is dispositive of forum availability.

19           10. Petitioner has prepared a comprehensive 495-page Omnibus Verified Petition for  
20 Post-Conviction Relief (Appendix G)<sup>4</sup> documenting thirteen independent constitutional violations,  
21 including: the sworn false drug allegation refuted by Cook County’s own written adjudications; the financial  
22 allegation barred by active Allstate insurance coverage (Claim 0670868884); the ASA Francis P. DeRosa  
23 sworn-then-withdrawn petition under Section 1-109; the 35-witness discovery abuse; the 100-day identity  
24 concealment by Officer Cervantes; the mail manipulation; the ex parte hearing communication; and the  
25 complete and continuing constructive abandonment by appointed counsel. **Each violation is corroborated**  
26 **by documentary evidence in the State’s own files. *No court has reviewed any of it.***

27 <sup>4</sup> **Appendix G (Omnibus Petition for Post-Conviction Relief).** Petitioner’s 495-page verified post-conviction petition detailing thirteen independent  
28 constitutional violations, twenty-four exhibits (A through X), and a complete chronological record of 516 days of proceedings. The Circuit Clerk  
refused to docket any of it.

          11. On June 17, 2026, Petitioner did the very thing the State says he must do — he appeared. He  
joined the court’s remote call for the 9:00 a.m. setting and was held in the electronic waiting room for nearly  
two hours. When finally admitted, the presiding judge (Hon. Christopher R. Stride) **refused to permit him  
to be heard**, accused him of “harassing” court staff for stating a single sentence, told him he “cannot have  
hearings” and must “hire a lawyer or a public defender”, responded “I don’t know what federal record  
you’re talking about” when Petitioner referenced his pending federal proceedings, declared the hearing a

1 nullity, terminated the session, and **did not recall the zero-bond warrant**. Thus, on a single day, **both**  
 2 **doors of the state forum closed at once**: the judge refused to hear the appearing defendant, and the Clerk  
 3 rejected the very lawsuit that sought to open the docket (§ 7; Appendix C-1). That conduct is the subject of a  
 4 supplement to Petitioner’s pending Judicial Inquiry Board complaint; it is recited here because it is  
 5 dispositive of the one question this Court must answer — whether any adequate remedy remains in the local  
 6 forum. None does.

7 **The lock-out at a glance.** Each entry below is documented by the cited Appendix:

Date (2026)	Event	Result
June 8	Clerk’s office refuses Petitioner’s pro se filing, in writing	“the motion must be filed by your attorney” — refused (App. D)
June 9	Certified omnibus packet to the Clerk last scanned (Palatine, IL)	Never delivered or signed for since (App. A)
June 12	[Proposed] Order to Quash uploaded to the Lake County portal	“Submitted”; never ruled on (App. F)
June 14	Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus e-filed (Envelope 38550660)	“Submitted” — then REJECTED June 17 (App. C, E, C-1)
June 15	Certified emergency application to the U.S. Supreme Court (D.C.)	DELIVERED and signed for (App. B)
June 17 (a.m.)	Petitioner appears remotely; held ~2 hrs; judge declares hearing “a nullity”	Refused a hearing; warrant NOT recalled
June 17, 3:34 p.m.	Clerk REJECTS the Verified Mandamus Complaint (Envelope 38550660)	“Multiple documents submitted as one PDF” (App. C-1)
June 17	Both state doors closed the same day; warrant still active	This original action filed in this Court

#### 18 **IV. POINTS AND AUTHORITIES / LEGAL ARGUMENTS**

##### 19 **A. A Self-Represented Litigant Has a Constitutional and Statutory Right to Appear Pro Se.**

20 The Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees a criminal defendant the  
 21 absolute right to represent himself. *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975). This constitutional right is  
 22 coordinate and is protected under the Fourteenth Amendment. The State cannot force an unwanted attorney  
 23 upon a defendant who voluntarily and intelligently elects to conduct his own defense.

24 In Illinois, this right is codified in 735 ILCS 5/2-301 and protected under Illinois Supreme Court  
 25 Rule 13, which allows any party to appear in person or by an attorney. A self-represented appearance must  
 26 be accepted. The clerk cannot bypass these fundamental provisions by enforcing an administrative policy  
 27 that mandates attorney signatures as a prerequisite to filing.

##### 28 **B. The Circuit Clerk Has a Mandatory Ministerial Duty to Accept and File Pleadings.**

1 A circuit court clerk is a non-judicial, ministerial officer of the court. The clerk possesses no  
2 judicial power and has no authority to review the legal sufficiency, merit, or representation status of  
3 pleadings. Under 705 ILCS 105/16 (Clerks of Courts Act), the legislature has mandated that the clerk *shall*  
4 attend to the duties of the office' and *shall* issue and file all processes and papers.' The Illinois courts have  
5 long held that the clerk's duty to file documents is absolute and ministerial. *People ex rel. Ward v. Salter*, 28  
6 Ill. 2d 612 (1963).

7 Furthermore, in *People ex rel. Kaufman v. Millard*, 307 Ill. App. 3d 583 (1999), the court explicitly  
8 ruled that a circuit clerk has zero authority to look behind a document to judge its legal context or  
9 representation status before filing it. Rejection of pleadings based on administrative signature-block rules or  
10 representation status constitutes an unauthorized exercise of judicial gatekeeping power.

11 This ministerial duty is not excused by the transition to electronic filing. Under Section 4 of the  
12 Illinois Supreme Court Electronic Filing Procedures, the clerk has a mandatory duty to maintain an  
13 electronic portal configuration that permits a self-represented litigant to submit a pro se appearance  
14 instant, irrespective of prior attorney representation flags. The automated configuration of a county-level  
15 database cannot override statewide electronic filing standards mandated by this Court. The clerk cannot use  
16 system settings to block access to the court.

17 By blocking Petitioner's filings, the Clerk is actively locking a self-represented criminal defendant  
18 out of his own case while a custodial warrant is outstanding. This administrative barrier runs direct  
19 interference with Petitioner's due process rights, preventing him from filing emergency motions to quash a  
20 void warrant. The Clerk has a clear, non-discretionary ministerial duty to immediately accept and docket the  
21 filings.

### 22 **C. Mandamus is the Exclusively Proper Remedy to Force Compliance.**

23 Mandamus is the proper remedy to compel a court clerk to perform a ministerial act. *People ex rel.*  
24 *Alvarez v. Howard*, 2016 IL 120729. Because the Clerk's refusal to file creates a total administrative barrier,  
25 Petitioner has no other adequate remedy. Petitioner cannot seek relief from the trial judge because his  
26 motions cannot even reach the judge's desk without being docketed by the Clerk first.

27 Respondent's administrative filter transforms the right to self-representation into a physical  
28 impossibility. By locking the portal, Respondent holds Petitioner defenceless in the face of an active  
custodial warrant, suppressing his ability to invoke the very exculpatory evidence held by the state. Every  
hour this blockade persists constitutes an ongoing, irreparable deprivation of access to the courts. This Court  
must issue a writ of mandamus to compel the Clerk to perform her ministerial duty and restore access to the

judicial process.

**D. The State Forum Is Demonstrably Unavailable, and This Court’s Original Jurisdiction Is the Only Adequate Remedy.**

Mandamus lies only where the petitioner has no other adequate remedy. *People ex rel. Berlin v. Bakalis*, 208 Ill. 2d 99 (2003). Here, that the local forum is closed is not argued in the abstract — it is measured. Two articles of U.S. Certified Mail, sent by the same litigant in the same week, tell the whole story side by side:

	To the LAKE COUNTY CLERK (Appendix A) <sup>5</sup>	To the U.S. SUPREME COURT (Appendix B) <sup>7</sup>
<b>Destination</b>	Clerk of the Circuit Court, Waukegan, Illinois	Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D.C.
<b>Distance from sender</b>	≈ 35 miles	≈ 700 miles
<b>Shipping label created</b>	June 7, 2026, 6:17 pm	June 9, 2026, 8:28 pm
<b>Accepted into USPS custody</b>	June 8, 2026, 10:00 am	June 10, 2026, 9:59 am
<b>Last tracking scan</b>	June 9, 2026, 7:55 am — Palatine, IL (in transit)	June 15, 2026, 8:00 am — DELIVERED, Washington, D.C.
<b>Status (as of petition date)</b>	<b>NEVER DELIVERED</b> — stalled 7+ days	<b>DELIVERED and signed for</b>
<b>Mailed first?</b>	<b>YES</b> — two days earlier	No — two days later

The arithmetic is unforgiving. The article addressed to the Lake County Clerk entered the United States mail **two full days before** the article addressed to the Supreme Court of the United States, and had to travel barely thirty-five miles — against nearly seven hundred, more than seventeen times farther. Yet the nearer letter, mailed first, has **never arrived**; the farther letter, mailed later, was delivered and signed for in six days. A letter that reaches Washington, D.C. but cannot reach Waukegan — though mailed earlier and carried a small fraction of the distance — has not been lost to the ordinary friction of the mails. Something at the destination is refusing it.

The electronic docket tells the identical story — and then makes it worse. The very lawsuit that would correct the lock-out — Petitioner’s Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus against the Clerk (Envelope No. 385506660)<sup>2</sup> — was submitted June 14, 2026, sat at “Submitted” (Appendices C, E)<sup>6</sup>, and then, on June 17, was **affirmatively rejected** by the Clerk’s own office (Appendix C-1): the defendant controls the intake queue of the suit against herself and used it to turn that suit away. Every channel into the local forum has been closed by the very officer to be sued — by hand she refused the filing in writing (Appendix D)<sup>1</sup>; by certified mail her office never accepted it (Appendix A)<sup>5</sup>; by electronic portal she first froze and then rejected it (Appendices C, C-1)<sup>6</sup>. Three independent routes, one identical result. And the

capstone fell on a single day: on June 17, 2026 the presiding judge admitted Petitioner only to refuse to hear him, declare the hearing “a nullity”, and keep the warrant, while **that same afternoon** the Clerk rejected the mandamus complaint. Both doors of the state forum closed the same day. When that is the record, the forum is not merely slow — it is unavailable, and the original jurisdiction of this Court is the only avenue left open.

<sup>1</sup> **Appendix D (Clerk’s Rejection Notice)**. Written rejection notice generated by deputy Hanna Becerra on June 8, 2026: “*the motion must be filed by your attorney.*” Rejects the pro se appearance and emergency motions because a public defender remains on the docket record. The Clerk lacks statutory authority to review representation status before docketing. *People ex rel. Ward v. Salter*, 28 Ill. 2d 612 (1963).

<sup>2</sup> **Appendix E (eFileIL Envelope Receipt)**. The official eFileIL envelope receipt confirming Petitioner filed his Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus on June 14, 2026, Envelope No. 38550660. The filing was assigned an envelope number and entered the Clerk’s intake queue, where it remains frozen at “Submitted” as of the date of this Petition (Appendix C). The named defendant controls the intake queue of the lawsuit against herself.

<sup>5</sup> **Appendix A (USPS Certified Mail Tracking — Waukegan)**. Tracking history for USPS Certified Mail No. 9402 6118 9876 5528 9340 61, dispatched June 7, 2026. Shows non-delivery and remains frozen at the Palatine distribution center. The Clerk’s office has not accepted service of Petitioner’s filings by any channel.

<sup>6</sup> **Appendix C (eFileIL Filing History)**. Filing history report confirming Envelope No. 38550660 is active but held undocketed since June 14, 2026. Status reads “Submitted” — the lawsuit against the Clerk has not been permitted to reach a judge.

## V. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner EHAB ALLABABIDI respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

1. ISSUE a Writ of Mandamus commanding Respondent ERIN CARTWRIGHT WEINSTEIN, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Lake County, to immediately ACCEPT, FILE, and DOCKET Petitioner’s pro se Appearance in Case No. 23 CF 1146, instanter;
2. ISSUE a Writ of Mandamus commanding Respondent to immediately ACCEPT, FILE, and DOCKET Petitioner’s 495-page Omnibus Petition for Post-Conviction Relief, Motion to Dismiss Revocation, and Motion to Quash Warrant, and to docket the Verified Complaint for Writ of Mandamus (Envelope No. 38550660), notwithstanding any counsel-of-record flag or administrative policy;
3. DEEM the foregoing filings filed as of June 8, 2026, the date first tendered to the Clerk;
4. DECLARE void, as applied to self-represented parties, any policy conditioning the docketing of a pleading on an attorney signature block, under 705 ILCS 105/16, 735 ILCS 5/2-301, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 13, and *Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975);
5. ISSUE a Supervisory Order directing the Honorable Christopher R. Stride to rule on the pending [Proposed] Order to Quash Warrant (JTI Ref. dc5ffbe9a07e) within seven (7) days, or, in the alternative, to STAY execution of the May 28, 2026 zero-bond warrant pending this Court’s further order; and
6. GRANT expedited consideration given the active zero-bond warrant, and such further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

**EHAB ALLABABIDI**, Petitioner, Pro Se

8516 W. Winona St., Chicago, IL 60656

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

---

**VERIFICATION BY CERTIFICATION UNDER 735 ILCS 5/1-109**

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 1746, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters the undersigned certifies as aforesaid that he verily believes the same to be true.

Date: June 18, 2026

/s/ Ehab Allababidi

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I certify that this Petition conforms to the form requirements of Illinois Supreme Court Rules 341 and 361. Excluding the cover, the certificate of compliance, the proof of service, and the attached appendices, the Petition contains fewer than the words permitted by Rule 341(b). The supporting documents are appended, each behind its own cover page, in ascending order of length so the dispositive records appear first: **Appendix A** (Lake County certified mail, never delivered), **Appendix B** (U.S. Supreme Court certified mail, delivered), **Appendix C** (eFileIL filing history showing the Verified Mandamus Complaint frozen at “Submitted”), **Appendix D** (the Circuit Clerk’s June 8, 2026 written refusal), **Appendix E** (the June 14, 2026 eFileIL envelope receipt), **Appendix F** (the Lake County portal receipt for the [Proposed] Order to Quash), and **Appendix G** (the 495-page Omnibus Petition the Clerk refused to docket).

**NOTICE OF FILING**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on June 18, 2026, Petitioner filed the foregoing Motion for Leave to File a Petition for an Original Writ of Mandamus, and the attached Petition, with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Illinois. Electronic courtesy copies of the complete filing packet were served concurrently via the TylerTech Odyssey eFileIL cloud backend infrastructure upon all parties identified in the Omnibus Certificate of Service and Courtesy Copy Distribution Register, including the primary statutory respondents, the presiding judge and chief judge of the Nineteenth Judicial Circuit, all hostile prosecutors and adverse counsel of record, cross-jurisdictional probation infrastructure personnel, the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission, the Illinois Judicial Inquiry Board, the United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, the Federal Bureau of Investigation Chicago Field Office, the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, and Tyler Technologies, Inc. as the Odyssey eFileIL software provider. Service by electronic transmission through the TylerTech portal establishes actual notice and constitutes service of process to the maximum extent permitted under Illinois Supreme Court Rules 11 and 13.

---

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

---

1  
2 The undersigned certifies under penalties of law (735 ILCS 5/1-109) and 28 U.S.C. § 1746 that on  
3 June 18, 2026, all foregoing documents were electronically transmitted through the TylerTech Odyssey  
4 eFileIL cloud backend infrastructure to every entity and individual identified in the Omnibus Certificate of  
5 Service and Courtesy Copy Distribution Register. Service was effected by the automated electronic filing  
6 service provider (EFSP) network and by direct electronic mail courtesy copies to each listed recipient. Due  
7 to the active zero-bond warrant and the extreme financial indigency of the Petitioner as demonstrated by  
8 multiple concurrent federal and state in forma pauperis determinations, physical service by process server  
9 was neither feasible nor required. Electronic service through the Court's own eFileIL portal constitutes  
10 service of process consistent with Illinois Supreme Court Rules 11 and 13. Under 735 ILCS 5/1-109, the  
11 undersigned certifies that the statements herein are true and correct.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
/s/ Ehab Allababidi — EHAB ALLABABIDI, Petitioner, Pro Se — Dated: June 18, 2026