

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT 1ST. DISTRICT

PLAINTIFF *Mae*
 VS.
 DEFENDANT *Shack Boy*

RETURN DAY NUMBER
 06/1-301847

COMPLAINT FILED, SUMMONS ISSUED, RETURNABLE
 IN ROOM 602

9th, FLD. RET. SERV. JUN 19 2008

PLAINTIFF FEES \$

DEFENDANT

ADDITIONAL PLAINTIFF'S ATTY.

P-PLAINTIFF
 D-DEFENDANT
 A-PLAINTIFF'S ATTY.

DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED	DATE	JUDGE	MEMORANDA OF POSTPONEMENTS
7/11/07	1855	<i>Call 1306-8-21-07 at 9am DW P 9:55AM. (TWIC-) Doc.</i>			<i>Dismissed</i>
		<i>Not DW P Emergent 11/6/07 9:00A.D.O</i>			
		<i>TWIC - T called esp. call</i>			
		<i>advising he cannot attend because</i>			
		<i>"before one of the him"</i>			
		<i>DWP - granted!</i>			
		<i>SPRITELL</i>			
		<i>T present - STRIVEN</i>			
		<i>ETC 2.7.08 9:00A.D.O</i>			
		<i>VAE 11-6-08 - DWP granted</i>			

JUDGE SHELDON A. HARRIS - 1807 SEP 27 2007

JUDGE SHELDON A. HARRIS - 1807 SEP 27 2007

JUDGE SHELDON A. HARRIS - 1807 NOV 06 2007

Harris

DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED	DATE	PAPERS FILED AND WRITS ISSUED
		N+D 21 days to move; 60 days to answer motions in limine; get a Camp by		
	Assoc. Judge Mary Regina Kinella 1912	JUN 10 2008 TR 6:11:08 9:00A D.S		
		Motion to continue trial is granted		
		Trial reset to 7/16/08 at 9AM		
		Trial date of 6/11/08 is stricken		
	Judge Lawrence J. Dorfner 1877	JUL 16 2008 Motion Adjournment to answer judgment for \$10000 Costs on behalf of both Defendants as stated - Judgment is entered in the amount of \$1000 against both Defendants. Motion of Costs and the Complaint is now denied and retroactively. Complaint cost to 7-30-08 for entry of judgment of Defendant		
	Thomas J. Jirscornb - 1854	JUN 30 2008 Mot ETC 8.13.08 9:00A D.S.		
	Judge Lawrence J. Dorfner 1877	AUG 13 2008 Mot ETC 8-19-08 9:00A		
	Judge Lawrence J. Dorfner 1877	AUG 19 2008 Mot to deny & all motions of Aug 13, 2008 denied - A's motion to pay \$1600 + 14150 To Clerk of Court transferred of Judgment entered - \$14150 to be paid for costs suspended Per Rule 298 and \$10000 to be held in T.		

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

Please, proceedings and judgments before the CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS, MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT at the place provided by the Chief Judge of said Circuit Court, for the holding of said Court, the name of the Judge, the names of several Judges severally, presiding on the day or on the several days on which proceedings were had in said Court, being as herein above and hereinafter stated, under the columns headed "JUDGE"

ATTEST: DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK
RICHARD DEVINE, STATES ATTORNEY
MICHAEL F. SHEAHAN, SHERIFF

Case # 1 Motion 8/17/06
\$1000.00
6/19/06

In the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Small Claims Division
First Municipal District

Robert J More
Plaintiff

vs

Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow Cab Company and John Doe Construction Company
Defendant

Case #

RECEIVED

FILED - 270641-301
1061301847
06 MAR 20 PM 4:08
TIME 09:30
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
JUDICIAL BRANCH

VERIFIED COMPLAINT OF 3/20/06

The plaintiff claims as follows: Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule No. 282, the Plaintiff ("RJM") herein avers that he was a resident at the Lugo Hotel ("LH") at 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, during the period in which the causes of action of which this complaint consists accrued. Plaintiff resides at the time of the filing of this complaint at: 2008 S. Blue Island, IL 60608, & a phone number at which a message can be left is 949 723-7856. At the time of the accident, the Defendant cab driver Ahmed Shahzad resided at 2 Sunset Court, Bensenville, IL, 60106, the office of the Defendant Yellow Cab Co. was located at 2223 S.Wabash St. Chicago, IL and the name and the office of the Defendant construction company is unknown as of the date of the filing of this complaint, but will be added very shortly.

1.

In as much as participation in the moral and social cancer of opportunism that so plagues this society at this juncture in its continued deterioration, will evidently be almost as difficult to justify on judgment day as will be the practice of making unjustified concessions to the heavyhanded and abusive practices of the many predator-bullies throwing their weight around at the expense of the weak and vulnerable in the society in which this complaint is being filed, RJM herein pledges, without reservation, the money he will obtain from this lawsuit to the spiritual and corporal works of mercy of the Non-counterfeit Catholic Church, which means practically that the money be held by either Mr. Jeff Lonigro or Most Holy Family Monastery for a period of one year to decide how it ought be allocated and then that it be allocated to some such work - either the BVM Queen of Heaven Charities or some other Non-counterfeit Catholic Charities.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Robert Jones
Plaintiff/Petitioner

v.

Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow
Defendant/Respondent

Col. Co. John Doe Construction
To
ORDER

20061301B47
CALENDAR/ROOM 1501
TIME 09:30
PT Motor Vehicle

No. _____

Calendar _____

This matter coming before the Court on an Application and Affidavit to Sue or Defend as an Indigent Person, the Court being fully advised in the premises, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED;

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 298 and 735 ILCS 5/5-105:

The applicant is permitted to sue or defend without payment or fees, costs or charges. The applicant may be ordered to pay any portion of the waived fees or costs out of a settlement or judgment resulting from this action.

The application is denied for the following reason(s): _____

Payment shall be: made by _____ (date) OR deferred until _____ (date) OR other _____

Associate Judge Leon Wool

APR 25 2006

Circuit Court-1802

ENTERED:

Dated: 4-25-06

Leon Wool 1802
Judge Judge's No.

Civil/Chancery/Domestic Relations/Law Codes

- 3387 - Application to Sue or Defend as Indigent Person Petitioner - Filed
- 3388 - Petition for Refund of Fees Collected in Error - Filed
- 3487 - Application to Sue or Defend as Indigent Person Respondent - Filed
- 3388 - Application to Sue or Defend as Indigent Person Co-Petitioner - Filed
- 4385 - Order Deferral of Fee Payment - Allowed
- 4386 - Order to Pay Fees - Allowed
- 4387 - Sue or Defend as Indigent - Allowed
- 4388 - Indigent Person Application - Denied/Billing Allowed
- 4670 - Order Fees Waived - Allowed
- 5387 - Sue or Defend as Indigent Person - Denied

Criminal Codes

- 876 - Petition to Defend as an Indigent Person - Filed
- 878 - Petition/Waiver to Defend as an Indigent Person - Granted

C00010

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, First DISTRICT

Name All Parties

Robert J. [unclear] Plaintiff(s)
Yellow Cab Company Inc
To 34 3000 S. [unclear] Defendant(s)
200 S. [unclear] Address of Defendant(s)
Chicago, IL 60604

Case No. 06-11751-047
Amount Claimed: \$ 1,000.00
*Return Date: 6/11/2006
Trial Date: _____
Time: 9:30 am Room: 1201

Please serve as follows: Certified Mail Sheriff Service (Plaintiff check one)

SMALL CLAIMS SUMMONS
(IL Sup. Ct. Rules 281-288)

To each Defendant:

YOU ARE SUMMONED and required:

FEE WAIVED

1. To file your written appearance by yourself or your attorney and pay the required fee in:

- District 1: Richard J. Daley Center; 50 West Washington, Room 602; Chicago, IL 60602
- District 2: 5600 Old Orchard Rd., Rm 136; Skokie, IL 60077
- District 3: 2121 Euclid, Rm 121; Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
- District 4: 1500 Maybrook Dr., Rm 236; Maywood, IL 60153
- District 5: 10220 S. 76th Ave., Rm 121; Bridgeview, IL 60455
- District 6: 16501 S. Kedzie Pkwy., Rm 119; Markham, IL 60428

on* 6/11/2006, 2006, (Return Date)

IF YOU FAIL TO DO SO, A JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT MAY BE TAKEN AGAINST YOU FOR THE RELIEF ASKED IN THE COMPLAINT, A COPY OF WHICH IS HERETO ATTACHED.

To the officer: (Sheriff Service)

This summons must be returned by the officer or other person to whom it was given for service, with endorsement of service and fees, if any, immediately after service, and not less than 3 days before the day for appearance. If service cannot be made, this summons shall be returned so endorsed.

This summons may not be served later than 3 days before the day for appearance.

THERE WILL BE A FEE TO FILE YOUR APPEARANCE. SEE FEES ON THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM.

Atty. No.: 99500 Pro Se 99500
Name: [unclear]
Atty. for: [unclear]
Address: 200 S. [unclear]
City/State/Zip: [unclear]
Telephone: [unclear]

WITNESS, _____
DOROTHY BROWN MAY 17 2006
DOROTHY BROWN, Circuit Court Clerk

Service by Certified Mail: _____ (Date)
 Date of Service: _____ (To be inserted by officer on copy left with Defendant or other person)

SEE REVERSE SIDE

*NOTICE TO PLAINTIFF: Not less than 14 or more than 40 days after issuance of Summons)

APPEARANCE FEES INCLUDE A COUNTY LAW LIBRARY FEE OF \$10.00, THE COURT AUTOMATION FEE OF \$5.00, DOCUMENT STORAGE FEE OF \$5.00 AND THE MANDATORY ARBITRATION FEE OF \$10.00 WHERE APPLICABLE.

APPEARANCE FEES (BASED ON AMOUNT OF CLAIM)	
(ALL CASES; NO DISPUTE RESOLUTION CHARGED)	
FORCIBLE DETAINER (POSSESSION ONLY)	\$133.00
\$1500.00 OR LESS	\$133.00
\$1500.00, TO \$15,000.00	\$143.00
MORE THAN \$15,000.00	\$163.00

JURY FEES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$5,000.00**
- *SIX-PERSON \$12.50**
- *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$25.00 or**
\$12.50 if another party paid for a jury of six
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$15,000.00**
- *SIX-PERSON \$115.00**
- *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$230.00 or**
\$115.00 if another party paid for a jury of six
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$15,000.00**
- *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$230.00**

***THESE FEES MAY BE WAIVED BY APPROPRIATE COURT ORDER. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO FILE A PETITION SEEKING SUCH AN ORDER.**

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT

- 1. The case will not be heard in court on the return date specified on the reverse side of this form. When you file your appearance and pay the fee required, you will receive your court date. You must come to court on this day.**
- 2. If you do not file an appearance and pay the required fee, a JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT may be taken against you for the relief requested in the complaint.**

In the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Small Claims Division
First Municipal District

Robert J More
Plaintiff

vs

Case #,

Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow Cab Company, and John Doe Construction Company

Defendant

06m1 301847

VERIFIED COMPLAINT OF 3/20/06

The plaintiff claims as follows: Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule No. 282, the Plaintiff ("RJM") herein avers that he was a resident at the Lugo Hotel ("LH") at 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, during the period in which the causes of action of which this complaint consists accrued. Plaintiff resides at the time of the filing of this complaint at: 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, & a phone number at which a message can be left is 949 723-7856. At the time of the accident, the Defendant cab driver Ahmed Shahzad resided at 2 Sunset Court, Bensenville, IL, 60106, the office of the Defendant Yellow Cab Co. was located at 2223 S.Wabash St. Chicago, IL and the name and the office of the Defendant construction company is unknown as of the date of the filing of this complaint, but will be added very shortly.

1. In as much as participation in the moral and social cancer of opportunism that so plagues this society at this juncture in its continued deterioration, will evidently be almost as difficult to justify on judgment day as will be the practice of making unjustified concessions to the heavyhanded and abusive practices of the many predator-bullies throwing their weight around at the expense of the weak and vulnerable in the society in which this complaint is being filed, RJM herein pledges, without reservation, the money he will obtain from this lawsuit to the spiritual and corporal works of mercy of the Non-counterfeit Catholic Church, which means practically that the money be held by either Mr. Jeff Lonigro or Most Holy Family Monastery for a period of one year to decide how it ought be allocated and then that it be allocated to some such work - either the BVM Queen of Heaven Charities or some other Non-counterfeit Catholic Charity (given the seriousness of the matters involving the removal of the feeding tube from Teresa Schiavo, which resulted in here government facilitated torture and murder under the color of law and pretext of legitimacy exactly one year ago to this date, and the importance of having persons in positions of authority who will never let such type abomination occur again in this country, it is in fact RJM's objective to donate the entirety of the damages procured in the case this complaint concerns to what has been established as the St. Michael the Archangel Defense of Public Officials and Government Employees Subjected to Retaliation for Refusals to Capitulate Fund and a contribution of the damages sought, to such cause or some similar entity, would bring the matters this complaint concerns to closure without this Court's having to have anything further to do with this case). One of the provisions of this policy is that RJM will never see one penny of the award that will eventually be collected. RJM understands the obligation imposed upon him by the requirements of the moral law to keep any alloyed or *other than beyond reproach*, motives, off of and out of, his record of conduct, and there is always a temptation to induce others to commit torts so that one can benefit from such duty breaches and this is a temptation that must be resisted at all costs in the spiritual warfare that constitutes human existence in this world, conducted as it at all times is, under the long shadow of the uneliminable problem of conditional salvation.

2. RJM is ever conscious that he must continue to help bear the burdens howsoever

onerous this burden-bearing may ever seem to, or actually, be, of the maintenance and restoration of the social order, and opportunism is the antithesis of the solidarity called for by the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the teaching of the Church he established and still directs. RJM has seen too many souls ruined by the benefit they have received from the misfortune and/or worse, sin, of (an)other(s) to not be solicitous to avoid falling into the same sorry state into which such souls have fallen (cf what are alleged to constitute former FAA Representative Rodney Stich's claims regarding the alleged efforts of PI Attorneys to prevent the FAA from identifying and correcting aviation problems that have later caused airplane crashes). It lamentably so frequently happens that when one party conducts his or her activity on the predatory side of what can be identified in a given matter to constitute the protective/predatory fault line that the other party(ies) involved in a given affair fails to keep his or her (their) response(s) on the protective side of that fault line and in such scenario, one evil has elicited another, which tends to elicit another into an ongoing proliferation of evils. This is an arrangement that not only cannot be permitted, but must be affirmatively prevented.

3. RJM is obliged, as he understands the duties to which he is subject, to be concerned to neither leave uncovered his moral liability for contributing to the prevention of any wrongdoer's

getting away with any wrongdoing at the expense of the Catholic Church on RJM's record of conduct according to the age-old axiom, *Qui parcit nocentibus, innocentibus punit*, which of course emanates from various scriptural passages (ie. 1Tim. 5:22, et al) on the one hand, nor for continuing to demonstrate as much pity and mercy and commitment to spare others grief as RJM can evidently justify continuing to demonstrate in a given case as RJM realizes that the consequences of not demonstrating non-counterfeit mercy are that one can even lose a claim to such mercy him or herself (cf. Ja. 2:13 et al), that the preferable alternative by which disputes ought to be resolved is for individuals, out of a non-counterfeit remorse of conscience, to voluntarily make reparation and restitution for harms unjustifiably caused others.

4. The public is entitled to every man's evidence, which it is RJM's position, in this case is evidence of culpable negligence by the cab driver and possibly by the construction company, and possibly by the cab company; and RJM cannot present that evidence in a court of law without filing this complaint and without filing it as an indigent person, knowing that the costs of the filing will be paid by the Defendant, when RJM recovers what ought be recovered for the harms unjustifiably caused as described in this complaint.

Claim No. 1 - Negligence - Driver and Cab Company

5. At all times relevant to this complaint, the driver and cab company were subjected to a duty to ensure that the cab being driven by Mr. Ahmed on 3/18/04 was not driven beyond a speed acceptable for the conditions under which such vehicle would ever have been and was operated.
6. On 3/18/04 at about 7:35 p.m. Robert More was riding his bicycle in Chicago, northbound on Franklin St. towards the intersection of Monroe and Franklin.
7. On the west side of Franklin, Monroe St was reduced to one lane eastbound where that street descends down a grade from the Wacker St. because the right lane of Monroe was under construction.
8. As RJM proceeded towards Monroe St. a construction vehicle pulling a trailer

- was proceeding through the intersection blocking RJM's view of the light.
9. RJM looked to his left and saw no traffic descending down the grade adjacent to where the road was under construction.
 10. The night was damp and foggy and the roadway was moist at this time.
 11. Since RJM saw no traffic behind the construction vehicle which was proceeding eastbound in the right lane of traffic on Monroe in the 200 block of Monroe (which is one way eastbound at that point), and since RJM could see the one lane of traffic heading eastbound on Monroe towards Franklin, RJM turned right on Monroe, bypassed the construction vehicle and then began to cross the road where he saw clear access to the sidewalk on the north side of the street.
 12. As RJM was crossing Monroe St. at that point, his bicycle was hit by a cab driven by Ahmed and owned by Yellow Cab and thrown eastbound between 10 and 15 feet with his backpack bag breaking its strap and his other bag sent flying.
 13. The collision bent the rim of the bicycle and destroyed the braking system.
 14. RJM landed flat on his right side after being thrown from the bike.
 15. RJM's right knee had been hit by the frame of the bike which had been hit by the bumper of the Cab, which most fortuitously was a Crown Victoria which has a wide and soft bumper.
 16. RJM incurred a very painful contusion on the inside of his right knee and a bruise on his right hip.
 17. A police officer was summonsed who made a police report of the incident.
 18. RJM went to the hospital and waited several hours, received an Xray and was told that his activity would have to be limited for several weeks.
 19. The bicycle was rendered inoperative and RJM was incapable of riding a bicycle, exercising on his right leg or even walking without a limp for several weeks.
 20. This restriction on RJM's activity imposed a burden on RJM's participation in the ordinary occupations of life.
 21. It is RJM's position that but for the driving at excessive speed in through a construction zone and/or his not paying attention to the roadway, the driver would not have hit RJM. with his cab.

Second Cause - Negligence of Construction Company in Not Posting a Reduced Speed Limit Sign.

22. To the extent of RJM's knowledge, the construction company did not post a reduced speed limit sign on the downhill grade between Wacker and Franklin on eastbound Monroe, which is a location at which cabs notoriously drive considerably above the speed limit as they try to beat the Franklin St. light.

Wherefore, the plaintiff R. More respectfully prays that a jury sworn by this Honorable Court award him \$1000.00 in monetary damages, against each and all of the Defendants on joint and several liability and for provision to be included in whatever judgment is rendered for the remission to Cook County for cost of the filing fee, for the assessment of all costs against the Defendant which may be incurred by RJM in collecting judgment (s), and whatever other relief it would be determined would be necessary under the circumstances from the evidence presented at the trial to be conducted in this case, to remedy the harms caused to RJM et al.

The plaintiff demands trial by a six man jury.

I Robert More certify that I am the plaintiff in the above entitled action. The allegations in this amended complaint are true.

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the substantial truthfulness of all factual

C00042

averments contained herein & as to those claims made on information and belief that I verily believe the same to be true.

Robert J. More

R. More, 2008 S. Blue Island #39, Chicago, IL, 60608, (949) 723-7856

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert J. More". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned over the printed name and address.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

Name All Parties

Robert J Moore Plaintiff(s)
v.
Ahmed Shahzad Defendant(s)
2 Sunset Court
Bensenville, IL 60106 Address of Defendant(s)

Case No. 06 M1 301847
Amount Claimed: \$ 1000.00
*Return Date: 6/19/2006
Trial Date: _____
Time: 9:30 am Room: 1501

Please serve as follows: Certified Mail Sheriff Service (Plaintiff check one)

SMALL CLAIMS SUMMONS
(IL Sup. Ct. Rules 281-288)

FEE WAIVED

To each Defendant:

YOU ARE SUMMONED and required:

1. To file your written appearance by yourself or your attorney and pay the required fee in:

- District 1: Richard J. Daley Center; 50 West Washington, Room 602; Chicago, IL 60602
- District 2: 5600 Old Orchard Rd., Rm 136; Skokie, IL 60077
- District 3: 2121 Euclid, Rm 121; Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
- District 4: 1500 Maybrook Dr., Rm 236; Maywood, IL 60153
- District 5: 10220 S. 76th Ave., Rm 121; Bridgeview, IL 60455
- District 6: 16501 S. Kedzie Pkwy., Rm 119; Markham, IL 60428

on* 6/19, 2006, (Return Date)

IF YOU FAIL TO DO SO, A JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT MAY BE TAKEN AGAINST YOU FOR THE RELIEF ASKED IN THE COMPLAINT, A COPY OF WHICH IS HERETO ATTACHED.

To the officer: (Sheriff Service)

This summons must be returned by the officer or other person to whom it was given for service, with endorsement of service and fees, if any, immediately after service, and not less than 3 days before the day for appearance. If service cannot be made, this summons shall be returned so endorsed.

This summons may not be served later than 3 days before the day for appearance.

THERE WILL BE A FEE TO FILE YOUR APPEARANCE. SEE FEES ON THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM.

Atty. No.: 99500 Pro Se 99500
Name: Robert J Moore
Atty. for: self
Address: 2008 S Blue Island
City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60608
Telephone: 312 451-7086

WITNESS, DOROTHY BROWN MAY 17 2006
DOROTHY BROWN, Circuit Court Clerk

Service by Certified Mail: _____ (Date)
 Date of Service: _____
(To be inserted by officer on copy left with Defendant or other person)

SEE REVERSE SIDE

*NOTICE TO PLAINTIFF: Not less than 14 or more than 40 days after issuance of Summons)

APPEARANCE FEES INCLUDE A COUNTY LAW LIBRARY FEE OF \$10.00, THE COURT AUTOMATION FEE OF \$5.00, DOCUMENT STORAGE FEE OF \$5.00 AND THE MANDATORY ARBITRATION FEE OF \$10.00 WHERE APPLICABLE.

APPEARANCE FEES (BASED ON AMOUNT OF CLAIM)
(ALL CASES; NO DISPUTE RESOLUTION CHARGED)

FORCIBLE DETAINER (POSSESSION ONLY)	\$133.00
\$1500.00 OR LESS	\$133.00
\$1500.00, TO \$15,000.00	\$143.00
MORE THAN \$15,000.00	\$163.00

JURY FEES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$5,000.00
 - *SIX-PERSON \$12.50
 - *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$25.00 or \$12.50 if another party paid for a jury of six
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$15,000.00
 - *SIX-PERSON \$115.00
 - *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$230.00 or \$115.00 if another party paid for a jury of six
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$15,000.00
 - *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$230.00

*THESE FEES MAY BE WAIVED BY APPROPRIATE COURT ORDER. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO FILE A PETITION SEEKING SUCH AN ORDER.

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT

1. The case will not be heard in court on the return date specified on the reverse side of this form. When you file your appearance and pay the fee required, you will receive your court date. You must come to court on this day.
2. If you do not file an appearance and pay the required fee, a JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT may be taken against you for the relief requested in the complaint.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

Name All Parties

Robert J Moore
Plaintiff(s)

Yellow Cab Company Inc
Defendant(s)
TO BE SERVED ON REGISTERED BUSINESS AGENT:
National Registered Agents
200 W Adams St Suite 22007
Chicago, IL 60606
Address of Defendant(s)

Case No. 06M1301847
Amount Claimed: \$ 1000.00
*Return Date: 6/19/2006
Trial Date: _____
Time: 9:30 am Room: 1501

Please serve as follows: Certified Mail Sheriff Service (Plaintiff check one)

SMALL CLAIMS SUMMONS
(IL Sup. Ct. Rules 281-288)

FEE WAIVED

To each Defendant:

YOU ARE SUMMONED and required:

1. To file your written appearance by yourself or your attorney and pay the required fee in:

- District 1: Richard J. Daley Center; 50 West Washington, Room 602; Chicago, IL 60602
- District 2: 5600 Old Orchard Rd., Rm 136; Skokie, IL 60077
- District 3: 2121 Euclid, Rm 121; Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
- District 4: 1500 Maybrook Dr., Rm 236; Maywood, IL 60153
- District 5: 10220 S. 76th Ave., Rm 121; Bridgeview, IL 60455
- District 6: 16501 S. Kedzie Pkwy., Rm 119; Markham, IL 60428

on* 6/19, 2006, (Return Date)

IF YOU FAIL TO DO SO, A JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT MAY BE TAKEN AGAINST YOU FOR THE RELIEF ASKED IN THE COMPLAINT, A COPY OF WHICH IS HERETO ATTACHED.

To the officer: (Sheriff Service)

This summons must be returned by the officer or other person to whom it was given for service, with endorsement of service and fees, if any, immediately after service, and not less than 3 days before the day for appearance. If service cannot be made, this summons shall be returned so endorsed.

This summons may not be served later than 3 days before the day for appearance.

THERE WILL BE A FEE TO FILE YOUR APPEARANCE. SEE FEES ON THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM.

Atty. No.: 99500 Pro Se 99500
Name: Robert J Moore
Atty. for: Self
Address: 2008 S Blue Island
City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL, 60608
Telephone: (312) 451-7086

WITNESS, _____
DOROTHY BROWN MAY 17 2006
DOROTHY BROWN, Circuit Court Clerk

Service by Certified Mail: _____ (Date)
 Date of Service: _____
(To be inserted by officer on copy left with Defendant or other person)

SEE REVERSE SIDE

*NOTICE TO PLAINTIFF: Not less than 14 or more than 40 days after issuance of Summons)

APPEARANCE FEES INCLUDE A COUNTY LAW LIBRARY FEE OF \$10.00, THE JURY AUTOMATION FEE OF \$5.00, DOCUMENT STORAGE FEE OF \$5.00 AND THE MANDATORY ARBITRATION FEE OF \$10.00 WHERE APPLICABLE.

APPEARANCE FEES (BASED ON AMOUNT OF CLAIM)	
(ALL CASES; NO DISPUTE RESOLUTION CHARGED)	
FORCIBLE DETAINER (POSSESSION ONLY)	\$133.00
\$1500.00 OR LESS	\$133.00
\$1500.00, TO \$15,000.00	\$143.00
MORE THAN \$15,000.00	\$163.00

JURY FEES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$5,000.00**
- *SIX-PERSON \$12.50**
- *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$25.00 or \$12.50 if another party paid for a jury of six**
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$15,000.00**
- *SIX-PERSON \$115.00**
- *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$230.00 or \$115.00 if another party paid for a jury of six**
- CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES NOT IN EXCESS OF \$15,000.00**
- *TWELVE-PERSON JURY \$230.00**

***THESE FEES MAY BE WAIVED BY APPROPRIATE COURT ORDER. YOU HAVE THE RIGHT TO FILE A PETITION SEEKING SUCH AN ORDER.**

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT

- 1. The case will not be heard in court on the return date specified on the reverse side of this form. When you file your appearance and pay the fee required, you will receive your court date. You must come to court on this day.**
- 2. If you do not file an appearance and pay the required fee, a JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT may be taken against you for the relief requested in the complaint.**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE

Plaintiff.

vs.
AHMED SHAHZAD, YELLOW CAB
COMPANY, and JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION
COMPANY

Defendants.

No. 06 M1-301847

Claimed: \$1,000.00

Return Date JUNE 19, 2006

Room No. 602

2006 JUN 19 AM 11:00
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT
FIRST DISTRICT
CLERK
DOROTHY BROWN
2006 JUN 19 2006

Address of Court District for Filing
DEFENDANT RELIES UPON JURY DEMAND
PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED

APPEARANCE

The undersigned, as attorney, enters the appearance of the defendant

YELLOW CAB COMPANY

JESMER & HARRIS

By: *Ronald J. Harris*

IMPORTANT:

Under the rules of this court, a copy of this appearance should be mailed immediately to the attorney for the plaintiff whose name and address appears on the papers that were served upon you.

Name JESMER & HARRIS
Attorney for DEFENDANT
Address 500 W. Madison St. # 650
City Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone (312) 373-1700
Attorney No. 90311

I certify that a copy of the within instrument was served on all parties who have appeared and have not heretofore been found by the Court to be in Default for failure to plead.

James A. Harris
Attorney for DEFENDANT

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

C00017

CLERK OF THE DISTRICT COURT - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 60011972 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 6/15/2006 11:00 AM
 STATE CASE 030 BONDING
 DEPOSIT: \$1,000.00
 CASE NO: 200611972 COURTROOM
 RETURN DATE: 6/15/2006
 CASE TOTAL: \$100.00
 Appearance Fee 1 \$50.00
 Publication \$15.00
 Document Storage \$15.00
 Arbitration \$10.00
 Use Library \$10.00
 INDEX AND BONDING \$100.00
 INDEX AND BONDING \$100.00
 FEE \$10.00
 TRANSACTION TOTAL: \$235.00

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT - FIRST MUNICIPAL DISTRICT

LINE # 35

ROBERT MORE)
)
)

v.
AHMED SHAZAD)
)
)

Case No. 06H1-301847

DISCOVERY CLOSURE AND ARBITRATION ORDER

Cause coming on to be heard and counsel having reviewed the file and finding all defendants having been served with Summons and Complaint;


IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Any party not having initiated discovery must do so within adequate time per the rules to allow completion within the time specified in Paragraph No. 2 below or all discovery by that party thereafter is barred.
2. All discovery shall be completed by 7-12-06
3. Parties shall complete discovery in such time and schedule any depositions and all other activity so that all discovery will be completed by the DISCOVERY CLOSURE DATE.
4. The cause is assigned to Mandatory Arbitration.
5. Routine motions and motions of course shall be presented in Room 1501. All motions relating to the scheduling and conduct of mandatory arbitration hearings and all motions for sanctions under Supreme Court Rule 90(g) through 95 shall be presented in Room 1501 only. The presentation and scheduling of motions in no way affect the scheduled date of the arbitration hearing.

6. Defendant AHMED SHAZAD given 14 days to appear & Answer.

Att. No.:
Name:
Attorney for:
City Zip:
Telephone:

_____, 20____
ENTER


JUDGE MICHAEL T. HEALY
Judge's No.
JUL 12 2006

Circuit Court - 1787

C00018

20060712 07:00:00

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,
Plaintiff,

vs.

AHMED SHAHZAD,
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION
COMPANY,
Defendants.

#90311
No. 06 M1-301847

12

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
DOROTHY BRIDGE
CLERK
06 JUL 21 AM 11:23
11-11-05

NOTICE OF MOTION

TO: Robert J. More, 2008 S. Blue Island Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60608

On 8-10, 2006 at 10:00 A.M., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, I shall appear before the **Honorable Judge Presiding**, or any judge sitting in his stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him in **Room 1501** at the Richard J. Daley Civic Center, Chicago, Illinois, and shall then and there move the Court for an order pursuant to Defendant's motion, a copy of which is attached hereto.

NAME: JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
ATTORNEYS FOR: Defendant
YELLOW CAB COMPANY
ADDRESS: 500 W. Madison St., Suite 650
CITY: Chicago, Illinois 60661
TELEPHONE: (312) 373-1700

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

The undersigned, a non-attorney, on oath state that I served this notice by mailing a copy to: THE ABOVE NAMED COUNSEL AT THEIR RESPECTIVE ADDRESSES and depositing the same in the U.S. Mail chute at 500 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois on July , 2006 with proper postage prepaid.

K. W. W...

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me
this _____ day of _____ July, 2006.

ah
2:00 10/13

Leslie Bovino
NOTARY PUBLIC SEAL
LESLIE BOVINO
NOTARY PUBLIC STATE OF ILLINOIS
My Commission Expires 01/28/2009

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
AHMED SHAHZAD,)
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)
COMPANY,)
Defendants.)

No. 06 M1-301847

CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
06 JUL 24 PM 11:23
#90311
DOROTHY TROMP
11-11-06

MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO
735 ILCS SECTION 2-619(5)

NOW COMES the Defendant, YELLOW CAB COMPANY, by its attorneys, JESMER AND HARRIS, and pursuant to the Illinois Revised Statutes, Chapter 110, Section 2-619(5) moves to dismiss the plaintiff's Complaint as having not been filed within the Statute of Limitations, and in support of its motion, defendant states as follows:

1. The plaintiff has filed a Complaint seeking damages for personal injury arising from an accident which took place on March 18, 2004. (See Plaintiff's Verified Complaint attached as Exhibit A)
2. The Complaint was filed May 10, 2006.
3. 735 ILCS 5/13-202 states that actions for personal injuries must be filed within two years of the date of occurrence.
4. Plaintiff's Complaint was filed approximately 7 1/2 weeks late.

WHEREFORE, Defendant, YELLOW CAB COMPANY, respectfully moves this court to dismiss the plaintiff's Verified Complaint for failing to file within the two year Statute of Limitations, pursuant to Illinois Revised Statutes, Section 2-619(5).

JESMER AND HARRIS

BY: 
ANDREW S. BRAVERMAN

JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
Attorneys for Defendant YELLOW CAB COMPANY
500 West Madison Street, Suite 650
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 373-1700

In the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, Small Claims Division
First Municipal District

Robert J More
Plaintiff

vs

Case #,

06M 301847

Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow Cab Company. and John Doe Construction Company
Defendant

VERIFIED COMPLAINT OF 3/20/06

The plaintiff claims as follows: Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule No. 282, the Plaintiff ("RJM") herein avers that he was a resident at the Lugo Hotel ("LH") at 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, during the period in which the causes of action of which this complaint consists accrued. Plaintiff resides at the time of the filing of this complaint at: 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, & a phone number at which a message can be left is 949 723-7856. At the time of the accident, the Defendant cab driver Ahmed Shahzad resided at 2 Sunset Court, Bensenville, IL, 60106, the office of the Defendant Yellow Cab Co. was located at 2223 S. Wabash St. Chicago, IL and the name and the office of the Defendant construction company is unknown as of the date of the filing of this complaint, but will be added very shortly.

1. In as much as participation in the moral and social cancer of opportunism that so plagues this society at this juncture in its continued deterioration, will evidently be almost as difficult to justify on judgment day as will be the practice of making unjustified concessions to the heavyhanded and abusive practices of the many predator-bullies throwing their weight around at the expense of the weak and vulnerable in the society in which this complaint is being filed, RJM herein pledges, without reservation, the money he will obtain from this lawsuit to the spiritual and corporal works of mercy of the Non-counterfeit Catholic Church, which means practically that the money be held by either Mr. Jeff Lonigro or Most Holy Family Monastery for a period of one year to decide how it ought be allocated and then that it be allocated to some such work - either the BVM Queen of Heaven Charities or some other Non-counterfeit Catholic Charity (given the seriousness of the matters involving the removal of the feeding tube from Teresa Schiavo, which resulted in here government facilitated torture and murder under the color of law and pretext of legitimacy exactly one year ago to this date, and the importance of having persons in positions of authority who will never let such type abomination occur again in this country, it is in fact RJM's objective to donate the entirety of the damages procured in the case this complaint concerns to what has been established as the St. Michael the Archangel Defense of Public Officials and Government Employees Subjected to Retaliation for Refusals to Capitulate Fund and a contribution of the damages sought, to such cause or some similar entity, would bring the matters this complaint concerns to closure without this Court's having to have anything further to do with this case). One of the provisions of this policy is that RJM will never see one penny of the award that will eventually be collected. RJM understands the obligation imposed upon him by the requirements of the moral law to keep any alloyed or *other than beyond reproach*, motives, off of and out of, his record of conduct, and there is always a temptation to induce others to commit torts so that one can benefit from such duty breaches and this is a temptation that must be resisted at all costs in the spiritual warfare that constitutes human existence in this world, conducted as it at all times is, under the long shadow of the uneliminable problem of conditional salvation.
2. RJM is ever conscious that he must continue to help bear the burdens howsoever



C00021

onerous this burden-bearing may ever seem to, or actually, be, of the maintenance and restoration of the social order, and opportunism is the antithesis of the solidarity called for by the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the teaching of the Church he established and still directs. RJM has seen too many souls ruined by the benefit they have received from the misfortune and/or worse, sin, of (an)other(s) to not be solicitous to avoid falling into the same sorry state into which such souls have fallen (cf what are alleged to constitute former FAA Representative Rodney Stich's claims regarding the alleged efforts of PI Attorneys to prevent the FAA from identifying and correcting aviation problems that have later caused airplane crashes). It lamentably so frequently happens that when one party conducts his or her activity on the predatory side of what can be identified in a given matter to constitute the protective/predatory fault line that the other party(ies) involved in a given affair fails to keep his or her (their) response(s) on the protective side of that fault line and in such scenario, one evil has elicited another, which tends to elicit another into an ongoing proliferation of evils. This is an arrangement that not only cannot be permitted, but must be affirmatively prevented.

3. RJM is obliged, as he understands the duties to which he is subject, to be concerned to neither leave uncovered his moral liability for contributing to the prevention of any wrongdoer's

getting away with any wrongdoing at the expense of the Catholic Church on RJM's record of conduct according to the age-old axiom, *Qui parcat nocentibus, innocentibus punit*, which of course emanates from various scriptural passages (ie. 1Tim. 5:22, et al) on the one hand, nor for continuing to demonstrate as much pity and mercy and commitment to spare others grief as RJM can evidently justify continuing to demonstrate in a given case as RJM realizes that the consequences of not demonstrating non-counterfeit mercy are that one can even lose a claim to such mercy him or herself (cf. Ja. 2:13 et al), that the preferable alternative by which disputes ought to be resolved is for individuals, out of a non-counterfeit remorse of conscience, to voluntarily make reparation and restitution for harms unjustifiably caused others.

4. The public is entitled to every man's evidence, which it is RJM's position, in this case is evidence of culpable negligence by the cab driver and possibly by the construction company, and possibly by the cab company; and RJM cannot present that evidence in a court of law without filing this complaint and without filing it as an indigent person, knowing that the costs of the filing will be paid by the Defendant, when RJM recovers what ought be recovered for the harms unjustifiably caused as described in this complaint.

Claim No. 1 - Negligence - Driver and Cab Company

5. At all times relevant to this complaint, the driver and cab company were subjected to a duty to ensure that the cab being driven by Mr. Ahmed on 3/18/04 was not driven beyond a speed acceptable for the conditions under which such vehicle would ever have been and was operated.
6. On 3/18/04 at about 7:35 p.m. Robert More was riding his bicycle in Chicago, northbound on Franklin St. towards the intersection of Monroe and Franklin.
7. On the west side of Franklin, Monroe St was reduced to one lane eastbound where that street descends down a grade from the Wacker St. because the right lane of Monroe was under construction.
8. As RJM proceeded towards Monroe St. a construction vehicle pulling a trailer

- was proceeding through the intersection blocking RJM's view of the light.
9. RJM looked to his left and saw no traffic descending down the grade adjacent to where the road was under construction.
 10. The night was damp and foggy and the roadway was moist at this time.
 11. Since RJM saw no traffic behind the construction vehicle which was proceeding eastbound in the right lane of traffic on Monroe in the 200 block of Monroe (which is one way eastbound at that point), and since RJM could see the one lane of traffic heading eastbound on Monroe towards Franklin, RJM turned right on Monroe, bypassed the construction vehicle and then began to cross the road where he saw clear access to the sidewalk on the north side of the street.
 12. As RJM was crossing Monroe St. at that point, his bicycle was hit by a cab driven by Ahmed and owned by Yellow Cab and thrown eastbound between 10 and 15 feet with his backpack bag breaking its strap and his other bag sent flying.
 13. The collision bent the rim of the bicycle and destroyed the braking system.
 14. RJM landed flat on his right side after being thrown from the bike.
 15. RJM's right knee had been hit by the frame of the bike which had been hit by the bumper of the Cab, which most fortuitously was a Crown Victoria which has a wide and soft bumper.
 16. RJM incurred a very painful contusion on the inside of his right knee and a bruise on his right hip.
 17. A police officer was summonsed who made a police report of the incident.
 18. RJM went to the hospital and waited several hours, received an Xray and was told that his activity would have to be limited for several weeks.
 19. The bicycle was rendered inoperative and RJM was incapable of riding a bicycle, exercising on his right leg or even walking without a limp for several weeks.
 20. This restriction on RJM's activity imposed a burden on RJM's participation in the ordinary occupations of life.
 21. It is RJM's position that but for the driving at excessive speed in through a construction zone and/or his not paying attention to the roadway, the driver would not have hit RJM. with his cab.

Second Cause - Negligence of Construction Company in Not Posting a Reduced Speed Limit Sign.

22. To the extent of RJM's knowledge, the construction company did not post a reduced speed limit sign on the downhill grade between Wacker and Franklin on eastbound Monroe, which a location at which cabs notoriously drive considerably above the speed limit as they try to beat the Franklin St. light.

Wherefore, the plaintiff R. More respectfully prays that a jury sworn by this Honorable Court award him \$1000.00 in monetary damages, against each and all of the Defendants on joint and several liability and for provision to be included in whatever judgment is rendered for the remission to Cook County for cost of the filing fee, for the assessment of all costs against the Defendant which may be incurred by RJM in collecting judgment (s), and whatever other relief it would be determined would be necessary under the circumstances from the evidence presented at the trial to be conducted in this case, to remedy the harms caused to RJM et al.


The plaintiff demands trial by a six man jury.

I Robert More certify that I am the plaintiff in the above entitled action. The allegations in this amended complaint are true.

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the substantial truthfulness of all factual

avermens contained herein & as to those claims made on information and belief that I verily believe the same to be true.

Robert J. More



R. More, 2008 S. Blue Island, #39, Chicago, IL, 60605 (249) 723-7856

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

12

Mon
v.
Shanfield

No. *06 M 301847*

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: *A Braverman*
James + Harris
503 W Madison St #650
Chicago IL 60661
On *8/18*, 2006, at *10:00*

DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
06 AUG -1 11:11:12
CLEM
a.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable *Judge P. Rosenberg 1501* or any Judge sitting in that Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at *Room 1501 R Daley Center Chicago IL*, Illinois, and present

Plaintiff's Motion To Strike D's Motion, of H Defaults Yellow
Name *R. Mon* Atty. No. *Pro Se 99500*
Address *87 Box 4926* Attorney for *Sally*
City/State/Zip *Chicago IL* Telephone *312 457-9086*

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, *R. Mon*, the ~~attorney~~/non attorney* certify that on the *7th* day of *August*, 2006 I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date *8/7*, 2006
Roland J. Mon
Signature/Certification

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

AD C 8/18 2:00 10/13

I, _____, the attorney/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing a copy to _____ at _____ (address on envelope) and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at _____ (place of mailing) at _____ a.m. p.m. on the _____ day of _____, with proper postage prepaid.

Date _____
Signature/Certification

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

C000025

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

R. More (ROM) Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Sharp et al Defendant(s)

No. 06 CM 1301847

TO: A. Brownman / James Harris for Yellow Cab

MOTION BY Plaintiff FOR Court to Strike

Defendant Yellow Cab's Motion to Dismiss Complaint for alleged failure to file the complaint within the 2 year Statute of Limitations, since as the accompanying exhibit #1 demonstrates - the claim was submitted to the Clerk of the Court on 3/20/06 at 4:08 PM, pursuant to the provisions of IL Sup Ct Rule 298 + 735 ILCS 5/5-105 and the non-resolution of the 298 petition until 4/25/06 was in no way imputable to any culpable negligence of ROM as ROM repeatedly endeavored to get the 298 petition adjudicated in favor

06 APR - 7 11:12
CLEM CIVIL DIVISION
DOROTHY BROWN
CLEM

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

1301 j t for the court to now enter a default judgment against Yellow Cab Co for the malice demonstrated in its filing of a motion

Dated: _____

Attorney Certification

to dismiss into conducting adequate inquiry into the facts.
Atty. No.: involved pursuant to the provisions of S. Ct Rule 137(b)
Name: and the court's equitable powers to banition
Atty. for: the abusive predatory practices to which "gojans"
Address: are subjected on a daily basis by attorney in Cook City
City/State/Zip: Or at least a \$200.00 sanction.
Telephone: for court to grant leave for Plaintiff More 8/7/06
ROM to remove proceedings if necessary. P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT FIRST DISTRICT**

ROBERT J. MORE

Plaintiff.

vs.

AHMED SHAHZAD, YELLOW CAB
COMPANY, and JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION
COMPANY

Defendants.

No. 06 M1-301847

Claimed: \$1,000.00

Return Date

6-9-06

Room No. 602

2006 JUN -8 AM 11:54
DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
LAW DIVISION

Address of Court District for Filing

**DEFENDANTS RELY UPON JURY DEMAND
PREVIOUSLY REQUESTED**

**AMENDED
APPEARANCE**

The undersigned, as attorney, enters the appearance of the defendants

YELLOW CAB COMPANY and AHMED SHAHZAD

JESMER & HARRIS

By: _____

Andrew s. Braverman

IMPORTANT:

Under the rules of this court, a copy of this appearance should be mailed immediately to the attorney for the plaintiff whose name and address appears on the papers that were served upon you.

Name JESMER & HARRIS
Attorney for DEFENDANTS
Address 500 W. Madison St. # 650
City Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone (312) 373-1700
Attorney No. 90311

I certify that a copy of the within instrument was served on all parties who have appeared and have not heretofore been found by the Court to be in Default for failure to plead.

Attorney for DEFENDANTS

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

C00026

01/15

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
#90311
06 SEP 19 AM 11:21

FILED-42

ROBERT J. MORE,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
AHMED SHAHZAD,)
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)
COMPANY,)
Defendants.)

No. 06 M1-301847

06

NOTICE OF MOTION

TO: Robert J. More, 2008 S. Blue Island Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60608

On 10-11, 2006 at 1:15 PM or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, I shall appear before the **Honorable Judge Presiding**, or any judge sitting in his stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him in **Room 1501** at the Richard J. Daley Civic Center, Chicago, Illinois, and shall then and there move the Court for an order pursuant to Defendant's motion, a copy of which is attached hereto.

NAME: JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
ATTORNEYS FOR: Defendants AHMED SHAHZAD and
YELLOW CAB COMPANY
ADDRESS: 500 W. Madison St., Suite 650
CITY: Chicago, Illinois 60661
TELEPHONE: (312) 373-1700

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL


The undersigned, a non-attorney, on oath state that I served this notice by mailing a copy to: THE ABOVE NAMED AT THEIR RESPECTIVE ADDRESSES and depositing the same in the U.S. Mail chute at 500 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois on September , 2006 with proper postage prepaid.

[Handwritten Signature]

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me
this _____ day of _____ September _____, 2006.

[Handwritten Signature: Julie Bovino]

NOTARY PUBLIC



A420 2297 ASB/kw

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
AHMED SHAHZAD,)
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)
COMPANY,)
Defendants.)

#90311

No. 06 M1-301847

FILED-40
06 SEP 29 AM 11:29
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
DOROTHY S. GIBSON

MOTION TO CONTINUE ARBITRATION HEARING

Now come defendants, AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY by and through their attorneys, JESMER AND HARRIS, and move this Honorable Court for an order continuing the arbitration hearing of this cause, presently set for October 13, 2006 at 2:00 p.m., and in support thereof state:

1. This case involves a March 18, 2004 accident. It is set for arbitration on October 13, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.
2. Defendants' attorney, Andrew Braverman will out of state for personal matters on October 13, 2006 and has already purchased non-refundable airline tickets. (See Exhibit A)
3. That the plaintiff will not be prejudiced in any way by the granting of this motion.
4. Defendant's attorney spoke to the plaintiff and he has no objection.
5. This motion is not made for purposes of delay and defendants' attorney seeks only a short continuance and if this arbitration is continued to another date and time the defendants will be able to participate at that time.

WHEREFORE, Defendants, AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY, move this Honorable Court to continue the arbitration of this case to a date other than October 13, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.

JESMER AND HARRIS

BY: 
ANDREW S. BRAVERMAN

JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
Attorneys for Defendants
500 West Madison Street, Suite 650
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 373-1700

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)	#90311
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	No. 06 M1-301847
)	
AHMED SHAHZAD,)	
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)	
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)	
COMPANY,)	
Defendants.)	


AFFIDAVIT

I, Andrew Braverman, attest as follows:

1. I am the attorney for defendants AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY
2. The case is presently set for arbitration on October 13, 2006 at 2:00 p.m.
3. I will out of state for personal matters on October 13, 2006 and have already purchased non-refundable airline tickets.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NOT.

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements as 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 that as aforesaid that he verily believes the same to be true.



 ANDREW S. BRAVERMAN



6

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MANDATORY ARBITRATION PROGRAM
_____ MUNICIPAL DISTRICT

More

v.
Shahzad

}
}

NO. 06 ml 301847

IN ARBITRATION

ORDER RESETTING ARBITRATION HEARING

This cause coming on to be heard on the motion of the attorney for Defendant,
_____, due notice having been given and the court being fully advised in the
premises:

THE COURT FINDS:

1. This cause was transferred to the Mandatory Arbitration Calendar on _____, _____
(month) (date)
by Judge _____.
2. Subsequently, this cause was set for a Mandatory Arbitration Hearing on _____, _____
(month) (date)
at _____ (AM)(PM).
(time)

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the said Mandatory Arbitration Hearing set for Oct 13, 2006
(month) (date)
at 2:00 (AM) (PM) is hereby vacated.
(time)
2. That the said Mandatory Arbitration Hearing is hereby reset to Nov. 15, 2006
(month) (date)
at 2:00 (AM) (PM) without further notice at:
(time)

- District 1: 222 N. LaSalle, St. 13th Floor, Chicago, IL 60610
- District 2: 5600 Old Orchard Rd., Skokie, IL 60077
- District 3: 2121 Euclid, Rolling Meadows, IL 60008
- District 4: 1500 Maybrook Dr., Maywood, IL 60153
- District 5: 10220 S. 76th Ave., Bridgeview, IL 60455
- District 6: 16501 S. Kedzie Pkwy., Markham, IL 60426

3. That the attorney who prepares this order shall send a copy of same to all Attorneys of record not present in court, and a copy of this order is to be delivered to the Court Administrator of the specified location.

Atty. No.: 90311
Name: Jerman and Harris
Atty. for: Def
Address: 500 W. Madison
City/Zip: Chic 60661
Telephone: 323-1700

ENTER: [Signature]
Judge
Judge's No.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Robert Moore
Plaintiff/Petitioner

v.

Ahmed Shahzad
Defendant/Respondent

No. 06ml-301847

Calendar _____

ORDER

This matter coming before the Court on an Application and Affidavit to Sue or Defend as an Indigent Person, the Court being fully advised in the premises, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED;**

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 298 and 735 ILCS 5/5-105:

The applicant is permitted to sue or defend without payment or fees, costs or charges. The applicant may be ordered to pay any portion of the waived fees or costs out of a settlement or judgment resulting from this action.

The application is denied for the following reason(s): _____

Payment shall be: made by _____ (date) OR deferred until _____ (date) OR other _____

ENTERED
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
DOROTHY BROWN

DEC 07 2006

JUDGE 1777 Morrissey
DEPUTY CLERK _____

ENTERED:

Dated: 12-7-06

Dennis Morrissey #1777
Judge Judge's No.

Civil/Chancery/Domestic Relations/Law Codes

- 3387 - Application to Sue or Defend as Indigent Person Petitioner - Filed**
- 3388 - Petition for Refund of Fees Collected in Error - Filed**
- 3487 - Application to Sue or Defend as Indigent Person Respondent - Filed**
- 3388 - Application to Sue or Defend as Indigent Person Co-Petitioner - Filed**
- 4385 - Order Deferral of Fee Payment - Allowed**
- 4386 - Order to Pay Fees - Allowed**
- 4387 - Sue or Defend as Indigent - Allowed**
- 4388 - Indigent Person Application - Denied/Billing Allowed**
- 4670 - Order Fees Waived - Allowed**
- 5387 - Sue or Defend as Indigent Person - Denied**

Criminal Codes

- 876 - Petition to Defend as an Indigent Person - Filed**
- 878 - Petition/Waiver to Defend as an Indigent Person - Granted**

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MANDATORY ARBITRATION PROGRAM
FIRST MUNICIPAL DISTRICT

✓
2006
DEC
7
PH 3:50

Rj more
v.
Abmed Shohyad et al

NO. 06-111-301847

IN ARBITRATION

NOTICE OF REJECTION OF AWARD

REMAINED

To: DOROTHY BROWN, Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, IL

NOTICE IS GIVEN THAT Rj more (Plaintiff/Defendant) rejects the Award of the Arbitrators

entered in this cause on 11/15/06 and requests a trial before the court.

Atty. No. 99560
Name: Robert J. More
Attorney for:
Address: P.O. Box 6926
City/Zip: Chicago IL
Phone:

PROOF OF SERVICE

On or before 12/18, 2006, I, Robert J. More on oath state that

I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to all parties of record.

I served this notice by mailing a copy to all parties of record and depositing the same in the U.S. Mail at _____, Illinois with the proper postage prepaid

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver that all factual averments contained herein supra are correct & accurate to a legally cognizable measure of probability.

Notary Public

Circuit Clerk

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

FILED 12-13
2006 DEC -7 PM 3:53

ORIGINALLY FILED
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF COOK COUNTY, IL

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT - DEPT. 10, 1ST
FLOOR, 1472 CIVIL-01 12/7/2006 3:53 PM
CITY: 99500 030 WHAIDUN
NO. 20061301847 \$1,000.00
CASE NO: 20061301847 COURTROOM:
RETURN DATE: 12/17/2006
CASE TOTAL: \$200.00
Notice of Select 1 \$200.00
FEE PAID \$200.00
CHANGE \$0.00
TRANSACTION TOTAL: \$200.00

Line # S.O.J.

More
v.
Shahzad

) Case No.
)
) 06M1301847
)

TRIAL ROOM ASSIGNMENT ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. All discovery remains closed in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 89.
2. The cause is assigned to Room 1306 on 8-21-07 at 9:00a.m. at which time an Intake and Case Management Conference pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 218 will be conducted and the trial date will be set.
3. All parties pro se, trial lawyers or other appropriate representatives familiar with the facts of the case and authorized to settle the case are required to be present.
4. All parties shall complete an Intake and Case Management Information Sheet for use at the Conference. (REVERSE SIDE OF THIS ORDER)
5. All motions relating to the conduct of the previous mandatory arbitration shall be presented in Room 1501. All other motions shall be presented in the assigned trial room, and all dispositive motions and initial motions in limine shall be presented at or before the Conference.

Assoc. Judge Moira S. Johnson

JUL 11 2007

Circuit Court - 1836

Atty. No. Order of Court
Name:
Attorney for:
City/Zip
Telephone:

Enter _____ 20
Judge _____ Judges's No.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

More

v.

Shahzad

No. 06H1-301847

ORDER

due to this matter coming before the court for intake, It is hereby ordered & Judge Shellie Williams-Hayes recuses herself and transfers this case to courtroom 150K.

Atty. No.: 90311
 Name: JES mer + Harris
 Atty. for: Defendant
 Address: 500 W. Madison
 City/State/Zip: Chgo IL 60661
 Telephone: 312-373-1700

ENTERED:

Dated: _____

Circuit Court of Cook County
ENTERED
 JUL 11 2001
 Judge Shellie D. Williams-Hayes-1706

Judge

Judge's No.

15

ORDER

CC N002-300M-2/28/05(43480658)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Line #15

8005

Robert J. More

v.

No. 06 ml 301847

Ahmed Shahzad, et Al

ORDER

This matter coming before this court on August 21, 2007 for intake, Plaintiff failed to appear.

It is hereby ordered that this case is Dismissed For Want of Prosecution. At 9:55

Judge Laurence J. Dunford
AUG 21 2007 DBD
Circuit Court - 1877

Atty. No.: 90311
Name: Hilary Rose
Atty. for: Defendant
Address: 500 W. Madison, # 650
City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60661
Telephone: 312-373-1700

ENTERED:

Dated:

8/21/07.

Laurence J. Dunford
Judge Judge's No.

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS

Mon ("R Mon")
v.
Shayhad A et al

No. 06-M-301847

FILED-82
07 AUG 28 PM 3:55
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
DOROTHY BROWN

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: Jessie & Harris
500 W Madison #650
Chicago IL 60661

On 9/27, 2007, at 9:00 am ^{a.m.} p.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable Judge J Sanford or any Judge sitting in that Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at Room 1306 R Daley

Center 50 W Washington St Chicago, Illinois, and present

Plaintiffs Motion to Withdraw Plaintiff
one was entered to conduct case management

Name R J Mon Atty. No. Pro Se 99500
Address RJ Mon Attorney for Self - public interest
City/State/Zip RD. 6926 Telephone 312 479-6287
Chicago IL

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, R J Mon, the ~~attorney~~/non attorney* certify that on the 26th day of 9/24/2007

I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date 8/28, 2007

R J Mon
Signature/Certification

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, _____, the attorney/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing (*strike one)

a copy to _____ at _____ (address on envelope)

and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at _____ (place of mailing)

at _____ a.m. p.m. on the _____ day of _____, _____, with proper postage prepaid.

Date _____

Signature/Certification

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Mou (ROM)
Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Shaybad. A. et al
Defendant(s)

No. 66-M1-301847

TO: Jessie Harris

MOTION BY ROM FOR Court to

Conduct Case Management Intake & Vacate
any DWI that has been entered if
one has been entered in this case.

Now comes the ROM to move this
Court to vacate a DWI if one was entered on 8/21/07
if one was entered to conduct case management ~~and~~ conference

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared
and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Let case on trial roll

Dated: 8/28, 2007

R-J Mon
Attorney Certification

Atty. No.: 41500

Name: R-J Mon

Atty. for: Sgt

Address: PO 6926

City/State/Zip: Chicago IL 60680

Telephone: 479-6287

CLERK
CIVIL DIVISION
AUG 28 PM 3:56
FILED-82

* C00036

#4

ORDER

CC# N002-300M-2/28/05(43480658)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

4902
4619

2
8
8
7

Mon

1
2
9

v.

No. 66 M1 - 301847

2
7
4

Shayhad Abd

Plaintiff Proposed ORDER of 9/27/07

This case having been brought by this court on Plaintiff ("RON's") Motion to Vacate the

Default Entered on 8/21/07, _____

probes appearing, the court having been advised in the premises, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

① RON having explained that he was attending to a stolen computer on 8/21/07 and that his calendar reminding him of that court date had been on that computer which was ~~stolen~~ on 8/15/07. This is herein vacated because of ~~error~~ **INTAKE** on NOV. 6, 07

Atty. No.:

Name:

Atty. for:

Address:

City/State/Zip:

Telephone:

R J Mon

ENTERED:

JUDGE SHELDON A. HARRIS

Dated:

SEP 27 2007

9/27/07

479-6287

Circuit Court - 1807

Judge's No.

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

000037

Court

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Notice of Motion

Morrison (RSM) Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Shayrad et al Defendant(s)

on 11/15/07 RSM served a copy of this motion on James Hines at 506 W... Chicago IL 6/14 16:30 PM for submission to the Court on 11/06

No. 06M1301847 RSM

Courtroom

1306

R. Hines

TO: James Hines for Shayrad / Yellow Cab

MOTION BY Plaintiff RSM

FOR

the Court to 1) Confirm

that it has been provided an explanation as why RSM is convinced that he cannot go to Court on 11/06/07 in this case 2) if the Defendant appears w/ a copy of RSM's Proposed Intake Form which Judge C. Jones in Room 1310 or 1410 did not accept because she refused herself 6/14 RSM could present it for this Court to accept such proposed Intake Form to set the case for trial (RSM can come into Court on the Motion held in the several matters addressed therein), or b) if the Defendant does not appear for this Court to reschedule the case intake audience for 12/14/07 at 9:00 a.m. or some other date hereafter and 3) if the Court should have any problems w/ any proposed written plea for this Court to call RSM on 11/16/07 so RSM can explain the situation

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Now come the Plaintiff (RSM) to seek petition this Court for the relief described in the title to this motion for explanation RSM covers

Dated: 11/15/07

Attorney Certification

RSM has been falsely arrested 2 x's in the past 102 mos & falsely imprisoned 3 x's & had police knock on his door 3 other times. These duty breaches by police have required RSM in this period resulted in litigation which is expensive for all concerned & (3) but please RSM has reason to believe police are again involved in some type of violation to apprehend him - the cause of which RSM will explain later. Entering court buildings is not counseled on such 000044

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

again apprehend RSM unjustifiably! Please RSM cannot enter the building

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

R Mon (R Mon) Plaintiff(s)

vs.

No. 06M1301847

Shonhad et al Defendant(s)

TO:

Proposed order of 11/06/07

MOTION BY

FOR

This matter having come before this court on Court Notice & in Court having read R Mon's motion entered of 11/6/07. R Mon had appeared for reasons explained in such motion & Defendant (not) appeared. It is HEREBY ORDERED

- ① The Court Notice Form submitted to defendants in this state judge James received hereby will be entered into the trial court record on 11/06/07 in this case & if the case is set for trial on _____ all relief anyone would seek can be granted on a motion will
- ② This court will be call R Mon at 312 479-6287 but failed to contact her
- ③ All matters entered & continued

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

12/14/07 or _____ in this case - and if one of the alternative forms of relief described supra was not to be granted, Dated: _____

Attorney Certification

R Mon is provided until _____ to petition this court for the granting of such (insert) relief as Name: R Mon would consider it necessary for R Mon to seek petition in regard wherefore an order to prevent the loss or subrogation of any claim City/State/Zip: _____ Telephone: _____

FILED
CV-1306
NOV 0 - 2007
DOLLY BROWN
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF COOK COUNTY, IL

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

8005

Mare

v.

No. 06 MI 301847

Ahmed Shahzad, et Al.

ORDER

on Defendant's motion to dismiss.

It is hereby ordered this matter is dismissed for want of prosecution. Plaintiff called the court clerk on 11-5-07 informing the court clerk he would not be in court today, 11-6-07 because the police were after him. Plaintiff did not appear in court on 11-6-07 for the scheduled intake.

A copy will be tendered to plaintiff.

Atty. No.: 90311

Name: Jesmer + Harris

Atty. for: Defendant

Address: 500 W. Madison, #650

City/State/Zip: Chicago, IL 60661

Telephone: 312-373-1700

ENTERED:

Dated: 11/6/07

Judge [Signature]

Judge

Judge's No. 1907

JUDGE SHELDON A. HARRIS

NOV 06 2007 DBD

Circuit Court - 1907

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad et al
Defendants

NOTICE OF MOTION

On 1/23/07, at 9:00 a.m. Robert J. More will appear for an audience regarding the present filing of a copy of the motion which this notice concerns in Courtroom 1306 of the Richard J. Daley Center at 50 W. Washington St. Chicago, IL which motion is identified as: Plaintiff's ("RJM's") Motion Of 12/03/07. filed via universal filing on 12/3/07 For 1/23/08 To Be Conducted.... and you are herein provided notice of the filing and audience date of such motion.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to all applicable statutes, I, Robert J. More do herein aver that I did serve a copy of:
Plaintiff's ("RJM's") Motion Of 12/03/07 For 1/23/08 To Be Conducted.... and this notice and certificate of service upon:
Jesmer and Harris for both Defendants
500 W. Madison St.
Chicago, IL 60604

Before 12/26/07 via hand delivery or U.S. mail, postage prepaid.

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the veracity of all claims contained herein.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287



Handwritten signature
1306


IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COURT DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Shazhad et al
Defendants

Case No 06-M1-301847



Plaintiff's ("RJM's") Motion Of 12/03/07 For 1/23/08 To Be Conducted By Telephone If Necessary, Petitioning This Court To Vacate The Dismissal Of This Case For Want Of Prosecution ("DWP") Which Was Entered In This Case On 11/06/07 And To Reinstate This Case And Provide The Other Forms Of Relief Described In The Proposed Order Submitted Along With This Motion In Order To Put The Prosecution Of This Case Back Onto *Terra Firma*, Or Else To Provide RJM And All Those Entitled To Consideration Of Whatever Sort And Measure From Him (Ie "RJM Et Al"), Some Other Form(s) Of Relief, The Provision Of Which Would Not Be Incompatible With The Requirements Of The Moral Law As Such Would Apply To The Matters That This Case Concerns

Now comes RJM to move this Court to provide the relief described in the title to this motion and contained in the postulations included in the Proposed Order submitted alongherewith and in support and explanation whereof, RJM avers and explains as follows:

1. RJM could not enter the Daley Center building on 11/06/07, because on 10/25/07, RJM was informed by an eminently credible source who would not have any motive to fabricate anything concerned in the matter in regard to which RJM was on that date provided information by him, whose identity will remain a confidence that RJM is not at liberty to divulge unless RJM would be permitted permission to reveal it by him, that members of the Chicago Police Department ("CPD") had addressed a certain establishment which RJM patronizes searching for RJM with pictures of RJM and what was allegedly a warrant for RJM's arrest.
2. Contrary t the patently false contents of the order entered in this case on 11/6/07, RJM never stated that the "police are after him."
3. For the record the hopelessly corrupt CPD continually ends up being used by those who manipulate it to crucify or try at least to put out of commission their competitors via the use thereof.
4. RJM has been falsely arrested by the CPD two times in the past 9 years and falsely imprisoned on another occasion, and in each case there has neither been any malum in se in RJM's conduct nor social harm caused thereby.
5. In each such case, the CPD neglected to satisfy the requirements described in Illinois v Gates (U.S.) for arresting a person accused of a crime (or whose seizure in a given instance would otherwise be sought), which have been defined to constitute the "totality of circumstances" standard regarding the determination of probable cause regarding whether an alleged crime would have in fact been committed by a person accused of the commission of such in a given case.
6. RJM is in the process of suing and incepting criminal prosecutions in regard to the two most recent incidents of the use of the CPD as an instrument of predation by specimens conducting activity in various quarters and positions in the Jewish Supremacist Controlled Abominations that are the government entities conducting activity in this Country at this time, which were responsible for the illegal seizures involved in those cases.
7. RJM could not see how RJM could possibly have justifiably proceeded through a magnometer on 11/06/07, given the fact that RJM had been informed that a warrant had been issued for RJM's arrest, as RJM is convinced that he has not incurred any criminal liability in any matter which might have resulted in the procurement/issuance of any warrant.
8. RJM has continued to endeavor to get an adversarial proceeding conducted in which RJM can get whatever warrant is out on RJM quashed before RJM would end up in any "black hole" without access to legal sources nor the means to conduct any factual investigation before being subjected to the type of sham trial for which the Circuit Court of Cook County has so distinguished itself.
9. RJM will not provide further explanation in regard to these matters unless a request would be made to RJM that RJM do so.
10. RJM herein seeks a sanction against Shazhad et al for their seeking a dismissal on 11/06/07 of this case, notwithstanding that it (they) received notice on 11/5/07, of RJM's predicament when they had not even bothered to appear at the previous audience conducted in this case.
11. RJM herein seeks a default against both Defendants for such conduct or at least a \$100.00 sanction, if this Court would vacate the DWP by mail, without any appearance being necessary or \$150.00 if RJM would have to appear to get the DWP vacated.

Wherefore, RJM herein moves this Court to provide the forms of relief identified in the title to this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. More

200047

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

Shazhad et al
Defendants

PROPOSED ORDER FOR MOTION OF 12/03/07 SET FOR HEARING ON 1/23/08

This cause having come before this Court on Plaintiff's Motion of 12/03/07, Petitioning this Court to Vacate the Dismissal of this Case Entered on 11/06/07 in the Case... Plaintiff ("RJM") only appearing, and the Court only having been advised in the premises to the extent RJM could advise it, RJM having been unarmed while in the Courthouse in which this matter was adjudicated and there having been innumerable armed individuals whom could have been summonsed to use force on the unarmed RJM were RJM to conducted his activity according to a standard and method which might have resulted in such type development occurring (as for example happened in the courtroom murder of Mr. J. Richmond in 1997 (Richmond v Sheahan 270 F.3d 430)), which to this date remains unprosecuted and RJM informing all entities and parties concerned that it is RJM's position that the non-inclusion of a petition for relief, response to any occurrence or development, and/or endeavor ordered to the prevention or mitigation of damages which might have been incurred by RJM from the unjustified injury causing duty breach(es) ("duty breach") of any entity or party could not possibly constitute a waiver, relinquishment or other type forfeiture ("waiver") of any claim to consideration, in regard to which no such conjectural claim of waiver would have been posited had RJM endeavored to accomplish more in whatever audience would have been the audience out of which this order would have emanated, without RJM's being provided some opportunity after whatever audience would have been conducted out of which this order would have emanated to eliminate and/or ameliorate the effects of whatever suchlike type duty breach might have been perpetrated or otherwise occurred, IT IS HEREIN ORDERED:

1. The dismissal of this case for want of prosecution ("DWP") entered in this case on 11/06/07 is herein vacated and this case is reinstated _____.
2. For the following reason(s) th DWP entered in this case on 11/06/07 will not now be reinstated without further proceedings being conducted in the matter _____.
3. A schedule for the briefing and/or adjudication of whatever other proceedings this Court would claim would have to be conducted in order for RJM to get the DWP vacated in this case and the case reinstated is established **as follows:**
_____, _____, _____.
4. In the scenario in which the DWP would not now be vacated and the case reinstated, this Court confirms that it has been informed that an assessment will be issued against it for any expenses including consumption of time to which RJM would have been unjustifiably subjected in order to get this case reinstated, if this Court cannot and would not succeed in demonstrating that the non-vacation of the DWP and reinstatement of this case would have been justified _____.
5. This Court also confirms that it has been informed that RJM is not a Non-Magna Charta Clause 61 litigant and that RJM correlatively does not recognize that there is any legitimacy in either the judicial immunity argument nor in any argument in which injustice rectification would be restricted solely to measures not involving whatever measure of physical force might need to be utilized in a given case in order to ensure that no injustice would remain not adequately rectified on the record of accountability of RJM, if a given injustice could not be adequately rectified in a given court proceeding and/or series of proceedings _____ and that an assessment of expenses

unjustifiably incurred by RJM due to duty breaches caused by Judges S. Harris and L. Dunsford in the adjudication by each of this case, respectively. is in the process of being

completed and arrived upon such Judges as of the date of the signing of this order if it such objective has not already been accomplished _____.

6. Judges Harris and Dunford are herein substituted as of right and for cause, respectively depending upon which one would be SOJ'ed as of right, removing both from any further adjudication of this case _____.
7. In the alternative, the entirety of the contents of the criminal statutes of the State of IL, and of whatever criminal ordinances and/or statutes of Cook County, IL and/or Chicago IL might ever have been applied to any activity of RJM which might ever be conducted for purposes of resolving the dispute this case concerns and rectifying whatever injustice might still remain unrectified as of 1/23/07 in the matters this case concerns, absent the issuance of this order, are herein declared to be unconstitutional as such might ever have been or otherwise, in the future be, applied in the absence of the issuance of this order to any of the type(s) of activity which might ever be conducted by RJM as described herein supra _____.
8. Confirmation is herein provided that this Court has been informed by RJM that Mr. A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, the Attorney who sought the DWP on 11/06/07, Judge Harris and if the Clerk in room 1306 was in anyway responsible for the DWP's having been entered (ie misrepresentation of averments provided to her, etc), the Clerk in room 1306 are all jointly and severally herein invited to make a contribution to Most Holy Family Monastery in Fillmore NY or to the Institute of St. Michael the Archangel Fund of \$150.00 for the time and costs RJM has incurred in having to compose, print, file and appear in regard to this motion _____.
9. Confirmation is herein provided that this Court has been informed by RJM that if this Court would vacate the DWP by mail, the proposal referenced supra would be reduced to \$100.00 unless God's grace would move those addressed to make a more generous contribution to the causes which such entities continue to fight _____.
10. Any and all other matters not presented to this Court prior to the date of 1/23/07 are herein entered and continued _____.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

Judge Date

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Mou (Rou)

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Shayhad et al

Defendant(s)

No. 06-21-301847

CLERK
DOROTHY BROWN
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
JAN - 8 PM 3:06
11-0-05

TO: Shayhad et al - James Harris Johnson

MOTION BY Rou of 11/08/08 FOR Court to grant

relief sought in Rou's timely filed motion to vacate the DWP entered on 11/06/07 in this case & to conduct a pretrial conference but use for trial as motion filed for such purposes was never set on the call, although adequately filed

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Dated: 11/8, 2008 Robert J. Moore
Attorney Certification

Atty. No.: 97500
Name: R J Moore
Atty. for: all not categorically harshest deprived persons
Address: PO 6926
City/State/Zip: Chicago IL 60680
Telephone: 312 479-6287
but not by expert design

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS

2

Mon. (Poni)
v.
Shaybal et al

No.

0661201847

DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK
COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

JAN - 8 PM 3:06

FILED-05

NOTICE OF MOTION

To:

James Harris
150 Northwest Point
Ekh Grove IL 60007

On 1/23, 2008 at 9:00 a.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable any judge presiding in 1306 or any Judge sitting in that Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at 1212 Holy Center St

W Washington St Chicago IL, Illinois, and present

Plaintiff's motion of 1/8/08. re vacation of DWP

Name Robert J. Mon Atty. No. Pro Se 99500

Address RD 6926 Attorney for

City/State/Zip Chicago IL 60680 Telephone 312 479-6287

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, _____, the attorney/non attorney* certify that on the _____ day of _____ (*strike one)

_____, I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date _____

Signature/Certification

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, Robert J. Mon, the attorney/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing (*strike one)

a copy to James Harris at 150 Northwest Point, Ekh Grove IL 60007 (address on envelope)

and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at 455 W Harrison St Chicago IL (place of mailing)

at 1:30 p.m. on the 15th day of Jan 2008, with proper postage prepaid.

Date 1/8, 2008

Signature/Certification

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

APPEAL TO THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DIVISION/DISTRICT

noted paid 3376

Robert J. Moore Plaintiff/Appellant
Shayhad, Yellow Cab et al Defendant/Appellee
Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County

Reviewing Court No.
Circuit Court No. 06 MI - 301847
Honorable J. Dunford Trial Judge
Date Notice of Appeal Filed 1/12, 2008

REQUEST FOR PREPARATION OF RECORD ON APPEAL

Attorney (or Party if no attorney): Name: Robert J. Moore
Address: P.O. 6928
Telephone Number: 312 548-1890, 4796287
City: Chicago State: IL Zip: 60680
E-mail Address (optional): mustforjustice@yahoo.com
Name of Party: Robert J. Moore

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County that Robert J. Moore requests the preparation of the Record on Appeal in the above case.

DESIGNATION OF RECORD

The Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County shall prepare the Record on Appeal in accordance with Illinois Supreme Court Rule 321. The record on Appeal shall include the common law record, which consists of trial documents filed and judgments and orders entered by the trial court and:

- All documentary exhibits entered at trial, except for those other exhibits that cannot ordinarily be included for review and are subject to motion.
Reports of Proceedings prepared in accordance with Illinois Supreme Court Rule 323.
Certificate in Lieu of Record on Appeal pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 325.
Documents filed under seal on the following dates and unsealed:
A copy of the trial court Order authorizing these documents to be unsealed for the purpose of inclusion in the Record on Appeal is attached hereto or will be provided by the Appellant to the Civil Appeals Division at least 30 days in advance of the date on which the Record on Appeal is scheduled to be transmitted to the Appellate Court. Upon return of the Record on Appeal to the Circuit Court, it is the responsibility of the parties to obtain an Order resealing these records, if the records are to be resealed.
Documents filed under seal on the following dates, which are to remain sealed:
Please note that, pursuant to Rule 17 of Appellate Court of Illinois, "No record, exhibit, or brief may be filed under seal in the Appellate Court, unless Appellate Court has first given leave for filing under seal, notwithstanding that the material was filed under seal in the Circuit Court."

FEES - IL S.C.R. 298 petitions

Payment may be made by Cash, Check or Money Order. Cash payments accepted for in-person payments only. Checks or money order should be made to Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County. Pursuant to 705 ILCS 105/27.2a(k) and 27.2(k), the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County must charge fees for Records on Appeal in advance as follows:

100 pages or less, \$110
100 - 200 pages, \$185
Each page in excess of 200, \$.30/page
Reduced fee for Local Governments and School Districts, \$50

All prescribed fees are due in advance of transmission of the Record on Appeal. It is understood and agreed that once a request for preparation of a Record on Appeal is made by submission of this form, the Appellant is responsible for the costs of preparing the Record on Appeal, regardless of whether the Appeal is successful, dismissed, the time is extended, or a party elects to not transmit the Record on Appeal to the Appellate Court. The Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County reserves the right to pursue a claim to recover the costs and expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, related to preparation of the Record on Appeal.

Robert J. Moore (Type or print name)

Robert J. Moore (Signature of Appellant or Appellant's Attorney)

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

C00092

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS

Mov

Sharfod et al

Court
No. *06 m 1301847*

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: *Jimmie Harris*
150 Northwest Point
Elk Grove Vly, IL 60007

On *1/31*, 2008, at *9:00*

FILED
2008 JAN 22 11:11 AM
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION
a.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable *Judge Prendergast in 1306* or any Judge sitting in that
Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at *Room 1306, 1200 W. Jackson St.,*
50 W Washington St, Chicago IL Illinois, and present

Plaintiff's motion to remove self brought on 12/21/08
and defendant's motion ruled on 12/4/08 for 1/23/08
Name *R. Brown* Atty. No. _____ Pro Se 99500
Address *P.O. 6926* Attorney for *99500*
City/State/Zip *Chicago IL 60680* Telephone *312 479-6287*

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, _____, the attorney/non attorney* certify that on the _____ day of _____ (*strike one)

_____, I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date _____

Signature/Certification _____

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, *Robert Brown*, the attorney/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing (*strike one)

a copy to *Jimmie Harris for her* at *150 Northwest Point Elk Grove Vly, IL 60007* (address on envelope)

and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at *455 W Harrison St Chicago IL* (place of mailing)

at *17th* a.m. or p.m. on the *28th* day of *January*, 2008, with proper postage prepaid.

Date *1/22*, 2008

Robert Brown
Signature/Certification _____

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

C00053

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Moran Plaintiff(s)
vs.
Shayford et al Defendant(s)

No. 06-01-1847

FILED-30
JAN 22 AM 11:08
DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION

TO: Attorney for Shayford, Yellow

MOTION BY Plaintiff (Moran) FOR of 1/22/08 for

① Court to accept into Court file copies of a document demonstrating that non filed the motion to Vacate DWP...
W/m 30 days of 1/16/07 ^{non 12/4/07} accept into Court record copy of Proposed Order of 1/22/08 ③ grant relief for which petition was made on 12/4/07 + 1/8/08 which were scheduled for 1/23/08 + 1/22/08, respectively, and confirm that all exhibits + documents filed along with ~~them~~ have been entered into Court file.

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.
Not there are some problems w/ universal filing + record maintenance

Dated: 1/22, 2008

Atty. No.: 99500
Name: Robert Moran
Atty. for: my proper person
Address: PO 6926
City/State/Zip: Chicago IL 60680
Telephone: 312 4079-6287

Robert Moran
Attorney Certification

been granted so respectfully petitions for relief described herein upon
R Moran

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Mora

Plaintiff(s)

Shaybrook et al

Defendant(s)

No. 06 111 301 847

Exhibit list for motion of 1/22/08 for 1/31/08

TO:	Notice of Motion Stamped 12/4/07	Filed Court file	Served on D
1		X	X
2		X	X

MOTION BY

FOR

3 Proposed order for motion of 12/3/07 X X

4 Notice of motion + motion Filed on

1/8/08

X

5 Proposed order of 11/15/07 X X

6 Proposed order of 1/22/08 X X

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the best of my belief that all documents set forth herein are true and correct to a given entry and served on the (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Court of the Defendants on or before 1/24/08.

Dated: _____

Attorney Certification

Atty. No.: _____

Name: _____

Atty. for: _____

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Telephone: _____

[Signature]
312 477 6287

Ex 46 to motion
of 1/22/08

FILED-50

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

08 JAN 22 AM 9:28

Robert J More
Plaintiff
v.
Shazhad et al
Defendants

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK
COUNTY ILLINOIS
Case No 06-M1-301847
CIVIL DIVISION

CLERK
DOROTHY BROWN

PROPOSED AGREED ORDER FOR MOTION OF 12/03/07 SET FOR HEARING ON 1/22/08

This cause coming to be heard on Plaintiff's ("RJM's") Motion filed on 1/8/08 for 1/22/08, service of notice and motion never having been accomplished before RJM endeavored to procure the fax number of Jesmer Harris ("JH") (the Law Firm for the Co-defendants) via phone call in order to fax a copy of such notice and motion to Co-defendants at 16:32 p.m. on 1/18/08 (after printing the document at the CPL, when the computers were shut down there, at which time RJM learned that such law firm closes at 16:30 p.m. on weekdays, RJM having been informed by JH Attorney Mr. Mordini on 1/21/08 via telephone, that Co-defendants stipulate to have all matters entered and continued to 1/24/08 at 9:00 a.m. if this Court would be amenable to such proposed arrangement, this Court having been informed that on 12/3/07, RJM filed a motion via universal filing at the Circuit Court of Cook County, IL located at 55 W. Harrison St., Chicago, IL, to vacate the dismissal entered in this case on 11/6/07 for want of prosecution (which was set for 1/23/08), which dismissal was entered at a juncture at which RJM did not know how he could justify risking entering any government building, and notwithstanding that RJM presented a copy of a notice and motion regarding the matter on 11/5/07 to the Co-defendants while the law firm was still open on that date and had an associate present a copy thereof on 11/06/07 to the Deputy Clerk of this Court so that this Court would not be uninformed regarding the reasons which RJM understood rendered him incapable of being in Court on 11/06/07, the Court having been advised in the premises to whatever extent the Court considered it appropriate and/or necessary for it to be so advised, IT IS HEREIN ORDERED:

1. In consideration of the fact that Plaintiff has alleged that Mr. Mordini agreed to enter and continue all matters originally set for 1/22/08 to 1/24/08 at 9:00 a.m. or some other future mutually acceptable date, contingent upon this Court's availability on that and/or some other future date, all matters this document concerns are herein entered and continued until 1/24/08 at 9:00 a.m. or until _____, at _____.
2. If any audience was ever established for 1/23/08 in the case this document concerns, it is herein vacated and the petitions for which relief was sought in regard to any motion originally scheduled for that date are entered and continued until 1/24/08 at 9:00, or until _____, at _____.
3. This Court implements some other measure in regard to the matters concerned herein described as follows _____.
4. In the scenario in which any final and appealable judgment would be entered in regard to the matters at issue, provision is made for the parties to procure certifications of any questions either would be committed to preserve for review as follows _____.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

Judge Date

#1 MOT

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

2
1
1
1
2
8

6246

Mon

v.

Shanghad et al

No. 66M4 301847

ORDER

All matters entered to continue

until 2/7/08

at 9:00 AM per stipulations of the parties

Atty. No.: 99563

Name: [Signature]

Atty. for: _____

Address: PO 6926

City/State/Zip: Chicago IL

Telephone: 312 479-6287

Judge James A. Shapiro

ENTERED:

JAN 31 2008 DBD

Circuit Court - 1975

Dated: _____

1/31/08

[Signature] 1975
Judge Judge's No.

3MOT

ORDER

CC

N002-300M-2/28/05(43480658)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

4902

R J Zimon

v.

Shaybird et al

No. 06M1301847

2008 FEB 14 11:41

ORDER

DWP of 11/06/07 is herein vacated & case is set for trial on ~~May~~ June 12, 2008 at 9:00 am

Judge Laurence J. Dunford
FEB 07 2008
Circuit Court - 1877

Atty. No.: 99500
Name: R J Zimon
Atty. for: RPR
Address: PO 6926
City/State/Zip: Chicago IL 60680
Telephone: 4796287

ENTERED:

Dated: 2/7/08
Judge: Laurence J. Dunford
Judge's No. 1877

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

000064

CASE NO. 06. m. -301847

7) The Plaintiff Robert J More's claim for PROPERTY DAMAGE totals \$ 100,00 and [the paid bill(s) shall be admitted pursuant to the rules.] or [the property not having been repaired or replaced, the Plaintiff has 30 days to advise Defendant of the expert witness Plaintiff intends to call along with their opinion as to the value of the loss, or same is barred.].

8) The Plaintiff(s) and Defendant(s) shall issue SCR 213 INTERROGATORIES simultaneously within 21 ~~21~~ days and shall each answer same within 60 days.

The identified OPINION WITNESSES to be called at trial are:

Plaintiff: Chief Medical Officer Stroger Hospital

~~affidavit made by Dr. [unclear] re incident~~

Defendant: Ahmed Sha2had

The ADDITIONAL IDENTIFIED WITNESSES to be called at trial are:

Plaintiff: Yellow cab dispatcher, personnel manager
Safety instructor

Defendant: Ahmed Sha2had

9) The following EVIDENCE DEPOSITIONS shall be completed within 30 days:

~~Yellow cab dispatcher, personnel manager & Safety instructor, Ahmed Sha2had~~

10) The following RULING ON MOTIONS IN LIMINE shall apply at trial:

- no mention of liability insurance.
- no mention of traffic tickets issued.
- no lay witness medical testimony or opinions.

11) OTHER COURT ACTION: (Pleadings, Jury Instructions)

① Filing fee to be reimbursed to Cook City
② Anyt cell petitions for summary may be filed anytime prior to issuance of judgment

Atty. No.: 19328

Name: Robert J More

Attorney for: m. p. p.

Address: P.O. Box 126

City/State/Zip: Chicago IL 60688

Telephone: 479 02 07

Judge Laurence J. Dunford

ENTERED: FEB 07 2008 BSD

Circuit Court - 1877

Lawrence J. Dunford 1877
Judge's No.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad et al
Defendants

Line #

8
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
CIVIL DIVISION
MAY 30 PM 1:00
DOROTHY DUNN
COURT REPORTER

NOTICE OF MOTION

On 6/1/08, at 9:00 a.m. Robert J. More will appear for an audience regarding the filing of a copy of the motion which this notice concerns in Courtroom 1306 of the Richard J. Daley Center at 50 W. Washington Str Chicago, IL which motion is identified as: "Plaintiff's Verified ("RJM") Motion Of 5/30/08 For Court To (1) Postpone Trial Until RJM Receives The Information From The Chief Medical Officer Of The J. Stroger Cook County Hospital Which RJM Understands That RJM Needs In Order To Discharge The Burden Of Proof Regarding Damages In The Matters That The Case This Motion Concerns ("This Case"), 2. Establish Terms And Conditions For The Trial Of This Case Or A Postponement Of The Trial To Be Conducted Until RJM Can, Whatever Would Be The Resolution Of Such Propositions, Get All Matters Concerning Such Proposed Terms And Conditions Adequately Preserved For Review And/Or Resolution In A Theatre Other Than That In Which This Motion Will Have Been Adjudicated, 3. For A Declaration Regarding Whether RJM Will Receive Sanctions For The Defendant's Motions Not Filed According To The Requirements Of IL Supreme Court Rule 137(B) ("137(B)", 4. The Issuance Of Such Sanctions Regarding Two Motions Filed By The Defendants In This Case Or Leave To Amend The Complaint Filed In This Case To Add Jesmer And Harris And Its Tortfeasor Attorneys As Defendants In This Case, If This Court Would Not Award Sanctions To RJM For Violations Of 137(B) ".... and you are herein provided notice of the filing and audience date of such motion.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to all applicable statutes, I, Robert J. More do herein aver that I did serve a copy of : "Plaintiff's ("RJM") Motion Of 5/30/08 For Court...." Jesmer and Harris for both Defendants

Elk Grove Village, IL

On 5/30/08 via insertion into the U.S. mail, postage prepaid, from Chicago, IL.

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the veracity of all claims contained herein.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

Shazhad et al

Plaintiff's Verified ("RJM") Motion Of 5/30/08 For Court To: 1.) Postpone Trial Until RJM Receives The Information From The Chief Medical Officer Of The J. Stroger Cook County Hospital ("CMO") Which RJM Understands That RJM Needs In Order To Discharge The Burden Of Proof Regarding Damages In The Matters That The Case This Motion Concerns ("This Case"), 2. Establish Terms And Conditions For The Trial Of This Case Or A Postponement Of The Trial To Be Conducted Until RJM Can, Whatever Would Be The Resolution Of Such Propositions, Get All Matters Concerning Such Proposed Terms And Conditions Adequately Preserved For Review And/Or Resolution In A Theatre Other Than That In Which This Motion Will Have Been Adjudicated, 3. For A Declaration Regarding Whether RJM Will Receive Sanctions For The Defendant's Motions Not Filed According To The Requirements Of IL Supreme Court Rule 137(B) ("137(B)"), 4. The Issuance Of Such Sanctions Regarding Two Motions Filed By The Defendants In This Case Or Leave To Amend The Complaint Filed In This Case To Add Jesmer And Harris And Its Tortfeasor Attorneys As Defendants In This Case, If This Court Would Not Award Sanctions To RJM For Violations Of 137(B) "...Defendants

Now comes RJM to move this Court to provide the relief described in the title to this motion and contained in the postulations included in the Proposed Order submitted alongherewith and in support and explanation whereof, RJM avers and explains as follows:

1. RJM mailed a letter to the CMO in late March or Early April of 2008, requesting an enumeration of County Funds expended in the examination conducted and X-ray of RJM taken at Stroger Hospital, after RJM was hit by Shazhad's Yellow Cab Car on 3/18/04 and an identification of what it would cost to replace any of RJM's bones should RJM have to get any bone replacement due to the trauma caused by the cab hitting RJM and throwing RJM onto the pavement.
2. RJM received a request for more information and promptly responded to such request with a second request for the information RJM had previously sought.
3. As of 5/30/08, RJM still has not received any response to the second request RJM transmitted to the CMO.
4. RJM does not see how he could be required to proceed to trial without such information as is described herein supra.
5. RJM has a number of proposals regarding the trial of this case which RJM will present to this Court on or before the audience date set for the motion this conveyance concerns ("this motion").
6. RJM seeks sanctions against Shazhad et al ("Shazhad") for three different malefactions which RJM is convinced could not justifiably remain unsanctioned in this case, without the interests in regard to which RJM understands that RJM will have to provide an accounting being unjustifiably injured thereby (ie the malefactions remaining unsanctioned).
7. The first was Shazhad's effort to get the case dismissed on a claim that it was not filed prior to the expiration of the statute of limitations for the torts plead, which cost RJM and hour to fix, since the case was filed prior to such expiration, but the Rule 298 petition was not adjudicated until several weeks later.
8. But for Shazhad's non-accomplishment of adequate diligence in investigating this matter, RJM would not have been put to the expenditure of an hour's time to file a response and serve it upon Shazhad et al.
9. Shazhad et al also filed a motion to deny RJM a jury trial which necessitated RJM's filing a response thereto, even though Shazhad had filed a jury demand in this case and RJM had also filed a jury demand and RJM seeks a sanction for the time lost composing and filing such response and appearing in Courtroom 1501 to get such motion denied.
10. Shazhad et al induced Judge S. Harris to dismiss this case for want of prosecution notwithstanding that RJM had provided Shazhad et al documents on 11/5/07, explaining why RJM could not appear in Court on 11/6/07, as RJM understood the matter, and that RJM would appear by telephone regarding this case.
11. The expense to which RJM was put to get the DWP vacated, it is RJM's understanding could not justifiably be left uncompensated, which includes the expenses incurred on 11/6/07 and in getting the Motion to Vacate the DWP granted.
12. A review of the documents filed concerning each alleged violation of Rule 137(b) would, it is RJM's understanding indicate that Shazhad et al's legal representatives and or Shazhad or Yellow Cab ought have to compensate RJM for the time RJM consumed in each instance at the rate which the Defendant being billed in this case compensates Jesmer and Harris Law Firm for the number of hours which such law firm billed Yellow Cab for the three matters referenced supra.
13. If this Court would for whatever reason not grant such sanction(s) as are described herein supra, then RJM will challenge the constitutionality as applied in such denial of Rule 137(b) and move to amend the complaint in this case to add Jesmer and Harris Law Firm and the offending attorneys as Defendants therein.
14. RJM demands that the entire procedural history of this case be presented to the jury at whatever trial would be conducted in regard to this case.
15. All other matters, it is RJM's position ought be entered and continued, if all concerned cannot resolve all disputes on 6/9/08

2000088

- and the trial postponed until RJM can procure the evidence RJM needs to procure and all disputes can either be adequately resolved or the issues concerned be adequately preserved for further review and resolution.
16. In the alternative, this Court could simply sign the "Declaration of Unconstitutionality as Applied ...RJM" contained in the accompanying Proposed Order of 5/30/08 and RJM could then remedy the injury he has been unjustifiably caused on his own accord, without further burdening anyone.

Wherefore, RJM herein moves this Court to provide the forms of relief identified in the title to this motion. Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the veracity of all factual averments contained herein.

Respectfully submitted,
Robert J. More

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, FIRST MUNICIPAL DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

Shazhad et al
Defendants

PRELIMINARY PROPOSED ORDER FOR MOTION OF 5/30/08 SET FOR HEARING ON 1/23/08

This cause having come before this Court on Plaintiff's Verified Motion of 5/30/08, ...
_____ appearing, and the Court only having been advised in the premises to the extent
RJM could advise it, IT IS HEREIN ORDERED:

1. The entirety of the contents of the criminal statutes of the State of IL, and of whatever criminal ordinances and/or statutes of Cook County, IL and/or Chicago IL might ever have been or be, applied to any activity of RJM which might ever be conducted for purposes of resolving the dispute this case concerns and rectifying whatever injustice might still remain unrectified as of 1/23/07 in the matters this case concerns, absent the issuance of this order, are herein declared to be unconstitutional as such might ever have been or otherwise, in the future be, applied in the absence of the issuance of this order to any of the type(s) of activity which might ever be conducted by RJM as described herein supra _____.
2. Confirmation is herein provided that this Court has been informed by RJM that Mr. A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, the Attorney who sought the DWP on 11/06/07, Judge Harris and if the Clerk in room 1306 was in anyway responsible for the DWP's having been entered (ie misrepresentation of averments provided to her, etc), the Clerk in room 1306 are all jointly and severally herein invited to make a contribution to Most Holy Family Monastery in Fillmore NY or to the Institute of St. Michael the Archangel Fund of \$150.00 for the time and costs RJM has incurred in having to compose, print, file and appear in court in regard to such motion _____.
3. Any and all other matters not presented to this Court prior to or upon the date of 6/908 are herein entered and continued _____.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

Judge Date

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Robert Nore

v.

Shehzad, et al.

No. 06M1-30184E

ORDER

Further, Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint is denied as untimely.

All Plaintiff's motions pursuant to Rule 137 for sanctions are denied, inclusive of ~~the~~ Defendants' Motion to dismiss the complaint, strike plaintiff's jury demand, and entry of DWP order. Defense Counsel's actions were well grounded and made in good faith. Plaintiff objects to the entry of ~~the~~ judgment for Pety and General of Pety motions

Atty. No.: 90311

Name: Jessica Harris

Atty. for: Defendants

Address: 150 NW Pt.

City/State/Zip: Ell C Grove Village

Telephone: 847-700-8311

Dated: Judge Laurence J. Dunford

JUL 16 2008

Circuit Court

Judge

DBD, 7/16/08

1877
1877

Judge's No.


C00071

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
AHMED SHAHZAD,)
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)
COMPANY,)
Defendants.)

#90311

No. 06 M1-301847



NOTICE OF MOTION

TO: PRO SE Robert J. More, P.O. Box 6926, Chicago, IL 60680

On July 30, 2008 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, I shall appear before the **Honorable Judge Dunford**, or any judge sitting in his stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him in **Room 1306** at the Richard J. Daley Civic Center, Chicago, Illinois, and shall then and there move the Court for an order pursuant to Defendants' motion, a copy of which is attached hereto.

NAME: JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
ATTORNEYS FOR: Defendants
AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY
ADDRESS: 150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Suite 310
CITY: Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007-1040
TELEPHONE: (847) 700-8311

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, Eugene N. Traunfeld, an attorney, certify that I served this notice on THE ABOVE ROBERT MORE by mail by depositing a copy of this notice and motion in the U.S. Mail chute at 150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Elk Grove Village, Illinois at 4:00 p.m. on July 22, 2008 with proper postage prepaid and addressed to address above.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me
this ___ day of July, 2008.

NOTARY PUBLIC

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)	#90311
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	No. 06 M1-301847
)	
AHMED SHAHZAD,)	
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)	
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)	
COMPANY,)	
Defendants.)	

MOTION

NOW COME defendants, AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY, by their attorneys, JESMER AND HARRIS, and hereby move the Court as follows:

1. On July 16, 2008, on defendants' motion, this Court entered judgment in the sum of \$1,000.00 and court costs in the sum of \$141.50.
2. If plaintiff does not execute release and satisfaction of judgment, defendants request this Court to enter order that upon defendants depositing check in the sum of \$1,141.50 with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, this Court will enter order of release and satisfaction of judgment as to judgment entered July 16, 2008.

JESMER AND HARRIS

BY: 

EUGENE N. TRAUNFELD

JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
 Attorneys for Defendants
 AHMED SHAHZED and YELLOW CAB COMPANY
 150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Suite 310
 Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007-1040
 (847) 700-8311

6246

#1

A420 2297\ENT\3-18-04

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)	#90311
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	No. 06 M1-301847
)	
AHMED SHAHZAD,)	
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)	
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)	
COMPANY,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This matter coming on to be heard on the motion of defendants AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY, due and timely notice having been given and the Court being fully advised in the premises:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

Defendants' motion for order of satisfaction of judgment is entered and continued for hearing to August 13, 2008 at 9:00 A.M. in Courtroom 1306.

JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
Attorneys for Defendants
AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY
150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Suite 310
Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007-1040
(847) 700-8311

7/30/08, 2008
ENTER:

ENTERED
JUDGE THOMAS LIPSCOMB-1854
JUDGE
JUL 30 2008 DBD
DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK OF COOK COUNTY
DEPUTY

JUDGE'S NO.

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

C00074

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

6246

More

v.

Shahzad

No. 0651-301847

ORDER

With this matter coming for hearing on Defendants' Motion to Satisfy Judgment, It is Hereby Ordered: Defendants' Motion is entered and continued to 8-19-08 at 9:00 A.M.

Atty. No.: 90311

Name: Jesmer Harris

Atty. for: Defendants

Address: 150 NW Pt.

City/State/Zip: Elk Grove Village

Telephone: 847-700-8311

Judge Laurence J. Dunford ENTERED: AUG 13 2008 DBD Circuit Court-1877 Dated: 8/13/08

Laurence J. Dunford Judge Judge's No.

49500
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

Line #

3390

FILED-6

Case No 06-M1-301847

08 AUG 13 AM 9:35

v.
A. Shazhad et al
Defendants

Plaintiff's ("RJM"'s) Motion Of 8/13/08 For Continuance Of 14 Days (Until Any Of 3 Or 4 Court Dates In Which Mr. Traunfeld Or Any Other Yellow Attorney ("Yellow") Can Without Beyond De Minimis Inconvenience Or Expense Return To This Court) Regarding Terms And Conditions Of RJM's Signing A Satisfaction And Release And/Or Declining To Sign Such Type Document In Regard To This Case

The following issues are issues which time and the press of various duties, permitting, RJM intends to get addressed on appeal if the defendants would not be willing to settle this case for more than the amount RJM sought in the *ad damnum* pled in this case, prior to the filing of a motion pursuant to the provisions of C.C.P. 2-604.1

1. Claim to use an audio-recording device in the Courtroom and in the Daley Center at any time in any circumstances, unless a stipulation to the contrary would supercede such prerogative in a given instance.
2. Claim to use a computer in the courtroom which does not create any noise nor otherwise disrupt any proceeding in any manner.
3. Claim to enter into the record RJM's response to various claims made by the Court which became matters of public record such as for instance: Court – Mr. More – you treat this as a game.

RJM- No, Judge, I consider it a battle in a larger crusade, a crusade between good and evil, conducted in the theatre of earthly existence, by the participants therein who have to deal with problems with which angelic entities need not be concerned – namely an arrangement in which such participants have to deal with the problems of poverty, violence, and disease, the uncertainty of future events, and ultimately for those who last long enough, the infirmity of old age and death, a crusade in which RJM is obliged by virtue of his baptism to conduct activity according to the mandate imposed first upon St. Peter (Jn. 20:_) and beyond that upon the rest of the first Apostles (Mt. 28:20), and necessarily by implication and explicit promulgation upon their successors, the particulars of which have been explicated to a substantial measure by several of St. Peter's successors to the Apostolic See, notably for purpose of this document with particular clarity in the encyclicals: *Immortale Dei* of Pope Leo XIII, *Il Fermo Proposito* Of Pius X and *Quas Primas* of Pius XI..

4. The Court – refers to RJM as a Don Quixote –
RJM would hope that his conduct would be less distanced from that of St. George the Dragonslayer than that of the Man from La Mancha, but realizes that like every human being, RJM is subject to deception(s) of the enemy of the human race in this regard.

5. Claim to conduct discovery of Yellow's recruiting, pre-employment investigation, hiring, instruction and training, supervision, retention, and termination policies.
6. Claim to amend the complaint to add count for punitive damages 735 ILCS 5/2-604.1 – which was denied as being untimely, even though this was a small claims case and trial had not been commenced and that in IL Court cases, the complaint can be amended to conform to the proof adduced at trial even after a verdict would be entered in a given case.
- 6.a Claim to present issue of accidents and traffic violation convictions to jury not relative to Mr. Shazhad but relevant to standard of care according to which Yellow Cab recruits, investigates, hires, trains, supervises, retains and/or terminates its drivers in its conducting of its activity according to a standard whereby it does or does not ensure that its moral liability is not left uncovered in regard to the public health and safety concern regarding traffic and road safety.
7. Claim to bar the issue of whether willful and wanton instruction ought be presented to the jury independent of the provisions of 604.1 and whether or not compliance would have been accomplished therewith on the basis that the claim is a small claim and that the Court ought to have proceeded according to a somewhat relaxed pleading standard provided any damage award would not exceed the small claims limit and no party would be prejudiced in light of fact that the Defendants opposed discovery being conducted in this case, when the issue was raised in March of 2008.
8. Claim regarding the issue of whether the jury ought to have been provided the opportunity to ascertain whether Mr. Shazhad could even read English and understand the standard of care according to which a taxi-cab driver is required to conduct his activity.
9. Claim regarding whether this Court was not obliged to provide a particularization of the factual predicates according to which this Court denied RJM's motion for sanctions in regard to the three items RJM presented in regard

thereto in the Motion RJM filed in this Case on 6/10/08.

10. Claim whether RJM ought to have been prevented from presenting or permitting to be present to the jury the contents of RJM's motion regarding sanctions.

11. Claim whether this Court ought not have signed RJM's "Proposed Addendum of RJM to Order of 7/16/08".

12. Claim that this Court ought not sign a statement that it would be the position of this Court that RJM could accept the settlement offer proposed as of 7/30/08 in this case upon the presumption that should it become obvious at some future juncture that RJM had incurred some injury which has not surfaced as of 7/30/08, and RJM would still not possess insurance that would cover whatever treatment might be necessary to incur any *as of present – not detected, latent injury*, that RJM would seek treatment from the Cook County Hospital at the expense of taxpayers and/or the remission of funds at some future juncture by RJM, once the County would eliminate abortions at the hospital and otherwise bring its activity, in terms of practices emanating from promulgated policies entirely within the requirements of the moral law and that this Court can see nothing in such arrangement incompatible with the claim that RJM has not in any way left his moral liability regarding the consideration owed the government under the principles of legal justice such that RJM could in no way be classified as a liability to the County, but would have to be in regard to the matters herein concerned, a burden-bearer who has not in regard to the matters concerned, shirked nor otherwise disregarded the duty imposed by the requirements of the moral law to contribute to the bearing of civic burdens.


13. Issue of CCSD Sgt. Rodriguez – came up to Courtroom 1306 to command RJM to remove electrical cord of computer from electrical outlet

RJM – What adequately promulgated statute, ordinance, rule, regulation and/or protocol prohibits the use of a computer in a Cook County Courtroom? If the use of county electricity by county taxpayers in courtrooms is prohibited, why are rich and compromised and many would claim, profiteering, predators such as Philip Corboy, Clifford, representatives of Sidley Austin, Mayer, Brown..... permitted to use county electricity for all of their video demonstrations and such like in their trials?

Now comes RJM to respectfully move this Honorable Court to grant the relief described in the title to this motion and to sign a copy of a document voicing its support for an order to be issued dispensing RJM from the code of criminal law presently operative in the State of IL or simply issuing an order which would accomplish such objective.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. More


Robert J. More

P.O. Box 6926

Chicago, IL 60680

312 479-6287

C00076

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Page 2 of 2

Robert J. Hore

v.

Shahzad

No. 0671-301847

ORDER

Motion to Reconsider order of 7-16-08 denying Plaintiff's oral motion to Amend Complaint is denied. Said oral motion having been made after judgment was confessed and judgment entered was untimely and would not have furthered the ends of justice. Plaintiff Relief sought in Plaintiff's filings of 8-10-08 and 8-19-08 are denied. Judgment order of 7-16-08 stands. There is no just reason to delay appeal.

Atty. No.: 90311
Name: Jesner & Harris
Atty. for: 150 NW Point
Address: EIC Group Village
City/State/Zip:
Telephone: 847-700-8311

Judge Laurence J. Dunford
AUG 19 2008
Circuit Court-1877
Dated: Laurence J. Dunford 1877
Judge's No.

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

#5 Mot (Cont'd)

Order

(2/24/05) CCG N002

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

5246
5215
4333

Robert J. Nore

Page 1 of 2

01208

v.

No. 06H1-301847

Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow Cab Company, et. al.

ORDER

With this matter coming for hearing on Plaintiff, Robert J. Nore, motion for continuance filed 8-13-08 and motions seeking relief filed 8-13-08 and 8-19-08, It is hereby Ordered: Motion for continuance is denied. Those requests for relief in Plaintiff's filings of 8-13-08 and 8-19-08 are in the nature of motions to Reconsider this Court's ruling of 7-16-08 wherein defendants confessed judgment and judgment was entered.

Page 1 of 2

Atty. No.: 90311

Name: Jessery Harris

ENTERED:

Atty. for: Defendants

Address: 150 NW Point

Dated: Judge Laurence J. Dunford

City/State/Zip: Ell C Grove Village

AUG 19 2008 DAB

Telephone: 847 700 831

Circuit Court - 1877

Judge

Judge's No.

C00080

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

#5 Mot (cont'd)

Order

(2/24/05) CCG N002

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

4220
4220

page 1 of 2

Robert More

v.

No. 0671-301847

Ahmed Shahzad,
et al

ORDER

With this matter coming for hearing on Defendants' Shahzad and Yellow Cab Co. continued motion, and with defendants appearing in Court with drafts in satisfaction of judgment, It is Hereby Ordered:

Defendants to pay the sum of \$1,000 to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County for the benefit and use of Plaintiff, Robert More, Defendant to pay the sum of \$141.50 to the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, in payment to the Clerk of costs waived pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 298.

Atty. No.: 90311

Judge Laurence J. Dunford

Name: Jesmer & Harris

ENTERED:

AUG 19 2008 DBD

Atty. for: Defendants

Dated: Circuit Court-1877

Address: 150 NW Point

City/State/Zip: Elk Grove Village

Judge

Judge's No.

Telephone: 847-7008311

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Robert More

v.

Shahzad, et al.

page 2 of 2

No. 0671-301847

ORDER

with payment of said sums,
the judgment entered 7-16-08
against Ahmed Shahzad and
Yellow Cab Company is satisfied
in full. The payment of the \$1,000.00
shall be held for the benefit of Robert J More
and will be paid ^{upon} further order of Court

Atty. No.: 90311

Judge Laurence J. Dunford

Name: Jessica Arris

AUG 19 2008

Atty. for: Defendant

ENTERED:

Circuit Court-1877

Address: 150 NW Point

Dated: 8-19-08

City/State/Zip: ENC Grove Village

Laurence J. Dunford
Judge Judge's No.

Telephone: 847-700-8311

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Moran
Shinghad et al

No. *66MI 301847*

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: *James Moran*
150 Northmont Park
Elk Grove IL

On *12/12*, *08*, at *9:00* ^{*60007*} a.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable *Judge Bensford* or any Judge sitting in that Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at *Rm 1302 N. Dearborn*

50 W Wabasha St Chicago IL, Illinois, and present
Plaintiffs Motion to Reconsider Motion for
Contempt to ~~Reconsider~~ Contempt analog to the
Name *R Moran* Atty. No. *99500* Pro Se *99500*
Address *R Moran* Attorney for *PA6 Paul J Moran*
City/State/Zip *IL 60626* Telephone *312 499 6287*

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, *[Signature]*, the attorney/non attorney* certify that on the _____ day of _____, _____, I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date _____
Signature/Certification _____

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, *R Moran*, the ~~attorney~~/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing a copy to *James Moran for Shinghad* at *150 Northmont Park Blue* (address on envelope) *Elk Grove IL* and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at *Chicago IL* (place of mailing) at *6/4/17:00* ^{a.m.} _{p.m.} on the *1st* day of *December*, *2008* with proper postage prepaid.

Date *12/11*, *2008*
Signature/Certification *[Signature]*

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Lu H

Mon (R. J. Moore)

Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Shayland et al

Defendant(s)

No. 06MI301847

TO: James F Harris for Shayland

of 9/16/08

MOTION BY

Robert J Moore

FOR

Court to reconsider

Ruling of 8/19/08 denying continuance, + to either grant continuance or accept + rule

upon entities analogous to offer of proof +

for other relief to be enumerated later according to a standard adequately accommodating all legitimate interests

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Dated: 9/16, 2008 *now comes Mon to move this court for reversal*

~~Attorney~~ Certification

~~Atty No.:~~ 975 W
Name: Robert J Moore
~~Atty for:~~ Robert J Moore
Address: PO 6826
City/State/Zip: Chicago IL
Telephone: 312 479 6287

R. J. Moore
SEP 16 PM 1:35
102

C00083

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Moran

Shunghad et al

No. 06M1301847

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: *James + Helen*
750 Northmont Park
Elk Grove IL

On *12/17*, *08*, at *9:00* *60007* *a.m.*
p.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable *Judge DeSaporta* or any Judge sitting in that Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at *1306 N. Dearborn*
50 W Wabasha St Chicago IL, Illinois, and present

Name *James Moran* Atty. No. *99500* Pro Se *99500*
Address *750 Northmont Park* Attorney for *James Moran*
City/State/Zip *Elk Grove IL* Telephone *312 449 2207*

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, *[Signature]*, the attorney/non attorney* certify that on the _____ day of _____ (*strike one)

_____ I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date _____

Signature/Certification _____

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, *[Signature]*, the attorney/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing (*strike one)

a copy to *James + Helen for Shunghad* at *1501 North Dearborn St* (address on envelope) *Chicago IL*

and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at *Chicago IL* (place of mailing)

at *12/17* *a.m.* on the *17th* day of *December*, 2008 with proper postage prepaid.

Date *12/17*, 2008

Signature/Certification *[Signature]*

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

[Handwritten signature]

Mon (Plaintiff)
Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Shayna et al
Defendant(s)

No. 06MI301847

TO: *James J. Harris Esq. for Shayna*
1916/08

MOTION BY *Robert J. Moore* FOR Court to reconsider

Ruling of 8/19/08 denying continuance, to either grant continuance or accept & rule upon parties' analogous to offer of proof & for other relief to be enumerated later according to a standard adequately accommodating all legal interests.

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Dated: *9/16/08*, 2008

Attorney Certification

Atty. No.: *12540*
Name: *Robert J. Moore*
Atty. for: *Plaintiff*
Address: *PO 6826*
City/State/Zip: *Chicago IL*
Telephone: *312 499 6287*

[Handwritten signature]
12/11/08
12/11/08

000085

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Mon
Shurwood et al

No. 66M1301847

NOTICE OF MOTION

To: James H. ...
150 Northwest Park
Elk Grove IL

FILED
08 SEP 16 PM 1:35
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

On 12/17, 08, at 9:53 a.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel

may be heard, I shall appear before the Honorable Judge De ... or any Judge sitting in that Judge's stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him/her, located at No. 130 N ... Illinois, and present

Name ... Atty. No. 99500 Pro Se 99500
Address ... Attorney for ...
City/State/Zip ... Telephone ...

PROOF OF SERVICE BY DELIVERY

I, [Signature], the attorney/non attorney* certify that on the ... day of ... I served this notice by delivering a copy personally to each person to whom it is directed.

Date _____

Signature/Certification _____

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, [Signature], the attorney/non attorney* certify that I served this notice by mailing a copy to James H. ... at 150 ... and depositing the same in the U. S. Mail at Chicago at 6:47 a.m. on the 17th day of December, 2008 with proper postage prepaid.

Date 12/17, 2008

Signature/Certification [Signature]

NOTE: If more than one person is served by delivery or mail, additional proof of service may be made by attaching an additional sheet to this Notice of Motion.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

[Handwritten signature]

Mora (P. Mora)
Plaintiff(s)

vs.

Shayfield et al
Defendant(s)

No. 06MI301847

TO:

James J. Harris for Shayfield

MOTION BY

Robert J. Mora

FOR

Court to reconsider

Order of 8/19/08 denying continuance, & to either grant continuance or accept & rule upon parties' analogous to offer of proof & for other relief to be enumerated later according to a standard adequately encompassing all legal interests.

I (We) do hereby certify that a copy of this instrument was served upon all parties who have appeared and have not previously been found by the Court to be in default for failure to plead.

Dated:

9/16, 2008

Attorney Certification

Atty No:

Name:

Atty for:

Address:

City/State/Zip:

Telephone:

Robert J. Mora
Robert J. Mora
P.O. 6226
Chicago IL
312 479 6287

2008
11/11
AJ
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
1166 P.M. 11:355
11-11-08

2

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)	#90311
Plaintiff,)	
vs.)	No. 06 M1-301847
)	
AHMED SHAHZAD,)	
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)	
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)	
COMPANY,)	
Defendants.)	

FILED-12
OCT 10 AM 8:32
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
DOROTHY BROWN

NOTICE OF MOTION


TO: PRO SE Robert J. More, P.O. Box 6926, Chicago, IL 60680

On 10/20/08 at 9:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard, I shall appear before the **Honorable Judge Dunford**, or any judge sitting in his stead, in the courtroom usually occupied by him in **Room 1306** at the Richard J. Daley Civic Center, Chicago, Illinois, and shall then and there move the Court for an order pursuant to Defendants' motion, a copy of which is attached hereto.

NAME: JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
ATTORNEYS FOR: Defendants
 AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY
ADDRESS: 150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Suite 310
CITY: Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007-1040
TELEPHONE: (847) 700-8311

PROOF OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, Eugene N. Traunfeld, an attorney, certify that I served this notice on THE ABOVE ROBERT MORE by mail by depositing a copy of this notice and motion in the U.S. Mail chute at 150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Elk Grove Village, Illinois at 4:00 p.m. on October 10, 2008 with proper postage prepaid and addressed to address above.



SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me
this ___ day of July, 2008.

NOTARY PUBLIC

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
AHMED SHAHZAD,)
YELLOW CAB COMPANY and)
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION)
COMPANY,)
Defendants.)

No. 06 M1-301847

FILED-12
08 OCT 10 AM 8:32
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
#90311
CIVIL DIVISION
DOORITHY BROWN CLERK

MOTION

NOW COME defendants, AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY, by their attorneys, JESMER AND HARRIS, and hereby move the Court, in the alternative, as follows:

1. On August 19, 2008, this Court entered orders, which included order permitting defendants to satisfy judgment by depositing sums with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County.
2. The Court computer reflects that plaintiff filed a motion and proof of service with the Clerk of this Court on September 16, 2008. Said motion was set for hearing December 12, 2008.
3. To date, counsel for defendant has not received the aforementioned motion.
4. On October 6, 2008, counsel for defendant reviewed the actual court file. The Court file does not contain a motion file stamped September 16, 2008, and contains no pleading or motion filed after August 19, 2008.

WHEREFORE, Defendants, AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY, in the alternative move that the Court enter an order correcting the court computer to reflect that no motion

was filed with this Court by plaintiff on September 16, 2008, or in the alternative, in the event plaintiff produces a clerk file stamped motion, that this Court hear the motion instanter.

JESMER AND HARRIS

BY: _____

I, an attorney, certify that the aforesaid averments are true.

JESMER AND HARRIS #90311
Attorneys for Defendants
AHMED SHAHZED and YELLOW CAB COMPANY
150 Northwest Point Boulevard, Suite 310
Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007-1040
(847) 700-8311

C00088

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Robert J. More

v.

Ahmed Shahzad

No. 06H1-301847

ORDER

This matter coming for hearing on Plaintiff's Motion to reconsider this Court's order of 8/19/08, said motion having been noticed for 12/12/08 and advanced for hearing on Defendant's Notice, and with the Court having fully remembered all of the facts and circumstances surrounding Defendant's Confession of Judgment in July, 2008 and Plaintiff's motions of 8-19-08, It is Hereby Ordered: Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider order of 8-19-08 is denied.

Atty. No.: 90311

Name: Jesmer & Harris

ENTERED: Judge Lawrence J. Dunford

Atty. for: Defendants

OCT 20 2008

Address: 150 NW Point

Dated: Circuit Court 1877

City/State/Zip: Elk Grove Village

Lawrence J. Dunford
Judge Judge's No.

Telephone: 847-700-8311

Judge Laurence J. Dunford

3323



#99500

APPEAL TO THE ILLINOIS APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT, FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still justify not hating)

08-3166

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al

Hon. Lawrence Dunford

Defendants- Appellees

Not unabbreviated Notice of Appeal of 11/12/08

Plaintiff-Appellant Robert More, in persona propria, hereby appeals to the Illinois Appellate Court for the First District for relief from the following orders entered in this matter in the Circuit Court of Cook County:

FILED-1
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2008 NOV 14 PM 1:08
CIVIL APPEALS DIVISION
DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK

1. Order of 2/7/08 denying RJM opportunity to conduct discovery prior to trial in trial court case ("TCC")
2. Order of 7/16/08 denying RJM opportunity to amend complaint to add petition for punitive damages, opportunity to include willful and wanton instruction in jury instructions, opportunity to examine Yellow Cab regarding adequacy of its hiring, training, supervision and disciplinary policies and practices, opportunity to examine A. Shazhad regarding his capacity to read English and knowledge of the liability and responsibility of a cab driver for ensuring the safety of persons who rely upon the road system in Cook County IL in order to participate in the ordinary occupations of life
3. Order of 8/19/08, denying RJM's Motion for a Continuance regarding matters to be reconsidered
4. Order of 10/20/08 bringing activity of TCC to an end

By this appeal, Plaintiff-appellant petitions the Appellate Court to remand this case to the Trial Court with orders to: 1.) permit RJM to amend the complaint to add a count for punitive damages, 2.) include an instruction on willfulness and wantonness in the jury instructions submitted to the jury during any trial which would ever be conducted in regard to the TCC, 3.) permit RJM to conduct discovery regarding the policies and practices of Yellow Cab Co. regarding the safety of its operation and regarding A. Shazhad's knowledge and understanding of the compliance-accomplishment standard according to which a cab driver in Cook County, IL is obliged to conduct his or her activity in order to avoid incurring any tort liability, and whether the conditions present on 3/18/04 for which Yellow and A. Shazhad were responsible did not constitute an unreasonably dangerous condition on that date, 4.) require the Trial Court to conduct an evidentiary hearing concerning the issue of whether Yellow and/or A. Shazhad ought not have been sanctioned for the several unnecessary and unjustified motions and/or orders filed and or presented by them, respectively, 5.) require any and all entities involved in the maintenance of order and security in the R. Daley Center to permit RJM to use and to refrain from interfering in any way with RJM's use of, an audio-recording device in any and all proceedings ever conducted in this case in the future in any court.

C00000

UNDER CONSTRUCTION, TO BE CONTINUED AND REVISED

Respectfully submitted,
Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680,
(312) 479-6287

FILED-7
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2008 NOV 14 PM 1:05
CIVIL APPEALS DIVISION
DOROTHY BROWN CLERK

APPEAL TO THE ILLINOIS APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT, FROM THE
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still justify not hating)
Plaintiff-Appellant
v. Case No 06-M1-301847
A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al Hon. Lawrence Dunford
Defendants- Appellees

NOTICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL AND DECLARATION OF SERVICE OF NOTICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL AND NOTICE OF APPEAL.

NOTICE IS HEREIN PROVIDED that on or before 11/12/08, the undersigned filed the accompanying: Notice of Appeal of Plaintiff-appellant Robert j. More with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, IL, a copy of which is attached hereto and hereby served upon you.
Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680,
(312) 479-6287

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Robert J. More a non-attorney, on oath, state that I served the foregoing Notice of Appeal and this Notice of Notice of Appeal and Declaration of Service of Notice of Appeal upon :
Jesmer and Harris Law Firm
150 Northwest Point
Elk Grove, IL

on or before 11/14/08 , via the insertion into the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, from the Cardiss Collins Post Office in Chicago, IL copies of all of the documents enumerate herein supra.
Under penalties provided by law pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I certify that the statements set forth herein are true and correct.

Robert J. More

APPEAL TO THE ILLINOIS APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT, FROM THE
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still justify not hating)

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al

Hon. Lawrence Dunford

Defendants- Appellees

Not unabbreviated Notice of Appeal of 11/12/08

Plaintiff-Appellant Robert More, in persona propria, hereby appeals to the Illinois Appellate Court for the First District for relief from the following orders entered in this matter in the Circuit Court of Cook County:

1. Order of 2/7/08 denying RJM opportunity to conduct discovery prior to trial in trial court case ("TCC")
2. Order of 7/16/08 denying RJM opportunity to amend complaint to add petition for punitive damages, opportunity to include willful and wanton instruction in jury instructions, opportunity to examine Yellow Cab regarding adequacy of its hiring, training, supervision and disciplinary policies and practices, opportunity to examine A. Shazhad regarding his capacity to read English and knowledge of the liability and responsibility of a cab driver for ensuring the safety of persons who rely upon the road system in Cook County IL in order to participate in the ordinary occupations of life
3. Order of 8/19/08, denying RJM's Motion for a Continuance regarding matters to be reconsidered
4. Order of 10/20/08 bringing activity of TCC to an end

By this appeal, Plaintiff-appellant petitions the Appellate Court to remand this case to the Trial Court with orders to: 1.) permit RJM to amend the complaint to add a count for punitive damages, 2.) include an instruction on willfulness and wantonness in the jury instructions submitted to the jury during any trial which would ever be conducted in regard to the TCC, 3.) permit RJM to conduct discovery regarding the policies and practices of Yellow Cab Co. regarding the safety of its operation and regarding A. Shazhad's knowledge and understanding of the compliance-accomplishment standard according to which a cab driver in Cook County, IL is obliged to conduct his or her activity in order to avoid incurring any tort liability, and whether the conditions present on 3/18/04 for which Yellow and A. Shazhad were responsible did not constitute an unreasonably dangerous condition on that date, 4.) require the Trial Court to conduct an evidentiary hearing concerning the issue of whether Yellow and/or A. Shazhad ought not have been sanctioned for the several unnecessary and unjustified motions and/or orders filed and or presented by them, respectively, 5.) require any and all entities involved in the maintenance of order and security in the R. Daley Center to permit RJM to use and to refrain from interfering in any way with RJM's use of, an audio-recording device in any and all proceedings ever conducted in this case in the future in any court.

FILED-1
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2008 NOV 11 PM 1:00
CIVIL APPELLATION DIVISION
DOROTHY BROWN CLERK

UNDER CONSTRUCTION, TO BE CONTINUED AND REVISED

Respectfully submitted,
Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680,
(312) 479-6287

FILED-1
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK
COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2008 NOV 14 PM 1:06
CIVIL APPEALS DIVISION
DOROTHY BRAMAN
CLERK

APPEAL TO THE ILLINOIS APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT, FROM THE
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still justify not hating)

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al
Defendants- Appellees

Hon. Lawrence Dunford

NOTICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL AND DECLARATION OF SERVICE OF NOTICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL AND NOTICE OF APPEAL.

NOTICE IS HEREIN PROVIDED that on or before 11/12/08, the undersigned filed the accompanying:

Notice of Appeal

of Plaintiff-appellant Robert j. More with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, IL, a copy of which is attached hereto and hereby served upon you.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680,
(312) 479-6287

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Robert J. More a non-attorney, on oath, state that I served the foregoing Notice of Appeal and this Notice of Notice of Appeal and Declaration of Service of Notice of Appeal upon :

Jesmer and Harris Law Firm
150 Northwest Point
Elk Grove, IL

on or before 11/14/08 , via the insertion into the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, from the Cardiss Collins Post Office in Chicago, IL copies of all of the documents enumerate herein supra.

Under penalties provided by law pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I certify that the statements set forth herein are true and correct.

Robert J. More

APPEAL TO THE ILLINOIS APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT, FROM THE
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still justify not hating)

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al

Hon. Lawrence Dunford

Defendants- Appellees

Not unabbreviated Notice of Appeal of 11/12/08

Plaintiff-Appellant Robert More, in persona propria, hereby appeals to the Illinois Appellate Court for the First District for relief from the following orders entered in this matter in the Circuit Court of Cook County:

1. Order of 2/7/08 denying RJM opportunity to conduct discovery prior to trial in trial court case ("TCC")
2. Order of 7/16/08 denying RJM opportunity to amend complaint to add petition for punitive damages, opportunity to include willful and wanton instruction in jury instructions, opportunity to examine Yellow Cab regarding adequacy of its hiring, training, supervision and disciplinary policies and practices, opportunity to examine A. Shazhad regarding his capacity to read English and knowledge of the liability and responsibility of a cab driver for ensuring the safety of persons who rely upon the road system in Cook County IL in order to participate in the ordinary occupations of life
3. Order of 8/19/08, denying RJM's Motion for a Continuance regarding matters to be reconsidered
4. Order of 10/20/08 bringing activity of TCC to an end

By this appeal, Plaintiff-appellant petitions the Appellate Court to remand this case to the Trial Court with orders to: 1.) permit RJM to amend the complaint to add a count for punitive damages, 2.) include an instruction on willfulness and wantonness in the jury instructions submitted to the jury during any trial which would ever be conducted in regard to the TCC, 3.) permit RJM to conduct discovery regarding the policies and practices of Yellow Cab Co. regarding the safety of its operation and regarding A. Shazhad's knowledge and understanding of the compliance-accomplishment standard according to which a cab driver in Cook County, IL is obliged to conduct his or her activity in order to avoid incurring any tort liability, and whether the conditions present on 3/18/04 for which Yellow and A. Shazhad were responsible did not constitute an unreasonably dangerous condition on that date, 4.) require the Trial Court to conduct an evidentiary hearing concerning the issue of whether Yellow and/or A. Shazhad ought not have been sanctioned for the several unnecessary and unjustified motions and/or orders filed and or presented by them, respectively, 5.) require any and all entities involved in the maintenance of order and security in the R. Daley Center to permit RJM to use and to refrain from interfering in any way with RJM's use of, an audio-recording device in any and all proceedings ever conducted in this case in the future in any court.

FILED-1
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK
COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2008 NOV 14 PM 1:05
CIVIL APPEALS DIVISION
DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK

UNDER CONSTRUCTION, TO BE CONTINUED AND REVISED

Respectfully submitted,
Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680,
(312) 479-6287

FILED-1
CIRCUIT COURT OF
COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2008 NOV 14 PM 1:06
CIVIL APPEALS DIVISION
DOROTHY BRUNSON CLERK

APPEAL TO THE ILLINOIS APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT, FROM THE
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still justify not hating)

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al
Defendants- Appellees

Case No 06-M1-301847
Hon. Lawrence Dunford

NOTICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL AND DECLARATION OF SERVICE OF NOTICE OF NOTICE OF APPEAL AND NOTICE OF APPEAL.

NOTICE IS HEREIN PROVIDED that on or before 11/12/08, the undersigned filed the accompanying: Notice of Appeal of Plaintiff-appellant Robert j. More with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, IL, a copy of which is attached hereto and hereby served upon you.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680,
(312) 479-6287

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Robert J. More a non-attorney, on oath, state that I served the foregoing Notice of Appeal and this Notice of Notice of Appeal and Declaration of Service of Notice of Appeal upon :
Jesmer and Harris Law Firm
150 Northwest Point
Elk Grove, IL

on or before 11/14/08 , via the insertion into the U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, from the Cardiss Collins Post Office in Chicago, IL copies of all of the documents enumerate herein supra. Under penalties provided by law pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I certify that the statements set forth herein are true and correct.

Robert J. More

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

*Exs #1, 2+3
of motion of
1/22/08*

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Case No 06-M1-301847

A. Shazhad et al
Defendants

NOTICE OF MOTION

On 1/23/07, at 9:00 a.m. Robert J. More will appear for an audience regarding the present filing of a copy of the motion which this notice concerns in Courtroom 1306 of the Richard J. Daley Center at 50 W. Washington St. Chicago, IL which motion is identified as: Plaintiff's ("RJM") Motion Of 12/03/07. filed via universal filing on 12/3/07 For 1/23/08 To Be Conducted.... and you are herein provided notice of the filing and audience date of such motion.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to all applicable statutes, I, Robert J. More do herein aver that I did serve a copy of :

Plaintiff's ("RJM") Motion Of 12/03/07 For 1/23/08 To Be Conducted.... and this notice and certificate of service upon:

Jesmer and Harris for both Defendants
500 W. Madison St.
Chicago, IL 60604

[Before 12/26/07 via hand delivery or U.S. mail, postage prepaid] (sic) via facsimile transmission on 1/18/08..

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the provisions of 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the veracity of all claims contained herein.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

100055

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COURT DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Shazhad et al
Defendants

Case No 06-M1-301847

Plaintiff's ("RJM") Motion Of 12/03/07 For 1/23/08 To Be Conducted By Telephone If Necessary, Petitioning This Court To Vacate The Dismissal Of This Case For Want Of Prosecution ("DWP") Which Was Entered In This Case On 11/06/07 And To Reinstate This Case And Provide The Other Forms Of Relief Described In The Proposed Order Submitted Along With This Motion In Order To Put The Prosecution Of This Case Back Onto *Terra Firma*, Or Else To Provide RJM And All Those Entitled To Consideration Of Whatever Sort And Measure From Him (Ie "RJM Et Al"), Some Other Form(s) Of Relief, The Provision Of Which Would Not Be Incompatible With The Requirements Of The Moral Law As Such Would Apply To The Matters That This Case Concerns

Now comes RJM to move this Court to provide the relief described in the title to this motion and contained in the postulations included in the Proposed Order submitted alongherewith and in support and explanation whereof, RJM avers and explains as follows:

1. RJM could not enter the Daley Center building on 11/06/07, because on 10/25/07, RJM was informed by an eminently credible source who would not have any motive to fabricate anything concerned in the matter in regard to which RJM was on that date provided information by him, whose identity will remain a confidence that RJM is not at liberty to divulge unless RJM would be permitted permission to reveal it by him, that members of the Chicago Police Department ("CPD") had addressed a certain establishment which RJM patronizes searching for RJM with pictures of RJM and what was allegedly a warrant for RJM's arrest.
2. Contrary t the patently false contents of the order entered in this case on 11/6/07, RJM never stated that the "police are after him."
3. For the record the hopelessly corrupt CPD continually ends up being used by those who manipulate it to crucify or try at least to put out of commission their competitors via the use thereof.
4. RJM has been falsely arrested by the CPD two times in the past 9 years and falsely imprisoned on another occasion, and in each case there has neither been any malum in se in RJM's conduct nor social harm caused thereby.
5. In each such case, the CPD neglected to satisfy the requirements described in Illinois v Gates (U.S.) for arresting a person accused of a crime (or whose seizure in a given instance would otherwise be sought), which have been defined to constitute the "totality of circumstances" standard regarding the determination of probable cause regarding whether an alleged crime would have in fact been committed by a person accused of the commission of such in a given case.
6. RJM is in the process of suing and incepting criminal prosecutions in regard to the two most recent incidents of the use of the CPD as an instrument of predation by specimens conducting activity in various quarters and positions in the Jewish Supremacist Controlled Abominations that are the government entities conducting activity in this Country at this time, which were responsible for the illegal seizures involved in those cases.
7. RJM could not see how RJM could possibly have justifiably proceeded through a magnometer on 11/06/07, given the fact that RJM had been informed that a warrant had been issued for RJM's arrest, as RJM is convinced that he has not incurred any criminal liability in any matter which might have resulted in the procurement/issuance of any warrant.
8. RJM has continued to endeavor to get an adversarial proceeding conducted in which RJM can get whatever warrant is out on RJM quashed before RJM would end up in any "black hole" without access to legal sources nor the means to conduct any factual investigation before being subjected to the type of sham trial for which the Circuit Court of Cook County has so distinguished itself.
9. RJM will not provide further explanation in regard to these matters unless a request would be made to RJM that RJM do so.
10. RJM herein seeks a sanction against Shazhad et al for their seeking a dismissal on 11/06/07 of this case, notwithstanding that it (they) received notice on 11/5/07, of RJM's predicament when they had not even bothered to appear at the previous audience conducted in this case.
11. RJM herein seeks a default against both Defendants for such conduct or at least a \$100.00 sanction, if this Court would vacate the DWP by mail, without any appearance being necessary or \$150.00 if RJM would have to appear to get the DWP vacated.

Wherefore, RJM herein moves this Court to provide the forms of relief identified in the title to this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. More

* 200056

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

v.

Shazhad et al
Defendants

Case No 06-M1-301847

PROPOSED ORDER FOR MOTION OF 12/03/07 SET FOR HEARING ON 1/23/08

This cause having come before this Court on Plaintiff's Motion of 12/03/07, Petitioning this Court to Vacate the Dismissal of this Case Entered on 11/06/07 in the Case... Plaintiff ("RJM") only appearing, and the Court only having been advised in the premises to the extent RJM could advise it, RJM having been unarmed while in the Courthouse in which this matter was adjudicated and there having been innumerable armed individuals whom could have been summonsed to use force on the unarmed RJM were RJM to conducted his activity according to a standard and method which might have resulted in such type development occurring (as for example happened in the courtroom murder of Mr. J. Richmond in 1997 (Richmond v Sheahan 270 F.3d 430)), which to this date remains unprosecuted and RJM informing all entities and parties concerned that it is RJM's position that the non-inclusion of a petition for relief, response to any occurrence or development, and/or endeavor ordered to the prevention or mitigation of damages which might have been incurred by RJM from the unjustified injury causing duty breach(es) ("duty breach") of any entity or party could not possibly constitute a waiver, relinquishment or other type forfeiture ("waiver") of any claim to consideration, in regard to which no such conjectural claim of waiver would have been posited had RJM endeavored to accomplish more in whatever audience would have been the audience out of which this order would have emanated, without RJM's being provided some opportunity after whatever audience would have been conducted out of which this order would have emanated to eliminate and/or ameliorate the effects of whatever suchlike type duty breach might have been perpetrated or otherwise occurred, IT IS HEREIN ORDERED:

1. The dismissal of this case for want of prosecution ("DWP") entered in this case on 11/06/07 is herein vacated and this case is reinstated _____.
2. For the following reason(s) th DWP entered in this case on 11/06/07 will not now be reinstated without further proceedings being conducted in the matter _____.
3. A schedule for the briefing and/or adjudication of whatever other proceedings this Court would claim would have to be conducted in order for RJM to get the DWP vacated in this case and the case reinstated is established **as follows:**
4. In the scenario in which the DWP would not now be vacated and the case reinstated, this Court confirms that it has been informed that an assessment will be issued against it for any expenses including consumption of time to which RJM would have been unjustifiably subjected in order to get this case reinstated, if this Court cannot and would not succeed in demonstrating that the non-vacation of the DWP and reinstatement of this case would have been justified _____.
5. This Court also confirms that it has been informed that RJM is not a Non-Magna Charta Clause 61 litigant and that RJM correlatively does not recognize that there is any legitimacy in either the judicial immunity argument nor in any argument in which injustice rectification would be restricted solely to measures not involving whatever measure of physical force might need to be utilized in a given case in order to ensure that no injustice would remain not adequately rectified on the record of accountability of RJM, if a given injustice could not be adequately rectified in a given court proceeding and/or series of proceedings _____ and that an assessment of expenses _____.

unjustifiably incurred by RJM due to duty breaches caused by Judges S. Harris and L. Dunsford in the adjudication by each of this case, respectively, is in the process of being

completed and served upon such Judges as of the date of the signing of this order if it such objective has not already been accomplished _____.

6. Judges Harris and Dunford are herein substituted as of right and for cause, respectively depending upon which one would be SOJ'ed as of right, removing both from any further adjudication of this case _____.
7. In the alternative, the entirety of the contents of the criminal statutes of the State of IL, and of whatever criminal ordinances and/or statutes of Cook County, IL and/or Chicago IL might ever have been applied to any activity of RJM which might ever be conducted for purposes of resolving the dispute this case concerns and rectifying whatever injustice might still remain unrectified as of 1/23/07 in the matters this case concerns, absent the issuance of this order, are herein declared to be unconstitutional as such might ever have been or otherwise, in the future be, applied in the absence of the issuance of this order to any of the type(s) of activity which might ever be conducted by RJM as described herein supra _____.
8. Confirmation is herein provided that this Court has been informed by RJM that Mr. A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, the Attorney who sought the DWP on 11/06/07, Judge Harris and if the Clerk in room 1306 was in anyway responsible for the DWP's having been entered (ie misrepresentation of averments provided to her, etc), the Clerk in room 1306 are all jointly and severally herein invited to make a contribution to Most Holy Family Monastery in Fillmore NY or to the Institute of St. Michael the Archangel Fund of \$150.00 for the time and costs RJM has incurred in having to compose, print, file and appear in regard to this motion _____.
9. Confirmation is herein provided that this Court has been informed by RJM that if this Court would vacate the DWP by mail, the proposal referenced supra would be reduced to \$100.00 unless God's grace would move those addressed to make a more generous contribution to the causes which such entities continue to fight _____.
10. Any and all other matters not presented to this Court prior to the date of 1/23/07 are herein entered and continued _____.

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

Judge Date

United States District Court
Northern District of Illinois
Eastern Division

Ex # 5 to motion 1/22/08
in case # 06-cv-301-847

Robert J More ("RJM") - Hopefully not deserving of the title *Betrayer of the Baptized*, as so countless many have proven, indisputably, themselves to be, but rather, in the end, ultimately found to be not be entirely undeserving of the title *Benefactor Of The Baptized and Escort of Sanctifying Grace* - but so soberly realizing that it is matters such as the outcome of this case that will serve as the material upon which such matter of incalculable moment will ultimately be determined (cf. Phil 2;12)

Case No. 06 C 6797

v.
City of Chicago et al,
Defendant(s),

INITIAL COMPONENT OF PROPOSED ORDER OF 11/15/07, FOR PURPOSES OF ELIMINATING THE IMPEDIMENT TO WHICH RJM HAS BEEN SO UNJUSTIFIABLY SUBJECTED SINCE 10/25/07, SO THAT RJM WILL NO LONGER BE LEFT IN A POSITION OF BEING INCAPABLE OF CONTINUING TO PROSECUTE THE CASE THIS ORDER CONCERNS ("THIS CASE")

This Court having received a copy of Plaintiff's Motion of 11/13/07 for 11/15/07 and RJM having been permitted to participate in a hearing conducted in this case via telephone, IT IS HEREIN ORDERED:

1. No member of any policing entity, whether federal, state, or of any political subdivision of the State of Illinois shall be permitted to enforce any legal process issued before the time of 9:00 a.m. on 11/15/07, which names Robert J. More ("RJM") as a respondent, defendant, accused, suspect or person to otherwise be subjected to be apprehended and/or detained without either a.) having succeeded in informing RJM that some form or other of legal process would have been issued which might authorize the subjection of RJM to apprehension, arrest and/or detainment (apprehension et al) by a member and/or any member of any of the types of policing entities described herein supra, and having a form of legal proof of such notification equally probative of the accomplishment of such notification to RJM in the possession of whatever member of whatever entity might in a given case claim that such notification would have been accomplished - to be manifested upon any demand made for the manifestation thereof, and having provided RJM the opportunity to respond thereto without RJM's having to be subjected to any type of apprehension et al in order that RJM might possess a record of an adjudicated disposition of a given claim of *probable cause or the equivalent thereof as the basis for a given apprehension et al*, prior to any apprehension et al or b.) having had accomplished the conducting of a probable cause hearing or the equivalent thereof for any type of legal process issued within the time window described herein supra, which might result in the possible apprehension et al of RJM, before either Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, Robert Thomas, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States ("SCUS"), John Roberts, Justice of the SCUS, Samuel Alito, United States Court of Appeals ("USCA") For the Seventh Circuit Judge Daniel Manion, USCA for the Eleventh Circuit Judge Charles Wilson, or USCA For the Fifth Circuit Judge Edith Jones

2. No member of any policing entity, whether federal, state, or of any political subdivision of the State of Illinois shall be permitted to enforce any legal process issued after the time of 9:00 a.m. on 11/15/07, which names Robert J. More ("RJM") as a respondent, defendant, accused, suspect or person to otherwise be subjected to be apprehended and/or detained without either a.) having succeeded in informing RJM that some form or other of legal process would have been issued which might authorize the subjection of RJM to apprehension, arrest and/or detainment (apprehension et al) by a member and/or any member of any of the types of policing entities described herein supra, and having a form of legal proof of such notification equally probative of the accomplishment of such notification to RJM in the possession of whatever member of whatever entity might in a given case claim that such notification would have been accomplished - to be manifested upon any demand made for the manifestation thereof, and having provided RJM the opportunity to respond thereto without RJM's having to be subjected to any type of apprehension et al in order that RJM might possess a record of an adjudicated disposition of a given claim of *probable cause or the equivalent thereof as the basis for a given apprehension et al*, prior to any apprehension et al or b.) having had accomplished the conducting of a *probable cause hearing or the equivalent thereof* for any type of legal process issued within the time window described herein supra, which might result in the possible apprehension et al of RJM, before either Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois, Robert Thomas, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States ("SCUS"), John Roberts, Justice of the SCUS, Samuel Alito, United States Court of Appeals ("USCA") For the Seventh Circuit Judge Daniel Manion, USCA for the Eleventh Circuit Judge Charles Wilson, or USCA For the Fifth Circuit Judge Edith Jones

3. This order shall remain in place until a further order of this Court modifying or rescinding this order would have been issued but will expire 365 days from today, subject to RJM's petitioning this Court for the renewal thereof

4. Any violation of the express terms of this order would subject any and all violator(s) thereof to the punishment of criminal contempt of court, based upon the power of this Court to punish malefactors for conduct and activity contemptuous of the powers of this Court _____ and to prosecution under various

000059

provisions of the United State's Code, including but not limited to those contained in 18 USC 242

5. The City of Chicago and/or the Police Department of the City of Chicago is herein ordered to immediately confirm for RJM whether or not there has been any legal process of any kind which might have subjected RJM to apprehension et al in the absence of the issuance of this order or which has otherwise been in existence at any juncture within the past five weeks (ie from 10/10/07 until 11/15/07) _____.

6. This Court herein now issues, without RJM's having to propose any briefing schedule in this regard: a default judgment upon liability against the City of Chicago on all counts which it has sought to have dismissed against RJM in the case this order concerns ("this case") a.) for the cumulative malice demonstrated in its defense of this case to this juncture _____, or: b.) for the malice demonstrated by it in endeavoring to procure an order dismissing this case while it was aware that RJM has been all but entirely preoccupied with ascertaining whether there was or has been any legal process outstanding against RJM which would render it unjustified for RJM to risk entering any government building since the moment on 10/25/07 at which RJM became apprised that members of the City of Chicago Police Department had solicited information from various members of the public concerning RJM – that is in its filing what has been presented as a *reply* to its motion to reconsider, after it was aware that RJM had informed this Court and the City that it was and has been RJM's position that the order entered in this case establishing a briefing schedule for the City's MTR was and has been and remains *void ab initio* imputable to its not having been entered according to a standard of legal adjudication not incompatible with the protections guaranteed by the Right to Petition and Due Process Clauses, among other provisions of the Constitution of the U.S. or: a briefing schedule in this regard is herein established as follows: _____, _____, _____, _____.

7. This Court confirms that it has been informed that it is RJM's intention to file another amended complaint within ten days of 11/15/07 in response to the conduct of the City of Chicago and members of its Law and Police Departments regarding the matters this case concerns _____.

8. This Court confirms that it has been informed that it is RJM's intention to procure rulings in regard to, and resolutions of, each and all of the innumerable petitions for relief which have been contained in the several motions which RJM has filed with this Court over the past six months before responding to any dispositive motion in this case, as RJM cannot understand how RJM's doing otherwise could possibly be justified _____.

9. This Court will conditionally provide RJM the relief described in postulations #1-5 supra for a period of three weeks, or until RJM can present arguments and an explanation convincing this Court of the need and correlative justification for the provisions of such forms of relief, based upon the past records of conduct of RJM, innumerable governmental and lawfirm entities and policing entities, whichever – the passage of the 21 days or the presentation of arguments as described supra, would occur first, with provision for the maintenance in place of the contents of this order issued herein in regard to such postulations until this Court would issue a ruling regarding whatever RJM might submit to it, regarding such items in this order _____.

10. In the scenario in which any of the relief sought in RJM's accompanying motion and described herein supra would not be provided, the following schedule is established for RJM to present to this Court whatever material RJM would understand that RJM would be obliged to present to it in such scenario, in order to ensure that none of issues concerned would be waived, relinquished or otherwise forfeited imputable to RJM's not having accomplished any more in terms of the presentation and preservation of issues than whatever RJM would have accomplished in the scenario in which any count would be dismissed from this case _____.

11. This Court has been informed that RJM has informed it that RJM is committed to present RJM's proposed terms and conditions for the adjudication of this case to it within 14 days of 11/15/07 and that until a definition of "good faith" as the term is used in the rules of procedure and case law is provided, that RJM really cannot proceed further than getting an adequate definition thereof established _____.

12. This Court further realizing how dangerous it indisputably is for someone conducting his activity according to the points of reference and priorities according to which the activity of RJM in regard to which this Court is cognizant has been conducted to be deprived of the means of protection guaranteed all of society's burden bearers by the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the U.S., to be unarmed in a society such as the one in which this order is being read; it is herein declared that any and all laws which might ever be - absent the issuance of this promulgation, applied to criminalize RJM's keeping and bearing of arms as his lights of conscience would indicate would be necessary and correlatively, appropriate in the various arrangements of circumstances which RJM might ever encounter *unconstitutional as applied to the activity of RJM* _____ and that further the entirety of the federal and state criminal codes are to be considered likewise regarding the activity of RJM until further notice would be provided in this regard from this Court

Robert J. More, P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287, thirstforjustice@yahoo.com

C00060

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Plaintiff/Petitioner Robert J. Mon
v.
Defendant/Respondent Ahmed Shahyad et al

No. 06-M1-301847
Calendar _____

APPLICATION AND AFFIDAVIT TO SUE OR DEFEND AS AN INDIGENT PERSON

I, Robert J. Mon, the Plaintiff/Petitioner Defendant/Respondent herein, age 46,
 On my own behalf, OR as Parent, Guardian, Other _____ on behalf of _____
a(n) Minor OR Incompetent Adult, state and believe in good faith that I, or the person on whose behalf this petition is brought, have
a meritorious claim/ defense.
 I have knowledge of the facts stated herein.

1. I am employed as a(n) unemployed. Yearly gross salary \$ _____ (before taxes)
Name of employer: N/A Telephone of employer: N/A
Address of employer: _____

I am unemployed as of 2/16/2000
Last employer: Howard Melway Service Telephone: _____
Address: 1601 W 16th St, Broadview IL

I began receiving Unemployment Compensation on 3/21/2000 in the amount of \$ 270.00 (per month).

2. My spouse is employed as a(n) none. Yearly gross salary \$ _____ (before taxes)
Name of employer: _____ Telephone of employer: _____
Address of employer: _____

My spouse is unemployed as of / /.
Last employer: _____ Telephone: _____
Address: _____

My spouse began receiving Unemployment Compensation on / / in the amount of \$ _____ (per month).

My other sources of income are: SSI Public Aid Child Support Food Stamps Family Assistance Foster Care Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled Temporary Assistance for Needy Families General Assistance State Transitional Assistance State Children and Family Assistance Other: _____ \$ 400-500 per mo (per month).

My available income is 125% or less of the current poverty level established by the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

The nature and value of property I own includes: Real Estate (Describe property, specify address, present value and mortgage and liens outstanding) none - except \$450 value of electronics, clothes, bike
 Cash, bank accounts, etc. \$ none Clothing and jewelry \$ see supra Furniture, appliances, household goods \$ see supra
 Automobile - Model none Year _____ Value \$ _____

The names and ages of persons dependent on the applicant for support are:
/ N/A / /

I am paying child support in the amount of \$ none per _____.

I am paying spousal support in the amount of \$ _____ per _____.

My monthly living expenses (not including payment of debts and child support) are \$ 1500.00 ~~per month~~ at least

I am eligible to receive civil legal services as defined in 735 ILCS 5/5-105.5.
 I am unable to pay the costs of this case, and to do so would cause a substantial hardship to me and my family.

Name: Robert J. Mon
Firm/Business Name: _____
Address: P.O. Box 6926
City/State/Zip: Chicago IL 60680
Telephone: (312) 571-1066
E-mail: stolen

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 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 s/he verily believes the same to be true.

Robert J. Mon
Signature of Applicant

**INFORMATION SHEET FOR
LEAVE TO SUE OR DEFEND AS AN INDIGENT PERSON**

(a) As used in this section:

(1) "*Fees, costs, and charges*" means payments imposed on a party in connection with the prosecution or defense of a civil action, including, but not limited to: filing fees; appearances fees; fees for service of process and other papers served either within or outside this State, including service by publication pursuant to Section 2-206 of this Code and publication of necessary legal notices; motion fees; jury demand fees; charges for participation in, or attendance at, any mandatory process or procedure including, but not limited to, conciliation, mediation, arbitration, counseling, evaluation, "Children First", "Focus on Children" or similar programs; fees for supplementary proceedings; charges for translation services; guardian ad litem fees; charges for certified copies of court documents; and all other processes and procedures deemed by the court to be necessary to commence, prosecute, defend, or enforce relief in a civil action.

2) "*Indigent person*" means any person who meets one or more of the following criteria:

(i) He or she is receiving assistance under one or more of the following public benefits programs: Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled (AABD), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Food Stamps, General Assistance, State Transitional Assistance, or State Children and Family Assistance.

(ii) His or her available income is 125% or less of the current poverty level as established by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, unless the applicant's assets that are not exempt under Part 9 or 10 of Article XII of this Code are of nature and value that the court determines that the applicant is able to pay the fees, costs and charges.

(iii) He or she is, in the discretion of the court, unable to proceed in an action without payment of fees, costs, and charges and whose payment of those fees, costs, and charges would result in substantial hardship to the person or his or her family.

(iv) He or she is an indigent person pursuant to Section 5-105.5 of this Code. [This states that "indigent person" means a person whose income is 125% or less of the current official federal poverty guidelines or who is otherwise eligible to receive civil legal services under the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974. (42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 2996 et. seq.)]

(b) On the application of any person, before or after the commencement of an action, a court, on finding that the applicant is an indigent person, shall grant the applicant leave to sue or defend the action without payment of the fees, costs and charges of the action.

(c) An application for leave to sue or defend an action as an indigent person shall be in writing and supported by the affidavit of the applicant or, if the applicant is a minor or an incompetent adult, by the affidavit of another person having knowledge of the facts. The contents of the affidavit shall be established by Supreme Court Rule.

(d) The court shall rule on applications under this Section in a timely manner based on information contained in the application unless the court, in its discretion, requires the applicant to personally appear to explain or clarify information contained in the application. If the court finds that the applicant is an indigent person, the court shall enter an order permitting the applicant to sue or defend without payment of fees, costs or charges. If the application is denied, the court shall enter an order to that effect stating the specific reasons for the denial. The clerk of the court shall promptly mail or deliver a copy of the order to the applicant.

(e) The clerk of the court shall not refuse to accept and file any complaint, appearance, or other paper presented by the applicant if accompanied by an application to sue or defend in forma pauperis, and those papers shall be considered filed on the date the application is presented. If the application is denied, the order shall state a date certain by which the necessary fees, costs, and charges must be paid. The court, for good cause shown, may allow an applicant whose application is denied to defer payment of fees, costs, and charges, make installment payments, or make payment upon reasonable terms and conditions stated in the order. The court may dismiss the claims or defenses of any party failing to pay the fees, costs, or charges within the time and in the manner ordered by the court. A determination concerning an application to sue or defend in forma pauperis shall not be construed as a ruling on the merits.

(f) The court may order an indigent person to pay all or a portion of the fees, costs, or charges waived pursuant to this Section out of monies recovered by the indigent person pursuant to a judgment or settlement resulting from the civil action. However, nothing in this Section shall be construed to limit the authority of a court to order another party to the action to pay the fees, costs, or charges of the action.

(g) A court, in its discretion, may appoint counsel to represent an indigent person, and that counsel shall perform his or her duties without fees, charges, or reward.

(h) Nothing in this Section shall be construed to affect the right of a party to sue or defend an action in forma pauperis without the payment of fees, costs, or charges, or the right of a party to court appointed counsel, as authorized by any other provision of law or by the rules of the Illinois Supreme Court.

(i) The provisions of this Section are severable under Section 1.31 the Statute on Statutes. See (5 ILCS 70/1.31)

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

R J Moore

v.

No. 06 M1 301847

Shanghaed - ad

ORDER

~~It is~~ herein ordered that no members of any policing entity shall interfere with any activities of Robert J Moore which might frustrate, impede and/or obstruct any endeavor of R J Moore to ~~complete~~ complete the prosecution of this case ~~except~~ according to the terms & conditions ("TCC") specified in the accompanying:

~~critical component of Proposed Order of~~
~~1/11/07 or amended~~ ENTERED: ~~to the following TCC's~~

Atty. No.: _____

Name: _____

Atty. for: *R J Moore*

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Telephone: 4796287

Dated: _____

Deniel *2708*

Judge _____ Judge's No. _____

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PO Brown

v.

No. 06 M1 301847

Shanbuck et al

ORDER

It is herein ordered that no member of any policy entity shall interfere with any activities of Robert Brown which might frustrate, impede and/or obstruct any endeavor of PO Brown to complete the prosecution of this case except according to the terms & conditions (TCC) specified in the accompanying:

Atty. No.: _____

Name: 1/1/15/07

Atty. for: PO Brown

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Telephone: 4796787

ENTERED:

Dated: _____

Judge: Denard Judge's No. 2708

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

Line #

Case No 06-M1-301847

v.
A. Shazhad et al
Defendants

Plaintiff's ("RJM"'s) Motion Of 8/13/08 For Continuance Of 14 Days (Until Any Of 3 Or 4 Court Dates In Which Mr. Traunfeld Or Any Other Yellow Attorney ("Yellow") Can Without Beyond De Minimis Inconvenience Or Expense Return To This Court) Regarding Terms And Conditions Of RJM's Signing A Satisfaction And Release And/Or Declining To Sign Such Type Document In Regard To This Case

The following issues are issues which time and the press of various duties, permitting, RJM intends to get addressed on appeal if the defendants would not be willing to settle this case for more than the amount RJM sought in the *ad damnum* pled in this case, prior to the filing of a motion pursuant to the provisions of C.C.P. 2-604.1

1. Claim to use an audio-recording device in the Courtroom and in the Daley Center at any time in any circumstances, unless a stipulation to the contrary would supercede such prerogative in a given instance.
2. Claim to use a computer in the courtroom which does not create any noise nor otherwise disrupt any proceeding in any manner.
3. Claim to enter into the record RJM's response to various claims made by the Court which became matters of public record such as for instance: Court – Mr. More – you treat this as a game.

RJM- No, Judge, I consider it a battle in a larger crusade, a crusade between good and evil, conducted in the theatre of earthly existence, by the participants therein who have to deal with problems with which angelic entities need not be concerned – namely an arrangement in which such participants have to deal with the problems of poverty, violence, and disease, the uncertainty of future events, and ultimately for those who last long enough, the infirmity of old age and death, a crusade in which RJM is obliged by virtue of his baptism to conduct activity according to the mandate imposed first upon St. Peter (Jn. 20:_) and beyond that upon the rest of the first Apostles (Mt. 28:20), and necessarily by implication and explicit promulgation upon their successors, the particulars of which have been explicated to a substantial measure by several of St. Peter's successors to the Apostolic See, notably for purpose of this document with particular clarity in the encyclicals: *Immortale Dei* of Pope Leo XIII, *Il Fermo Proposito* Of Pius X and *Quas Primas* of Pius XI..

4. The Court – refers to RJM as a Don Quixote –

RJM would hope that his conduct would be less distanced from that of St. George the Dragonslayer than that of the Man from La Mancha, but realizes that like every human being, RJM is subject to deception(s) of the enemy of the human race in this regard.

5. Claim to conduct discovery of Yellow's recruiting, pre-employment investigation, hiring, instruction and training, supervision, retention, and termination policies.
6. Claim to amend the complaint to add count for punitive damages 735 ILCS 5/2-604.1 – which was denied as being untimely, even though this was a small claims case and trial had not been commenced and that in IL Court cases, the complaint can be amended to conform to the proof adduced at trial even after a verdict would be entered in a given case.
- 6.a Claim to present issue of accidents and traffic violation convictions to jury not relative to Mr. Shazhad but relevant to standard of care according to which Yellow Cab recruits, investigates, hires, trains, supervises, retains and/or terminates its drivers in its conducting of its activity according to a standard whereby it does or does not ensure that its moral liability is not left uncovered in regard to the public health and safety concern regarding traffic and road safety.
7. Claim to bar the issue of whether willful and wanton instruction ought be presented to the jury independent of the provisions of 604.1 and whether or not compliance would have been accomplished therewith on the basis that the claim is a small claim and that the Court ought to have proceeded according to a somewhat relaxed pleading standard provided any damage award would not exceed the small claims limit and no party would be prejudiced in light of fact that the Defendants opposed discovery being conducted in this case, when the issue was raised in March of 2008.
8. Claim regarding the issue of whether the jury ought to have been provided the opportunity to ascertain whether Mr. Shazhad could even read English and understand the standard of care according to which a taxi-cab driver is required to conduct his activity.
9. Claim regarding whether this Court was not obliged to provide a particularization of the factual predicates according to which this Court denied RJM's motion for sanctions in regard to the three items RJM presented in regard

thereto in the Motion RJM filed in this Case on 6/10/08.

10. Claim whether RJM ought to have been prevented from presenting or permitted to present to the jury the contents of RJM's motion regarding sanctions.

11. Claim whether this Court ought not have signed RJM's "Proposed Addendum of RJM to Order of 7/16/08".

12. Claim that this Court ought not sign a statement that it would be the position of this Court that RJM could accept the settlement offer proposed as of 7/30/08 in this case upon the presumption that should it become obvious at some future juncture that RJM had incurred some injury which has not surfaced as of 7/30/08, and RJM would still not possess insurance that would cover whatever treatment might be necessary to incur any *as of present – not detected, latent injury*, that RJM would seek treatment from the Cook County Hospital at the expense of taxpayers and/or the remission of funds at some future juncture by RJM, once the County would eliminate abortions at the hospital and otherwise bring its activity, in terms of practices emanating from promulgated policies entirely within the requirements of the moral law and that this Court can see nothing in such arrangement incompatible with the claim that RJM has not in any way left his moral liability regarding the consideration owed the government under the principles of legal justice such that RJM could in no way be classified as a liability to the County, but would have to be in regard to the matters herein concerned, a burden-bearer who has not in regard to the matters concerned, shirked nor otherwise disregarded the duty imposed by the requirements of the moral law to contribute to the bearing of civic burdens.

13. Issue of CCSD Sgt. Rodriguez – came up to Courtroom 1306 to command RJM to remove electrical cord of computer from electrical outlet

RJM – What adequately promulgated statute, ordinance, rule, regulation and/or protocol prohibits the use of a computer in a Cook County Courtroom? If the use of county electricity by county taxpayers in courtrooms is prohibited, why are rich and compromised and many would claim, profiteering, predators such as Philip Corboy, Clifford, representatives of Sidley Austin, Mayer, Brown..... permitted to use county electricity for all of their video demonstrations and such like in their trials?

Now comes RJM to respectfully move this Honorable Court to grant the relief described in the title to this motion and to sign a copy of a document voicing its support for an order to be issued dispensing RJM from the code of criminal law presently operative in the State of IL or simply issuing an order which would accomplish such objective.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert J. More

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926
Chicago, IL 60680
312 479-6287

While court was in session this note
was left on the clerks desk (in the courtroom)
at 10:10 AM 1.8.08,

The paper was passed to the judge on
the bench. He took no action nor gave
any orders re: same other than to
make this addendum to the note + place
in file.

D. Dawson
clerk.

Grant County Cook County

Mon

v

Cont# 06 M 1301847

Shaybaal

Robert J. Mon has respectfully
proposes that the motion which
he filed to vacate the DW entered
in this case on 11/6/07 was
universal filing at the SSS Co. Harrison
St Court be set on the Court docket
(which was never set on the Court docket)
~~be set on the Court docket~~ at this

time or that ~~not~~ notice be provided

to RDM that RDM would have
to spend such motion in Room 601
to accomplish such objective
Robert J. Mon (312) 477-6287

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
CIVIL DIVISION, FIRST MUNICIPAL DISTRICT

Plaintiff(s)

Defendants(s)

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No.

ORDER

This cause coming forth for a jury trial, the jury having rendered a verdict in favor of the defendant(s) _____ v. plaintiff(s) _____.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT judgment is entered on the verdict in favor of defendant(s) _____ against plaintiff(s) _____ plus costs. Withdraw exhibits.

ENTER:

JUDGE LAURENCE J. DUNFORD

Attorney Number:

Attorney Name:

Attorney For:

Address:

City:

Telephone No.:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION

Robert J More
Plaintiff

Line #

v.
A. Shazhad et al
Defendants

Case No 06-M1-301847

Plaintiff's Motion and Proposed Order of 8/19/08

Now comes the Plaintiff ("RJM") to respectfully move this Hon. Court to provide signatures in the spaces adjacent to the entries included herein infra or explanations justifying not doing so in any case in which this Court would not provide a signature adjacent to a given entry, in order to ensure that the Court's moral liability regarding its activity therein would not remain not adequately covered and that if it would, that such lamentable conjectural condition could in no way be imputed to any culpable negligence attributable to RJM and in explanation and support whereof, RJM avers and explains as follows:

1. At this juncture, howsoever the issues RJM presented in his most recent submission to this Hon. Court would end up being adjudicated, RJM considers it necessary to move this Hon. Court to either sign a copy of the postulation included herein infra or to have it recommend that such postulation or something similar be signed by a judge conducting activity in a court possessing authority over this Court, which postulation in its present form is constituted as follows:

Declaration of Unconstitutionality of... Criminal Code(s) Regarding Activity of ...Robert J. More

1. (It is herein proposed that any clause contained herein which would cause any Court to refuse to sign this document be stricken over the explicitly confirmed and acknowledged objection of the proponent thereof, so that no clause, the inclusion of which would render it impossible for such proponent to presently procure a signature upon this document, would be left herein such that the signature herein sought would remain unprocured, without in the endeavor to procure a signature on a document which might facilitate the procurement of some form of relief and/or the elimination of some burden - there being present the making of any unjustified concessions to the activity of the devil, and such that it could never be claimed that the proposition was unjustifiably conciliatory and/or characterized by concessions which the proponent thereof would possess no authority to make, acknowledging that in exigent circumstances wherein a signature upon some modified version of any original proposal could facilitate the procurement of a benefit or the elimination of an evil, the effect of which would evidently be more beneficial to the interests of the Catholic Church than would be whatever condition would be left in place as a consequence of whatever injury or loss might accrue to such Church from the non-inclusion of any clause in whatever declaration would have been issued which would not include the entirety of whatever would have been included in the proposal originally offered, it is the proponent of this postulation's understanding that the procurement of a document in some measure modified would not be unjustified, but that great solicitude must necessarily be exercised in this regard, lest non-negotiables end up being unjustifiably conceded and/or otherwise compromised.

(SEVERABILITY CLAUSE SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION AND STILL UNDER CONSTRUCTION))

By the authority vested in this Court pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States of America {or by any other authority and/or any authority howsoever described (include any other formulation here: _____)} as the derivation of such authority has been transmitted down through the centuries of the history of Western Civilization, through the succession of generations reaching back to the signing of the Magna Charta on June 15, 1215 A.D., and in consideration of the consideration and protections to which the people of the United States of America ("u.S.A", "u.S. of A.") (or any other formulation describing the citizens of the 50 states that presently constitute the Union and/or Republic of the u.S. of A. howsoever described and/or appelled) are entitled, correlative to the moral liability to which such persons are subject under the immutable requirements of the natural law as such as been inscribed upon the heart of every man (Romans 1:15 et al) and that any arrangement at any juncture in place imputable to whatever combination of contributing causes which would effectively constitute a deprivation of the measures of consideration guaranteed to all citizens of such Union and/or Republic by amongst other provisions of such Constitution, those of the Prohibition on the Establishment of a Religion, Prohibition on the Right to the Free Exercise of Religion, Right to Petition, Due Process, Supremacy and/or Guaranty Clauses of such Constitution and/or the prohibition on slavery explicitly promulgated in the Thirteenth Amendment to such Constitution, this Court herein declares that all state, county and municipal laws are unconstitutional as such might be applied and/or as any member of any government entity might ever endeavor to apply such in the absence of the issuance of this order to any measure which Robert J. More might implement and/or to any endeavor in which RJM might ever participate which would have been implemented and/or undertaken, whether in a given case, the intents and purposes of a given agenda and/or project concerning such matters, would have been published, promulgated and/or declared explicitly or not, for purposes of

the rectification via vigilante and/or military measures of ^{any} the injustice^s which it is RJM's informed understanding presently prevail in ~~the~~ matters, ^{RJM is involved in any case} which ~~the case this document concerns~~ in the Circuit Court of Cook County, IL ~~concerns~~ ^{so that his capacity to continue to prosecute this case would be in no way impaired.}

Signature _____ Date _____

OR:
This Court, ever mindful, that the authority which it exercises in this case, has ultimately emanated from the consequences of a commitment to use force by the English Peasants at Runneymede in 1215, were King John III not to grant them the concessions which they then and there demanded as being the minimal consideration which they could accept, without in accepting anything less, incurring a most egregiously sinful complicity in deprivations and predations, the likes of which no human being, created in God's image and likeness, who would hope to retain a claim to procure the reward promised to those who refuse to make any unjustified concessions to evil & to avoid the punishment guaranteed to those who do not require themselves to refuse to make any such type of unjustified concessions, and who otherwise satisfy the requirements of the moral law in the conduct of their mortal lives at least to the extent necessary to ensure that their moral liability would not have been left not adequately covered in any substantial area in regard to which their activity in the earthly theatre would ultimately be assessed (Matt. 25:26 et al), could justifiably accept from any sovereign, and the actual use of force by those British American Colonists who in 1775, refused to make the same type of unjustified concessions to the predations and deprivations which the then reigning British Sovereign was at that time perpetrating upon them; acknowledges that no morally legitimate formula concerning the relations of people and their government(s), could ever be proposed which would not include provision for vigilantism and/or domestic insurrection in situations in which means less likely to result in the types of serious consequences which has always caused the Catholic Church to insist that remedies for the rectification of injustices and the resolution of disputes alternative to those involving the use of force, always be exhausted prior to anyone's resorting to force for the accomplishment of such objectives, howsoever legitimate and necessary the use of force for such purposes might be, in a given instance, be, but for the following reasons, asserts that the conditions which would have to be present in order for force to be justifiably utilized in these matters ^{described supra} are not present at this time either because conditions independent of RJM's control render the use of force unnecessary and hence unjustified which are identified as follows

_____, _____ (use additional paper as needed) or because RJM has not proven to this Court's satisfaction that he possesses the requisite combination of adequately adjusted priorities and moral fiber for this Court to now provide him the type of "Declaration of Unconstitutionality as Applied...RJM..." which this Court would understand and consider that RJM would have had to have demonstrated in order for it to provide RJM such type order _____, and that further, correlative to this assertion that RJM simply has not yet demonstrated the possession of such type priorities and moral fiber to this Court's satisfaction, this Court herein informs RJM that if RJM would complain that it would be RJM's position that such position of the Court could not on the whole be justified, that RJM would be welcome to explain to this Court the basis upon which RJM would posit such claim, so that upon the consideration of any such postulations as RJM might present in this regard, this Court could without further delay and the imposition of any further burden upon RJM in this regard, issue the type of order RJM has sought herein, or that RJM would have to satisfy the following exact requirements and/or make the following exact modifications in his priorities and/or *modus operandi* in order to procure the type of order which he has herein sought _____, _____ (use additional paper as necessary).

2. This Court is reluctant to provide any affirmative endorsement of the nature proposed herein, but at this juncture would at least provide a *nihil obstat* - indicating that it could not see any reason why some Court of higher authority than this ought have any reluctance to provide a signature on this document or something similar in regard to the activity of Robert J. More in general (subject to the following restrictions, limitations and prohibitions) _____

Robert J. More
P.O. Box 6926,
Chicago, IL 60680, 312 479-6287

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT, FIRST DISTRICT

ROBERT J. MORE)
Plaintiff)
Vs.) No. 06 M1 301847
AHMED SHAHZAD)
YELLOW CAB COMPANY)
Defendants)

DEFENDANTS' INITIAL MOTIONS IN LIMINE

DefendantS. AHMED SHAHZAD and YELLOW CAB COMPANY, by attorneys, Jesmer & Harris move the Court in limine to prevent inadmissible evidence from being suggested to the jury by any means.

In this motion, Defendants seeks an order precluding the introduction of specific evidence and prohibiting Plaintiff, witnesses, agents and anyone else from discussing, mentioning, alluding to or referring in any manner to particular evidence in the presence of the jury.

As the following topics are inadmissible to any issue involved in this lawsuit, Defendant moves that the Plaintiff, witnesses, agents, etc., be precluded from using any remark, statement, questions, inference, innuendo, reference, discussion or testimony of any nature which might inform the jury or infer to the jury these circumstances, facts or topics. An ordinary trial objection, limiting instruction, and/or motion to strike could not protect Defendants since if any of the following topics were made known to the jury in any manner whatsoever, it would be highly improper, inflammatory and unfairly prejudicial to moving Defendant. Accordingly, Defendant requests an order in limine as to the following matters:

A. Motion in Limine to Bar Use of Documents or Exhibits Not Timely Disclosed or Previously Disclosed.



GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

as to any documents expedite -

B. Motion in Limine to Bar the Comments of Plaintiff.

Plaintiff may not suggest, infer or allude to the jury that he has been prevented from commenting on facts barred by the court or mentioning his opponent objections. Anderson v. Universal Delta, 90 Ill.App.2d 105 234 N.E.2d 21, 25 (1st Dist. 1968).

GRANTED ✓ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

over H's objection

C. Motion in Limine to Bar Speaking/Argumentative Objections.

Defendant seeks an instruction from the court to Plaintiff that any and all arguments or bases for objections during trial be made outside the presence of the jury. Such an instruction is proper given the impropriety of speaking and/or argumentative objections made for the purpose of prejudicing the jury by disclosure of facts and innuendo. Eizeman v. Behn, 9 Ill.App.2d 263, 132 N.E.2d 788. (1st Dist. 1956). Such an instruction is proper as objections themselves as well as statements following objections are prejudiced, highly inflammatory and cannot be cured by the court's ruling or limiting instructions. Ryan v. Monson, 33 Ill.App.2d 406, 179 N.E.2d 449 (1st Dist. 1961).

GRANTED _____



DENIED _____

RULING REERVED _____

D. Motion in Limine to Bar Prior Consistent Statements.

Defendant seeks an order barring witness testimony regarding prior consistent statements. Evidence of statements made prior to trial for the purpose of corroborating testimony at trial is inadmissible. *See, People v. Shum*, 17 Ill.2d 317, 512 N.E.2d 1183 (1987); *In Re: Marriage of Stone*, 197 Ill.App.3d 457, 545 N.E.2d 801 (1990); *People v. Gibson*, 117 Ill.App.3d 270, 452 N.E.2d 1368 (1983); *In Interest of Brunken*, 139 Ill.App.3d 232, 487 N.E.2d 397 (1985).

Evidence of a prior consistent statement is not admissible to corroborate the testimony of the witness even after the witness has been impeached. *See, Walker v. Gilbert*, 27 Ill.App.3d 463, 327 N.E.2d 42 (1975).

Plaintiff, defendants and their attorneys and witnesses should be prohibited from presenting any evidence on, commenting or alluding to prior consistent statements made by any witness called on behalf of the Party, and/or examined by said Party.


GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

E. Motion in Limine Regarding Insurance.

Defendant moves this Honorable Court for an order in limine, prohibiting the mention of any insurance company, insurance administrator, insurance adjuster or self insured, primary or excess coverage for reasons that are irrelevant and prejudicial. Further, Defendant requests that this Court instruct the parties and their witnesses to refrain from referring to, arguing, or making references to the existence of insurance.

The insurance coverage or lack thereof of any party to this matter is irrelevant as it does not bear on the question of negligence or damages and would be highly prejudicial if heard by the jury. Koonce ex. Rel. Koonce v. Pacilio, 307 Ill.App.3d 449 718 N.E.2d 628, (1st Dist. 1999); Lenz v. Julian, 276 Ill.App.3d 66, 657 N.E.2d 712 (2nd Dist. 1995); Neyzelman v. Treitman, 273 Ill.App.3d 511, 652 N.E.2d 1300 (1st Dist. 1995).

GRANTED _____



DENIED _____

RULING REERVED _____

F. Motion in Limine to Bar Any Reference to Settlement Negotiations.

Defendant moves this Honorable Court for an order in limine prohibiting and barring all parties from referring to the settlement negotiations which went on prior to the trial of this matter and/or the absence of settlement negotiations between the parties involved. Any such references would have no relevance to any issue in this lawsuit and would serve no purpose other than to prejudice Defendant. Generally, matters concerning settlement and negotiations are not admissible. Garcez by and through Chicago Title and Trust Co. v. Michel, 272 Ill.App.3d 346, 348-9, 668 N.E.2d 194, 196 (1st Dist. 1996).

In Illinois there are two underlying public policy reasons prohibiting the admission of such evidence. First, an agreement to settle does not constitute an admission of guilt and is therefore irrelevant. Id. Second, admitting evidence of settlements and negotiations would contravene public policy by discouraging litigants from settling before trial. See Barkei v. DelNor Hospital, 176 Ill.App.3d 681, 531 N.E.2d 413 (1988).

In the case at bar, any mention of settlement negotiations, or the lack thereof is both irrelevant and contrary to public policy. As such, Plaintiff should be barred from mentioning, directly or indirectly, any reference to ~~(Georgia Pacific)~~ settlement offers or negotiations.

In addition, the probative value of any reference to any settlement negotiations is substantially outweighed by its prejudicial effect. The trial court may exclude evidence if it finds that the probative value of the evidence is slight and is outweighed by the tendency to unduly prejudice, mislead, or confuse the jury. Pyskaty v. Oyama, 266 Ill.App.3d 801, 641 N.E.2d 552, 568 (1994).

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

✓
w/o why

H. Motion in limine to bar testimony regarding the pecuniary circumstances of any of the parties.

The wealth of the defendant or the poverty of the plaintiffs or the pecuniary circumstances of any of the parties is not admissible to any issue herein. *Hedge vs. Midwest Contractors Equipment*, 53 Ill.App.2d.365, 202 N.E.2d.869,

Defendant anticipates that Plaintiff will attempt to introduce evidence of Defendant=s financial status, net worth, etc. Evidence of Defendant=s financial status or net worth or other facilities is relevant only to the issue of punitive damages. Pickering v. Owens-Corning Fiberglass Corp., 265 Ill.App.3d 806, 638 N.E.2d 1127 (1994). Evidence of Defendant=s net worth should be barred as there has been no determination that such evidence is relevant and warranted. Any testimony, comments, or opinions regarding the financial status of Defendant should be barred. The issue of Defendant=s financial status has no relevance or materiality to any of the issues in this case.

Any mention of Defendant=s financial status would be highly inflammatory and unfairly prejudicial against Defendant. The financial condition of the Defendant is immaterial and may be prejudicial. Stathis v. Geldermann, Inc., 295 Ill.App.3d 844, 692 N.E.2d 798 (1st Dist. 1998); Chicago Daily News Emp. Credit Union v. Reed, 42 Ill.App.2d 336, 192 N.E.2d 447 (1st Dist. 1963); Plooy v. Paryani, 275 Ill.App.2d 1074, 657 N.E.2d 12 (1st Dist. 1995).

↓

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

I. Motion in limine to exclude from the courtroom all non-party witnesses.

Defendants seek an order excluding from the courtroom any and all non party witnesses who intend to testify in this case prior to the time of their testimony. *None vs. Olehy, 297 Il.160.*



GRANTED _____

DENIED _____

RULING REERVED _____

M. Motion in Limine to Bar Evidence of Medical Treatment Not Previously Disclosed

Defendant moves to bar any evidence or testimony by any of Plaintiff=s treating physicians and/or witnesses regarding any treatment or examination of Plaintiff not previously disclosed and to bar any opinions based in full or in part upon an examination or treatment of the Plaintiff not previously disclosed.

Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 213, 214, 237 and 219(c), Plaintiff should be barred from calling any witnesses introducing evidence and opinions not properly disclosed in discovery.

Such testimony would surprise and prejudice Defendant. Defendant has relied upon the disclosures of Plaintiff and would not be able to prepare against late disclosures and opinions beyond the scope of disclosed testimony, in violation of Supreme Court Rules 213 and 218.

Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 213, 214, 237 and 219(c), Plaintiff should be barred from calling any witnesses for the purposes of introducing opinions not properly disclosed in discovery. *See Adami v. Belmonte*, 302 Ill.App.3d 17, 704 N.E.2d 708 (1st Dist. 1998); *Dept. Of Transportation vs. Crull*, 294 Ill.App.3d 531, 690 N.E.2d 143 (4th Dist. 1998).

GRANTED  _____

DENIED _____

RULING REERVED _____

W/D

**N. Motion in Limine to Bar Plaintiff from Inference or Direct Testimony
that Defendant Delayed the Trial in this Cause.**

Plaintiff should be barred from inferring or directly commenting that Defendant and its attorneys or employees have ever delayed the trial of this cause. Such evidence is irrelevant and would be grossly and unfairly prejudicial to Defendant.

GRANTED

DENIED

RULING REERVED

O. Motion in Limine as to Certain Comments of Plaintiff

Bar comments as to the truth or credibility of evidence based upon the personal opinion or personal knowledge of counsel. Central Information Financial Services, Ltd. vs. First National Bank of Decatur, 128 Ill.App.3d.1052, 471 N.E.2d.992 (4th Dist. 1984) (Implication of personal knowledge of facts not before the jury.

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____



P. Motion in Limine as to Certain Argument of Counsel

Bar comment or argument that the jurors place themselves in the shoes of the Plaintiff. See Offutt vs. Pennoyer Merchants Transfer Company, 36 Ill.App.3d.194, 343 N.E.2d.665 (1st Dist. 1976).

Defendant

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

1

Q. Motion in Limine to Bar Admission of Hearsay Testimony.

Parties may attempt to elicit testimony from various witnesses regarding what they heard said by unidentified individuals not parties to this litigation. An attempt may be made to elicit testimony as to “verbal acts” or “implied hearsay,” or may attempt to elicit testimony as to self-serving statements made by defendant, KATHLEEN MULLALLY, after the occurrence, which are not subject to any exception to the hearsay rule. The aforementioned testimony would be hearsay and should be barred.

Statements which are made out-of-court can not be admitted into evidence for the purpose of proving the matter asserted by the statements.

Hearsay evidence is testimony in court or written evidence, of a statement made out of court, such statement being offered as an assertion to show the truth of the matter asserted therein, and thus resting for its value upon the credibility of the out-of-court asserter. People v. Carpenter, 28 Ill.2d 116, 121, 190 N.E.2d 732 (1963). See also People v. Rogers, 81 Ill.2d 571, 44 Ill.Dec. 254, 411 N.E.2d 223 (1980). Accord- McCormick, Evidence Section 246 (Cleary Ed. 1972).

Hearsay evidence is an out-of-court statement offered to prove the truth of the matter asserted, and it is generally inadmissible due to its lack of reliability. . . ≅ People v. Olinger, 176 Ill.2d 326, 680 N.E.2d 321 (1997).

Words are not the only method to communicate specific facts. “Verbal acts” are the nodding of the head, the pointing with a finger. Regardless what method is used to communicate, the “verbal act” will be treated as hearsay if the result is to bring into court any such “statement.” Hearsay includes conduct or action that is tantamount to a statement, such as the fact that the decedent pointed to an individual when asked who had committed a crime. **People v. Reeves** 360 Ill. 55, 195 NE 443 (1935)

In addition, those actions which, in themselves, amount to statements which, if offered in evidence for their truth are hearsay. Such statements may be reasonably inferred from the conduct of the actor, even though no such statement was actually made. This is referred to as “implied hearsay.” The classic example of “implied

hearsay” is testimony that an individual opened an umbrella while walking in the street. This testimony is hearsay in that it implies that it is raining. **People v. Bush** 300 Ill. 532, 133 NE 201 (1921)

Parties should be barred from presenting any testimony from witnesses as to statements of non-parties; and witnesses should be barred from testifying to such actions by non-parties that fall within the parameter of “verbal acts” and “implied hearsay.” Such actions as being bumped by a non-party, implying that was purposefully done, or whether a non-party said or did not say “excuse me” or used more colorful language is hearsay. Such testimony is inherently unreliable and its prejudicial value would substantially outweigh its probative value.

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

R. BAR TESTIMONY REGARDING MEDICAL BILLS, WHICH HAVE NOT BEEN PAID, WITHOUT FOUNDATION AS TO NECESSITY AND REASONABLENESS OF THE AMOUNTS ON THE BILLS.

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

S. TRAFFIC CITATIONS.

Bar testimony that defendant received a traffic citation as a result of this accident and bar testimony as to any other traffic citations.

GRANTED _____ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

T. OTHER ACCIDENTS.

Defendants move that there be no mention of any accidents in which the Defendant may have been involved at any time prior or subsequent to the occurrence complained of, whether while operating a taxi cab or not.

GRANTED ✓ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

U. CITIZENSHIP & ETHNICITY

Defendants move that there be no mention made of the ethnicity of the Defendant, AHMED SHAHZAD. Bar any mention of the Plaintiff or Defendant's citizenship or alien status in the United States.

GRANTED ✓ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

V. Bar any mention or any reference to any behavior on the part of the Defendant subsequent to the occurrence, evidencing lack of concern, lack of cooperation or hostility, absent a showing that such behavior contributed to the injuries of the Plaintiff, ~~CRYSTLE SAYLOR.~~ *Robert J. Taylor*


GRANTED ✓ DENIED _____ RULING REERVED _____

CONCLUSION

Defendants respectfully request the court to instruct the Plaintiff, not to mention, refer to, interrogate concerning, or attempt to convey to the jury in any manner, either directly or indirectly, any of the above-mentioned matters without first obtaining permission of this court outside the presence and hearing of the jury and further instruct the Plaintiff, co-defendant and counsel not to make any reference to the fact that this motion has been filed and allowed and to warn and caution each and every one of their witnesses and agents to follow these instructions.

Respectfully submitted,

JESMER AND HARRIS

By : 
Eugene N. Traunfeld

Eugene N. Traunfeld
Jesmer and Harris #90311
Attorneys for Defendant,
150 North west Point
Elk Grove Village, IL
847 700 8311

06-M1-301847 MORE ROBERT J

V.

SHAHZAD AHMED
JOHN DOE CONSTRUCT
YELLOW CAB COMPANY

DISPOSED

RETURN DAY _____ SET CALL 08/19/2008 ROOM 1306 TIME 9:00 TRIAL CALL MOTIONS OF COURSE 12/12/2008ROOM 1306 TIME 9:00

05/10/2006 MORE ROBERT J

1024 PERSONAL INJURY(MOTOR VEHICLE) COMPLAINT FILED (JURY DEMAND) FOR 1,000.00 FEES 141.50
99800 MORE ROBERT J 2008 S BLUE ISLAND CHICAGO IL 80000

05/11/2006

05/19/2006 SHAHZAD AHMED

3421 ALIAS SUMMONS ISSUED AND RETURNABLE FOR 06/19/2006 AT 09:30 A.M.

SHAHZAD AHMED

05/30/2006

05/19/2006 NATIONAL REGD AGTS

3421 ALIAS SUMMONS ISSUED AND RETURNABLE FOR 06/19/2006 AT 09:30 A.M.

NATIONAL REGD AGTS

05/30/2006

06/05/2006 SHAHZAD AHMED

4406 CASE SET ON STATUS CALL FOR 07/12/2006 AT 09:30 A.M. IN ROOM 1501

HEALY MICHAEL THOMAS

06/05/2006

06/06/2006 YELLOW CAB COMPANY

2320 SUMMONS NOT SERVED - CERTIFIED MAIL - FOR 06/06/2006

06/08/2006

06/12/2006 SHAHZAD AHMED

2154 SUMMONS SERVED - CERTIFIED MAIL - FOR 05/31/2006

06/16/2006

06/19/2006 YELLOW CAB COMPANY

0900 APPEARANCE FILED - FEE PAID -

07/11/2006

90311 JESMER HARRIS

150 NORTHWEST POINT ELK GROVE V IL

60007

07/12/2006 MORE ROBERT J

4295 ORDER ON MOTION TO CLOSE DISCOVERY - ALLOWED - FOR 07/12/2006 863302

07/20/2006

07/12/2006 MORE ROBERT J

7210 CASE TRANSFERRED TO MANDATORY ARBITRATION - ALLOWED - 863302

07/20/2006

07/14/2006 MORE ROBERT J

3303 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

JESMER HARRIS

07/24/2006

07/14/2006 MORE ROBERT J

3390 MOTION FILED

JESMER HARRIS

07/24/2006

MISSING PLEADINGS

07/14/2006 MORE ROBERT J JESMER HARRIS
3397 MOTION SPINDLED FOR 08/10/2006 AT 10:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1501

07/24/2006

07/31/2006 MORE ROBERT J *** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN ***
3499 MANDATORY ARBITRATION HEARING POST CARD MAILED FOR 10/13/2006 AT 02:00 P.M.

07/31/2006

08/08/2006 SHAHZAD AHMED
0909 APPEARANCE FILED - NO FEE PAID -
90811 JESMER HARRIS 150 NORTHWEST POINT

08/23/2006

ELK GROVE V IL

60007

08/08/2006 YELLOW CAB COMPANY
0909 APPEARANCE FILED - NO FEE PAID -
90311 JESMER HARRIS 150 NORTHWEST POINT

08/23/2006

ELK GROVE V IL

60007

CONTINUED

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3392 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3390 MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3390 MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
4282 TRANSFER CASE TO FOR 05/17/2007 AT 10:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1410 621675

JOHNSON MOIRA S.

05/24/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
4519 CASE SET ON CASE MANAGEMENT CALL FOR 07/11/2007 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1410 621675

JOHNSON MOIRA S.

05/24/2007

07/11/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3203 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

07/11/2007

07/11/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3392 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED

MORE ROBERT J

07/11/2007

07/11/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3396 MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

07/11/2007

07/11/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3397 MOTION SPINDED FOR 08/21/2007 AT 09:30 A.M. IN ROOM 1410

MORE ROBERT J

07/11/2007

07/11/2007 MORE ROBERT J
4282 TRANSFER CASE TO FOR 07/11/2007 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 872639

JOHNSON MOIRA S.

07/19/2007

07/11/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
4782 TRANSFER CASE TO FOR 07/11/2007 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1501 900916

WILLIAMS, SHELLI D.

07/24/2007

07/11/2007 MORE ROBERT J
4519 CASE SET ON CASE MANAGEMENT CALL FOR 08/21/2007 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 872639

JOHNSON MOIRA S.

07/19/2007

07/11/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
8212 RECUSAL - ALLOWED 900916

WILLIAMS, SHELLI D.

07/24/2007

08/21/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
4330 STRIKE FROM MOTION CALL - ALLOWED 1131257

WILLIAMS, SHELLI D.

09/05/2007

~~08/21/2007~~ SHAHZAD AHMED
~~8065~~ DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION 1121311

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

09/05/2007

~~08/28/2007~~ MORE ROBERT J
3363 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

08/28/2007

~~08/28/2007~~ MORE ROBERT J
~~3372~~ PROOF OF SERVICE FILED

MORE ROBERT J

08/28/2007

~~08/28/2007~~ MORE ROBERT J
~~3390~~ MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

08/28/2007

CONTINUED

08/28/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3397 MOTION SPINDLED FOR 09/27/2007 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306
MORE ROBERT J 08/28/2007

09/27/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
4819 CASE CONTINUED FOR CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE - ALLOWED - FOR 11/06/2007 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 1294274
HARRIS, SHELDON A. 10/04/2007

09/27/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
4902 VACATE JUDGMENT/DISSISSAL - ALLOWED 1294274
HARRIS, SHELDON A. 10/04/2007

11/08/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3890 MOTION FILED
MORE ROBERT J 11/16/2007

11/06/2007 MORE ROBERT J
8005 DISMISSED FOR WANT OF PROSECUTION 1512012
HARRIS, SHELDON A. 11/14/2007

11/15/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
3324 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF OFFICE FILED
*** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN *** 12/11/2007

11/15/2007 JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION
3324 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF OFFICE FILED
*** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN *** 12/11/2007

11/15/2007 YELLOW CAB COMPANY
3324 NOTICE OF CHANGE OF OFFICE FILED
*** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN *** 12/11/2007

11/15/2007 SHAHZAD AHMED
3372 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED
*** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN *** 12/11/2007

11/15/2007 JOHN DOE CONSTRUCTION
3372 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED
*** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN *** 12/11/2007

11/15/2007 YELLOW CAB COMPANY
3372 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED
*** ATTORNEY UNKNOWN *** 12/11/2007

01/08/2008 MORE ROBERT J
3303 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED
MORE ROBERT J 01/08/2008

01/08/2008 MORE ROBERT J
3372 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED
MORE ROBERT J 01/08/2008

01/08/2008 MORE ROBERT J
3390 MOTION FILED
MORE ROBERT J 01/08/2008

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3004 EXHIBITS FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3008 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3009 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

05/17/2007 MORE ROBERT J
3072 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED

MORE ROBERT J

06/08/2007

CONTINUED

01/08/2008 MORE ROBERT J MORE ROBERT J
3397 MOTION SPINDLED FOR 01/22/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

01/08/2008

01/22/2008 MORE ROBERT J MORE ROBERT J
3303 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

01/22/2008

01/22/2008 MORE ROBERT J MORE ROBERT J
~~3390~~ MOTION FILED

01/22/2008

01/22/2008 MORE ROBERT J MORE ROBERT J
~~3397~~ MOTION SPINDLED FOR 01/31/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

01/22/2008

CONTINUED

01/22/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

SNYDER JAMES E

ALLOWED - 70248

01/24/2008

4284 ORDER ON MOTION TO STRIKE OR WITHDRAW MOTION OR PETITION

01/31/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

SHAPIRO JAMES A

ALLOWED FOR 02/07/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 114120

02/01/2008

4419 CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FROM MOTION CALL - ALLOWED FOR 02/07/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

02/07/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

ALLOWED - 161142

02/19/2008

4206 ORDER ON MOTION TO ANSWER INTERROGATORIES - ALLOWED - 161142

02/07/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

ALLOWED - 161142

02/19/2008

4215 ORDER ON MOTION TO COMPLY - ALLOWED - 161142

02/07/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

ALLOWED - 161142

02/19/2008

4229 ORDER ON MOTION TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE, TESTIMONY OR A WITNESS - ALLOWED - 161142

02/07/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

ALLOWED - 161142

02/19/2008

4296 ORDER ON MOTION TO DISCOVERY - ALLOWED - 161142

02/07/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

161142

02/19/2008

4482 CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FOR 06/11/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

02/07/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

ALLOWED 161141

02/19/2008

4902 VACATE JUDGMENT/DISMISSAL - ALLOWED 161141

05/30/2008 MORE ROBERT J

MORE ROBERT J

NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

05/30/2008

3803 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

05/30/2008 MORE ROBERT J

MORE ROBERT J

MOTION FILED

05/30/2008

3390 MOTION FILED

05/30/2008 MORE ROBERT J

MORE ROBERT J

MOTION SPINDLED FOR 06/10/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

05/30/2008

3397 MOTION SPINDLED FOR 06/10/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

06/10/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

MINNELIA MARY REGINA

STRIKE FROM THE CALL - ALLOWED - FOR 06/10/2008 830054

06/11/2008

4304 STRIKE FROM THE CALL - ALLOWED - FOR 06/10/2008 830054

06/10/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

MINNELIA MARY REGINA

CASE CONTINUED FOR TRIAL - MOTION PLAINTIFF - ALLOWED 830054

06/11/2008

4415 CASE CONTINUED FOR TRIAL - MOTION PLAINTIFF - ALLOWED 830054

06/10/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

MINNELIA MARY REGINA

CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FOR 07/16/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 830054

06/11/2008

4482 CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FOR 07/16/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 830054

1/2 sheet

83-0054

06/11/2008	SHAHZAD AHMED		DUNFORD LAURENCE J	06/17/2008
4304	STRIKE FROM THE CALL - ALLOWED - FOR 06/11/2008		840618	
07/16/2008	SHAHZAD AHMED		DUNFORD LAURENCE J	07/17/2008
4215	ORDER ON MOTION TO COMPLY - ALLOWED - 1000369			
07/16/2008	SHAHZAD AHMED		DUNFORD LAURENCE J	07/17/2008
4293	ORDER ON MOTION TO ASSESS COSTS - ALLOWED - 1000369			
07/16/2008	SHAHZAD AHMED		DUNFORD LAURENCE J	07/17/2008
4482	CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FOR 07/30/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306		1000370	

CONTINUED

~~07/16/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

07/17/2008

5215 ORDER ON MOTION TO COMPLY - DENIED - 1000370

~~07/16/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

07/17/2008

5292 ORDER ON MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT OR PETITION - DENIED - 1000370

~~07/16/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

07/17/2008

8001 JUDGMENT FOR PLAINTIFF FOR 100.00 1000369

~~07/30/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED LIPSCOMB THOMAS J

07/31/2008

4482 CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FOR 08/13/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 1063906

~~08/13/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J MORE ROBERT J

08/26/2008

3290 MOTION FILED

~~08/13/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/18/2008

4482 CASE SET ON TRIAL CALL FOR 08/19/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306 1130337

~~08/19/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/21/2008

4220 ORDER ON MOTION TO DEPOSIT MONIES OR FUNDS - ALLOWED - 1160512

~~08/19/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/21/2008

4220 ORDER ON MOTION TO DEPOSIT MONIES OR FUNDS - ALLOWED - 1160513

~~08/19/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/21/2008

4333 JUDGMENT TO STAND - ALLOWED 1160513

~~08/19/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/21/2008

5215 ORDER ON MOTION TO COMPLY - DENIED - 1160515

~~08/19/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/21/2008

5246 ORDER ON MOTION TO MOTION TO - DENIED - 1160514

~~08/19/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED DUNFORD LAURENCE J

08/21/2008

9206 ORDER ON MOTION TO CONFIRMATION OF JUDGMENT - DENIED - 1160512

~~09/16/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J MORE ROBERT J

09/16/2008

3803 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

~~09/16/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J
3372 PROOF OF SERVICE FILED

MORE ROBERT J

09/16/2008

~~09/16/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J
3390 MOTION FILED

MORE ROBERT J

09/16/2008

~~09/16/2008~~ MORE ROBERT J
3397 MOTION SPINDLED FOR 12/12/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

MORE ROBERT J

09/16/2008

~~10/10/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED
3303 NOTICE OF MOTION FILED

JESMER HARRIS

10/10/2008

~~10/10/2008~~ SHAHZAD AHMED
3390 MOTION FILED

JESMER HARRIS

10/10/2008

CONTINUED

10/10/2008 SHAHZAD AHMED

JESMER HARRIS

10/10/2008

3397 MOTION SPINDLED FOR 10/20/2008 AT 09:00 A.M. IN ROOM 1306

10/20/2008 MORE ROBERT J

DUNFORD LAURENCE J

10/24/2008

5285 ORDER ON MOTION TO STRIKE OR VACATE AN ORDER - DENIED - 1443807

11/14/2008 MORE ROBERT

MORE ROBERT

11/14/2008

3323 NOTICE OF APPEAL FILED

*** END OF DATA FOR CASE 06-M1-301847 ** LAST UPDATED ON 11/14/2008 ***

5/20/94) CCL 0529

**APPEAL TO THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST DISTRICT
FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT MUNICIPAL DIVISION**

CIRCUIT COURT NO.: 06 M1 301847
TRIAL JUDGE: HON. LAWRENCE DUNFORD
REVIEWING COURT NO.: 08-3166

**ROBERT MORE ("RJM") Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the
World Safe for Innocence Once Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund
(allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can still
justify not hating)**

Plaintiff/Appellant,

Vs.

SHAZHAD, Yellow Cab, et al

Defendant/Appellees.

**DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT**

PER *Charlotte Bleich*
DEPUTY

VOLUME 1 OF 1 TOTAL VOLUMES.

A Notice of Appeal has been filed in case **06 M1 301847**.

Upon receipt of this request, the court file shall be removed from its current location and placed in the personal custody of the Division/District Chief Deputy Clerk until the file can be transmitted to the Civil Appeals Division. Any request to view the file shall be permitted under the supervision of the Chief Deputy Clerk or his/her designee.

Please arrange to have the entire file, including any and all loose paper, delivered to the Civil Appeals Division located in Room 801 of the Richard J. Daley Center. It is critical that the file be transmitted as soon as it is feasible. Delays may have a detrimental impact on the timely preparation of the Record on Appeal.

Please reply to this email no later than November 19, 2008 if this case was transferred out of your division or if the file is in the warehouse. However, please remember, this case has had very recent court activity that is the subject of this appeal. The file and loose paper therefore may be in your division/district or in the courtroom.

If you have any questions, problems or if you have already sent the file, please contact my manager, Mary Ann Neitzke at 312-603-5138 or me via email or at 312-603-5523.

Please transmit the file and loose paper to the Civil Appeals Division no later than November 19, 2008.

Thank you.

11/17/08 10:46

APPEAL TO THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS, FIRST DISTRICT
FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

Robert More ("RJM") , Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once
Again, St. Michael the Archangel, Fund(allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of
everything God can still justify not hating)

Plaintiff-Appellant,

Vs.

A. Shazhad, Yellow Cab, et al,

Defendants-Appellees.

CIRCUIT COURT NUMBER: 06 M1 301847
TRIAL JUDGE: Hon. Laurence J. Dunford
REVIEWING COURT NUMBER: 08-3166

The record has been prepared and certified in the form required for transmission to the reviewing court. It consists of:

- 1 volume/s of Common Law Record
- 0 volume/s of Report of Proceedings
- 0 volume/s or Description of Exhibits

(Here set forth a detailed table of contents of the record on appeal.)

Kindly acknowledge receipt of this record on the attached copy of this letter.

I do further certify that this certification of the record pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 324, is issued out of my office this 14th day of December, 2009.

Dorothy Brown
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

CC: Robert J. More
Appellant's attorney
P.O. BOX 6926
Address
Chicago, Illinois 60680
City/State/Zip

Received this above record this
_____ day of _____

CLERK OF THE REVIEWING COURT

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

#1

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

4215
8001
4293
5292
6240
5215

Robert More

v.

Shahzad, et al.

Page 1 of

No. 06M1301847

ORDER

With this matter coming for hearing at trial, It is Hereby Ordered: Defendants, Ahmed Shahzad + Yellow Cab Company ~~confes~~ motion to confess judgment in the sum of \$1,000.00 is granted. Judgment is entered for Plaintiff, Robert More and ~~Yellow Cab Company~~ Ahmed Shahzad in the sum of \$1,000 plus costs in the sum of \$141.50. The matter is continued ~~for~~ to July 30, 2008 at 9:00 AM for filing of release + satisfaction of judgment or Motion for leave to deposit proceeds with Clerk of Court.

Atty. No.: 90311

Name: Jessee Hamis

Atty. for: Defendants

Address: 150 NW Pt.

City/State/Zip: Elmhurst V. Ilge

Telephone: 847-700-8338

ENTERED: Court for release + Satisfaction of Judgment

Dated: _____

Judge See page 2

Judge's No.

C00070

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

page 1 of 2

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS

42902
42910
42 More

42209
Shayhad et al

42209
42152
4432

Line # 2

No. 06-MC-301848

INTAKE AND SCR 218 CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER

This matter having come on to be heard pursuant to notice to the parties that this matter is now assigned from Room 1501 Assignment Call to Room _____ for Intake and Management Conference in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 218 as well as firm trial setting, the Court having considered the following specific matters orders as follows:

- 1) TRIAL DATE: This matter is set for trial at 9:30 ^{9:00} ~~9:30~~ a.m. ^{June 11} ~~July 12~~, 2008. All witnesses shall be available for trial that day unless otherwise ordered.
- 2) ADDITIONAL SETTING: This matter is also set on _____, _____ at _____ a.m. p.m. for hearing on _____.
- 3) The Plaintiff Robert J. More claims that MEDICAL CARE, TREATMENT, AND SERVICES RECEIVED are itemized as follows:

PROVIDER	\$ PAID	\$ UNPAID
Stroger Hospital		X-ray, exam

These shall be admitted into evidence as to the paid portions pursuant to the rules governing the admission of paid bills. Unpaid amounts shall be admitted only after proper foundational testimony has been reviewed in this conference.

- 4) The Plaintiff Robert J More is making a claim for FUTURE MEDICAL AND FUTURE PAIN AND SUFFERING and will be calling Chief Medical Officer, Stroger Hospital as their opinion witness on these issues. Said opinions to be produced in writing within 60 days or the claim is barred.
- 5) The Plaintiff Robert J More claims LOST TIME AND/OR LOST WAGES in the amount of \$ _____ to this date, and pursuant to the Defendant's request for tax returns, accompanying schedules, and W-2 Forms, Plaintiff shall produce same for the year of the occurrence as well as the year prior and year subsequent thereto within 30 days or the claim is barred.
- 6) The Plaintiff Robert J More claims ADDITIONAL ITEMS OF DAMAGES, reviewed pursuant to this order and to be presented at trial, itemized as follows:

(1) Time spent from time of accident until release from Stroger Hospital, Inconvenience to ride bike except w/ one leg pedaling for 3 weeks. Inconvenience

to use any cardiovascular equipment for almost 4 weeks.

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

R J Brown

v.

Shayheed et al

No. 06 M1 301847

ORDER

It is herein ordered that no member of any policing entity shall interfere with any activity of Robert J Brown which might frustrate, impede and/or obstruct any endeavor of RJB to complete the prosecution of this case except according to the terms & conditions ("TLC") specified in the accompanying:

Atty. No.: _____
Name: 1/1/07
Atty. for: *RJ Brown*
Address: _____
City/State/Zip: _____
Telephone: 4786287

ENTERED:

Dated: _____
Deniel 2-708
Judge _____ Judge's No. _____

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

000063

**APPEAL TO THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS
FIRST DISTRICT
FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, MUNICIPAL DIVISION**

**CIRCUIT COURT NO.: 06 M1 301847
TRIAL JUDGE: HON. LAURENCE DUNFORD
REVIEWING COURT NO.: 08-3166**

Robert More ("RJM"), Estate of RJM, Campaign to Make the World Safe for Innocence Once Again,
St. Michael the Archangel, Fund (allegedly, and hopefully, in fact, on behalf of everything God can
still justify not hating)

Plaintiff-Appellant,

vs.,

A. Shazhad,, Yellow Cab, et al

Defendants-Appellees.

**DOROTHY BROWN
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT**

Charlotte Bleid PER
DEPUTY

VOLUME 1 OF 1 TOTAL VOLUMES

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

STATE OF ILLINOIS

SS:

COUNTY OF COOK

PLEAS, before the Honorable Laurence J. Dunford one of the Judges of the Circuit Court of Cook County, in the State of Illinois, holding a branch Court of said Circuit Court, at the Court House in said County and State, on October 20th, 2008.

PRESENT: The Honorable Laurence J. Dunford
Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County

Attest: DOROTHY BROWN, Clerk

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

STATE OF ILLINOIS

SS:

COUNTY OF COOK

PLEAS, before the Honorable Laurence J. Dunford one of the Judges of the Circuit Court of Cook County, in the State of Illinois, holding a branch Court of said Circuit Court, at the Court House in said County and State, on October 20th, 2008.

**PRESENT: The Honorable Laurence J. Dunford
Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County**

Attest: DOROTHY BROWN, Clerk

DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT 1ST. DISTRI

PLAINTIFF *Mae*
 VS.
 DEFENDANT *Shackford*
 PLAINTIFF'S ATTY.

RETURN DAY	NUMBER
COMPLAINT FILED, SUMMONS ISSUED, RETURNABLE IN ROOM 602	<i>06/1-301847</i>
PLAINTIFF	
FEE \$	
<i>SOL. FLD. RET. SERV. JUN 19 2008</i>	

ADDITIONAL NAMES	DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED	DATE	JUDGE	MEMORANDA OF POSTPONEMENTS
	<i>7/12/07</i>	<i>1855</i>	<i>Call 1306-8-21-07 at 9am. DW P 9:55AM. (T Nic-) D.O.</i>			<i>transferred</i>
			<i>see DW P summons 11/6/07 9:00A.D.O</i>			
			<i>IT Nic - IT called esp cell</i>			
			<i>advising he cannot attend because "After one of the him"</i>			<i>A/C Mrs to</i>
			<i>DOCP - presented - STRICKEN</i>			
			<i>IT present - STRICKEN</i>			
			<i>ETC 2.7.08 9:00A.D.O</i>			
			<i>11-6-08 - DW P 9:00A.D.O</i>			

DATE	JUDGE	ORDERS ENTERED	DATE	PAPERS FILED AND WRITS ISSUED
		N + Δ 21 days to move; 60 days to answer motions in limine; get a summary		33
		TR 6.11.08 9:00 AM D.D.		33
	Assoc. Judge Mary Regina Minella 1912	JUN 10 2008 Motion to continue trial is granted		33
		Trial reset to 7/16/08 at 9 AM		33
		Trial date of 6/11/08 is stricken		33
	Judge Lawrence J. Benford 1877	JUL 16 2008 Motion by Defendant to allow judgment for \$100000 on behalf of both Defendants as granted - Judgment is entered in the amount of \$100000 against both Defendants. Notice of judgment and this judgment is now deemed as satisfactory. Judgment set to 7-30-08 for entry of judgment of Defendant		33
	Judge Lawrence J. Benford 1877	AUG 13 2008 Mot. ETC 8.13.08 9:00 AM Dec.		33
	Judge Lawrence J. Benford 1877	AUG 13 2008 Mot. ETC 8-19-08 9:00 AM		33
	Judge Lawrence J. Benford 1877	AUG 19 2008 Mot to court & all members of Aug 13, 2008 denied - A's motion to pay \$1600 + 14/150 To Clerk of Court transferred by of Judgment awarded - \$1,415 To pay for costs suspended This rule 298 and \$10000 to be held by T.		33

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

State of Illinois SS the Chief Judge of said Circuit Court, for the holding of said Court, the name of the Judge, the names of several Judges severally, presiding on the day or on the several days on which proceedings were had in said Court, being as herein above and hereinafter stated, Under the columns headed "JUDGE"

ATTEST: DOROTHY BROWN, CLERK
RICHARD DEVINE, STATES ATTORNEY
MICHAEL F. SHEAHAN, SHERIFF

0/000.00
6/1 9/06 06M-30
847

Robert J More
Plaintiff
vs
Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow Cab Company, and John Doe Construction Company
Defendant

Case #

05 MAR 20 PM 4:08 1501

VERIFIED COMPLAINT OF 3/20/06

The plaintiff claims as follows: Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule No. 282, the Plaintiff ("RJM") herein avers that he was a resident at the Lugo Hotel ("LH") at 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, during the period in which the causes of action of which this complaint consists accrued. Plaintiff resides at the time of the filing of this complaint at: 2008 S. Blue Island, Chicago, IL 60608, & a phone number at which a message can be left is 949 723-7856. At the time of the accident, the Defendant cab driver Ahmed Shahzad resided at 2 Sunset Court, Bensenville, IL, 60106, the office of the Defendant Yellow Cab Co. was located at 2223 S.Wabash St. Chicago, IL and the name and the office of the Defendant construction company is unknown as of the date of the filing of this complaint, but will be added very shortly.

1. In as much as participation in the moral and social cancer of opportunism that so plagues this society at this juncture in its continued deterioration, will evidently be almost as difficult to justify on judgment day as will be the practice of making unjustified concessions to the heavyhanded and abusive practices of the many predator-bullies throwing their weight around at the expense of the weak and vulnerable in the society in which this complaint is being filed, RJM herein pledges, without reservation, the money he will obtain from this lawsuit to the spiritual and corporal works of mercy of the Non-counterfeit Catholic Church, which means practically that the money be held by either Mr. Jeff Lonigro or Most Holy Family Monastery for a period of one year to decide how it ought be allocated and then that it be allocated to some such work – either the BVM Queen of Heaven Charities or some other Non-counterfeit Catholic Charity (given the seriousness of the matters involving the removal of the feeding tube from Teresa Schiavo, which resulted in her government facilitated torture and murder under the color of law and pretext of legitimacy exactly one year ago to this date, and the importance of having persons in positions of authority who will never let such type abomination occur again in this country, it is in fact RJM's objective to donate the entirety of the damages procured in the case this complaint concerns to what has been established as the St. Michael the Archangel Defense of Public Officials and Government Employees Subjected to Retaliation for Refusals to Capitulate Fund and a contribution of the damages sought, to such cause or some similar entity, would bring the matters this complaint concerns to closure without this Court's having to have anything further to do with this case). One of the provisions of this policy is that RJM will never see one penny of the award that will eventually be collected. RJM understands the obligation imposed upon him by the requirements of the moral law to keep any alloyed or *other than beyond reproach*, motives, off of and out of, his record of conduct, and there is always a temptation to induce others to commit torts so that one can benefit from such duty breaches and this is a temptation that must be resisted at all costs in the spiritual warfare that constitutes human existence in this world, conducted as it at all times is, under the long shadow of the uneliminable problem of conditional salvation.

2. RJM is ever conscious that he must continue to help bear the burdens howsoever onerous this burden-bearing may ever seem to, or actually, be, of the maintenance and restoration of the social order, and opportunism is the antithesis of the solidarity called for by the Gospel of Jesus Christ and the teaching of the Church he established and still directs. RJM has seen too many souls ruined by the benefit they have received from the misfortune and/or worse, sin, of (an)other(s) to not be solicitous to avoid falling into the same sorry state into which such souls have fallen (cf what are alleged to constitute former FAA Representative Rodney Stich's claims regarding the alleged efforts of PI Attorneys to prevent the FAA from identifying and correcting aviation problems that have later caused airplane crashes). It lamentably so frequently happens that when one party conducts his or her activity on the predatory side of what can be identified in a given matter to

constitute the protective/predatory fault line that the other party(ies) involved in a given affair fails to keep his or her (their) response(s) on the protective side of that fault line and in such scenario, one evil has elicited another, which tends to elicit another into a going proliferation of evils. This is an arrangement that not only cannot be permitted, but must be affirmatively prevented.

3. RJM is obliged, as he understands the duties to which he is subject, to be concerned to neither leave uncovered his moral liability for contributing to the prevention of any wrongdoer's getting away with any wrongdoing at the expense of the Catholic Church on RJM's record of conduct according to the age-old axiom, *Qui parcat nocentibus, innocentibus punit*, which of course emanates from various scriptural passages (ie. 1Tim. 5:22, et al) on the one hand, nor for continuing to demonstrate as much pity and mercy and commitment to spare others grief as RJM can evidently justify continuing to demonstrate in a given case as RJM realizes that the consequences of not demonstrating non-counterfeit mercy are that one can even lose a claim to such mercy him or herself (cf. Ja. 2:13 et al), that the preferable alternative by which disputes ought to be resolved is for individuals, out of a non-counterfeit remorse of conscience, to voluntarily make reparation and restitution for harms unjustifiably caused others.

4. The public is entitled to every man's evidence, which it is RJM's position, in this case is evidence of culpable negligence by the cab driver and possibly by the construction company, and possibly by the cab company; and RJM cannot present that evidence in a court of law without filing this complaint and without filing it as an indigent person, knowing that the costs of the filing will be paid by the Defendant, when RJM recovers what ought be recovered for the harms unjustifiably caused as described in this complaint.

Claim No. 1 – Negligence – Driver and Cab Company

5. At all times relevant to this complaint, the driver and cab company were subjected to a duty to ensure that the cab being driven by Mr. Ahmed on 3/18/04 was not driven beyond a speed acceptable for the conditions under which such vehicle would ever have been and was operated.
6. On 3/18/04 at about 7:35 p.m. Robert More was riding his bicycle in Chicago, northbound on Franklin St. towards the intersection of Monroe and Franklin.
7. On the west side of Franklin, Monroe St was reduced to one lane eastbound where that street descends down a grade from the Wacker St. because the right lane of Monroe was under construction.
8. As RJM proceeded towards Monroe St. a construction vehicle pulling a trailer was proceeding through the intersection blocking RJM's view of the light.
9. RJM looked to his left and saw no traffic descending down the grade adjacent to where the road was under construction.
10. The night was damp and foggy and the roadway was moist at this time.
11. Since RJM saw no traffic behind the construction vehicle which was proceeding eastbound in the right lane of traffic on Monroe in the 200 block of Monroe (which is one way eastbound at that point), and since RJM could see the one lane of traffic heading eastbound on Monroe towards Franklin, RJM turned right on Monroe, bypassed the construction vehicle and then began to cross the road where he saw clear access to the sidewalk on the north side of the street.
12. As RJM was crossing Monroe St. at that point, his bicycle was hit by a cab driven by Ahmed and owned by Yellow Cab and thrown eastbound between 10 and 15 feet with his backpack bag breaking its strap and his other bag sent flying.
13. The collision bent the rim of the bicycle and destroyed the braking system.
14. RJM landed flat on his right side after being thrown from the bike.
15. RJM's right knee had been hit by the frame of the bike which had been hit by the bumper of the Cab, which most fortuitously was a Crown Victoria which has a wide and soft bumper.

16. RJM incurred a very painful contusion on the inside of his right knee and a bruise on his right hip.
17. A police officer was summonsed who made a police report of the incident.
18. RJM went to the hospital and waited several hours, received an Xray and was told that his activity would have to be limited for several weeks.
19. The bicycle was rendered inoperative and RJM was incapable of riding a bicycle, exercising on his right leg or even walking without a limp for several weeks.
20. This restriction on RJMs' activity imposed a burden on RJM's participation in the ordinary occupations of life.
21. It is RJM's position that but for the driving at excessive speed in through a construction zone and/or his not paying attention to the roadway, the driver would not have hit RJM with his cab.

Second Cause – Negligence of Construction Company in Not Posting a Reduced Speed Limit Sign.

22. To the extent of RJM's knowledge, the construction company did not post a reduced speed limit sign on the downhill grade between Wacker and Franklin on eastbound Monroe, which is a location at which cabs notoriously drive considerably above the speed limit as they try to beat the Franklin St. light.

Wherefore, the plaintiff R. More respectfully prays that a jury sworn by this Honorable Court award him \$1000.00 in monetary damages, against each and all of the Defendants on joint and several liability and for provision to be included in whatever judgment is rendered for the remission to Cook County for cost of the filing fee, for the assessment of all costs against the Defendant which may be incurred by RJM in collecting judgment (s), and whatever other relief it would be determined would be necessary under the circumstances from the evidence presented at the trial to be conducted in this case, to remedy the harms caused to RJM et al.


The plaintiff demands trial by a six man jury.

I Robert More certify that I am the plaintiff in the above entitled action. The allegations in this amended complaint are true.

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109, I aver to the substantial truthfulness of all factual averments contained herein & as to those claims made on information and belief that I verily believe the same to be true.

Robert J. More

R. More, 2008 S. Blue Island, #39, Chicago, IL, 60608, (949) 723-7856



THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLI

Plaintiff/Petitioner: Robert J. Moran
Defendant/Respondent: Ahmed Shahzad, Yellow Cab Construction Co.

No. 20061301847
Calendar: PT Motor Vehicle

APPLICATION AND AFFIDAVIT TO SUE OR DEFEND AS AN INDIGENT PERSON

I, Robert J. Moran, the Plaintiff/Petitioner Defendant/Respondent herein, age 46

On my own behalf, OR as Parent, Guardian, Other on behalf of
I have knowledge of the facts stated herein.

1. I am employed as a(n) unemployed, firefighter. Yearly gross salary \$
Name of employer: home Telephone of employer: N/A

I am unemployed as of 2/15/06
Last employer: Howard Delivery Services Telephone: out of business
Address: 616th St, Broadview IL

I began receiving Unemployment Compensation on 2/15/06 in the amount of \$ 150 (per month)

2. My spouse is employed as a(n) single. Yearly gross salary
Name of employer: N/A Telephone of employer:

My spouse is unemployed as of
Last employer: Telephone:
Address:
My spouse began receiving Unemployment Compensation on in the amount of \$ (per month)

3. My other sources of income are: SSI, Public Aid, Child Support, Food Stamps, Family Assistance, Foster Care, Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, General Assistance, State Transitional Assistance, State Children and Family Assistance, Other: RM has 3 total judgments from several cases which can be collected.

4. My available income is 125% or less of the current poverty level established by the United States Department of Health and Human Services.

5. The nature and value of property I own includes: Real Estate, Cash, bank accounts, etc., Clothing and jewelry \$ 300.00, Furniture, household goods \$ NONE, Automobile - Model NONE Year Value \$

6. The names and ages of persons dependent on the applicant for support are:

7. I am paying child support in the amount of \$ NONE per

8. I am paying spousal support in the amount of \$ per

9. My monthly living expenses (not including payment of debts and child support) are \$ 2506.00 including a health

10. I am eligible to receive civil legal services as defined in 735 ILCS 5/5-105.5. emergency unless petitioner is evicted from dwelling which would make him homeless

Name: Robert J. Moran
Firm/Business Name:
Address: 2008 S Blue Island
City/State/Zip: Chicago IL
Telephone: (773) 940-0712
Date: 4/25/06

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 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 s/he verily believes the same to be true.

Signature of Applicant: Robert J. Moran
Date: 4/25/06 (OVER)

INFORMATION SHEET FOR
LEAVE TO SUE OR DEFEND AS AN INDIGENT PERSON

(a) As used in this section:

(1) "*Fees, costs, and charges*" means payments imposed on a party in connection with the prosecution or defense of a civil action, including, but not limited to: filing fees; appearances fees; fees for service of process and other papers served either within or outside this State, including service by publication pursuant to Section 2-206 of this Code and publication of necessary legal notices; motion fees; jury demand fees; charges for participation in, or attendance at, any mandatory process or procedure including, but not limited to, conciliation, mediation, arbitration, counseling, evaluation, "Children First", "Focus on Children" or similar programs; fees for supplementary proceedings; charges for translation services; guardian ad litem fees; charges for certified copies of court documents; and all other processes and procedures deemed by the court to be necessary to commence, prosecute, defend, or enforce relief in a civil action.

2) "*Indigent person*" means any person who meets one or more of the following criteria:

(i) He or she is receiving assistance under one or more of the following public benefits programs: Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled (AABD), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Food Stamps, General Assistance, State Transitional Assistance, or State Children and Family Assistance.

(ii) His or her available income is 125% or less of the current poverty level as established by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, unless the applicant's assets that are not exempt under Part 9 or 10 of Article XII of this Code are of nature and value that the court determines that the applicant is able to pay the fees, costs and charges.

(iii) He or she is, in the discretion of the court, unable to proceed in an action without payment of fees, costs, and charges and whose payment of those fees, costs, and charges would result in substantial hardship to the person or his or her family.

(iv) He or she is an indigent person pursuant to Section 5-105.5 of this Code. [This states that "indigent person" means a person whose income is 125% or less of the current official federal poverty guidelines or who is otherwise eligible to receive civil legal services under the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974. (42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 2996 et. seq.)]

(b) On the application of any person, before or after the commencement of an action, a court, on finding that the applicant is an indigent person, shall grant the applicant leave to sue or defend the action without payment of the fees, costs and charges of the action.

(c) An application for leave to sue or defend an action as an indigent person shall be in writing and supported by the affidavit of the applicant or, if the applicant is a minor or an incompetent adult, by the affidavit of another person having knowledge of the facts. The contents of the affidavit shall be established by Supreme Court Rule.

(d) The court shall rule on applications under this Section in a timely manner based on information contained in the application unless the court, in its discretion, requires the applicant to personally appear to explain or clarify information contained in the application. If the court finds that the applicant is an indigent person, the court shall enter an order permitting the applicant to sue or defend without payment of fees, costs or charges. If the application is denied, the court shall enter an order to that effect stating the specific reasons for the denial. The clerk of the court shall promptly mail or deliver a copy of the order to the applicant.

(e) The clerk of the court shall not refuse to accept and file any complaint, appearance, or other paper presented by the applicant if accompanied by an application to sue or defend in forma pauperis, and those papers shall be considered filed on the date the application is presented. If the application is denied, the order shall state a date certain by which the necessary fees, costs, and charges must be paid. The court, for good cause shown, may allow an applicant whose application is denied to defer payment of fees, costs, and charges, make installment payments, or make payment upon reasonable terms and conditions stated in the order. The court may dismiss the claims or defenses of any party failing to pay the fees, costs, or charges within the time and in the manner ordered by the court. A determination concerning an application to sue or defend in forma pauperis shall not be construed as a ruling on the merits.

(f) The court may order an indigent person to pay all or a portion of the fees, costs, or charges waived pursuant to this Section out of monies recovered by the indigent person pursuant to a judgment or settlement resulting from the civil action. However, nothing in this Section shall be construed to limit the authority of a court to order another party to the action to pay the fees, costs, or charges of the action.

(g) A court, in its discretion, may appoint counsel to represent an indigent person, and that counsel shall perform his or her duties without fees, charges, or reward.

(h) Nothing in this Section shall be construed to affect the right of a party to sue or defend an action in forma pauperis without the payment of fees, costs, or charges, or the right of a party to court appointed counsel, as authorized by any other provision of law or by the rules of the Illinois Supreme Court.

(i) The provisions of this Section are severable under Section 1.31 the Statute on Statutes. See (5 ILCS 70/1.31)

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE



First-Class Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
USPS
Permit No. G-10

01 ED-37

2006 JUN 12 PM 3:33

RETURN TO:

DEBRA BROWN
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT
CIVIL DIVISION

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
1ST MUNICIPAL DISTRICT
P.O. BOX 4719
CHICAGO, IL 60680



CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
1ST MUNICIPAL DISTRICT
P>O> BOX 4719
CHICAGO, IL 60680

(Extra Fee) Yes

CERTIFIED

Article Number
7110 4397 3980 0010 6379



7110 4397 3980 0010 6379

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature: (Addressee or Agent)

X

B. Received By: (Please Print Clearly)

Saad Ahmed

C. Date of Delivery

5/31/06

D. Addressee's Address (If Different From Address Used by Sender)

Secondary Address / Suite / Apt. / Floor (Please Print Clearly)

Delivery Address

City State ZIP + 4 Code

Article Addressed To:

061301847 061906
SHAHZAD AHMED
2 SUNSET-COURT
BENSENVILLE, IL 60106

CERTIFIED MAIL

IT COURT
ICT



7110 4397 3980 0010 6881

RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED
IF RESTRICTED DELIVERY REQUESTED

ATTEMPTED, NOT KNOWN
NO SIGNATURE TO SEND


30:21MD 9-HIT 9002

~~YELLOW CAB REGISTERD AGENT
NATIONAL ADAMS STE 2007
300 W ADAMS ST
CHGO IL 60606~~

George B

[Handwritten mark]

*NO SURE #
ADK*



REGIONS

\$2.52

MAY 22 2015
US POSTAGE
FIRST CLASS

MAILED FROM 60612
048J0085002320

CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
 1ST MUNICIPAL DISTRICT
 P-O> BOX 4719
 CHICAGO, IL 60680



7110 4397 3980 0010 6881

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

A. Signature: (Addressee or Agent)

B. Received By: (Please Print Clearly)

C. Date of Delivery

X

D. Addressee's Address (If Different From Address Used by Sender)

Secondary Address / Suite / Apt. / Floor (Please Print Clearly)

Delivery Address

City State ZIP + 4 Code

Restricted Delivery? Yes

Service Type

(Extra Fee) Yes

CERTIFIED

Article Number

7110 4397 3980 0010 6881

Article Addressed To:

061301847 061906
 YELLOW CAB
 NATIONAL REGESTERD AGENT
 300 W ADAMS ST STE 2007
 CHGO, IL 60606



★ Patent 5,626,286 ★
 ★ Patent 6,041,999 ★
 /USA CMF-076 10/04 ★

Envelope Laser Form

3. Fo
 2. EX
 1. su

CERTIFIED MAIL

Return Receipt Card MUST Have Return To: Address Prior To Sealing Envelope

2019 0086 wrrr PS