Stop Illinois Corruption

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D, M.D.
Founder and Director
http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/
http://cookcountyjudges.wordpress.com/

April 19, 2009

Chief Judge Timothy Evans
Circuit Court of Cook County
50 W. Washington, Rm 2600
Chicago, IL 60602

VIA FASCIMLE TRANSMISSION TO: 312 603-5366 and certified mail

Dear Judge Evans:

Thank you for your response letter of April 20, 2009. I understand your concerns not to involve yourself in judicial decisions concerning other judges. However, decisions on indigency petitions are not judicial decisions. They are administrative decisions. As chief administrator of the courts you are responsible for the employees under you including the judges, the clerk, and the court reporters. As you have now willfully refused to do your job and actually are condoning many criminal acts committed by judges under you, the Sheriff's staff, the Court Clerk, and the Court Reporters, I MUST NOW ASK ON BEHALF OF THE CITIZENS OF COOK COUNTY FOR YOUR RESIGNATION. It is not acceptable for the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County to engage in willful denial of due process on such a large scale, and at the same time to abdicate his responsibility as an administrator. The net result of your crimes is that you are participating in running the Circuit Court of Cook County as a criminal enterprise.

It is clear from your previous responses to my concerns that you have no intention of doing your job as an administrator. Your court reporters have defied and still are defying court orders to prepare and file transcripts in 05 CR 12718. The Illinois Appellate Court has also violated their oaths of office and the law by failing to enforce Judge Kazmierski's order to prepare free transcripts and file them. Therefore, Federal Judge Coar has ruled in 09 C 105, a habeas corpus petition on this case, that the Appellate Court through their actions has waived the right of the State of Illinois to insist I exhaust State remedies with direct appeals and a petition for habeas before the Illinois Supreme Court. He is hearing my habeas petition on this [wrongful] conviction where a Cook County Correctional Officer, Sgt. Anthony Salemi, attacked me, falsified his records, perjured himself in court, and the Judge, Kazmierski, committed gross judicial misconduct and the prosecutors, Andrew Dalkin and John Maher committed gross prosecutorial misconduct resulting in an unfair trial denying me due process. Then Judge Kazmierski illegally sentenced me to two years in IDOC, refused to stay sentence pending appeal, in violation

of U.S. Supreme Court Holding in Cunningham v. California, 127 S. Ct. 856 (2007). I fully expect to be vindicated and for the Sgt. to be arrested and convicted of official misconduct and other crimes and for the prosecutors to be charged with prosecutorial misconduct and punished appropriately. Judge Kazmierski should be disciplined and I intend to find a way to hold him accountable in a court of law or before the JIB and press.

Judge Maddux is running a criminal enterprise called the Law Division, which denies pro se litigants in particularly the constitutional rights to redress of grievances and due process. He does this by running an illegal and unconstitutional operation called the "Black Line Trial System" of which you are fully aware and condone. He also illegally denies indigent petition and then violates law by ordering his clerks not to promptly give the litigant a copy of their petition and his order concerning the petition. I have now publicized this misconduct and criminal RICO violation on the Internet. As you know Sheila Mannix has also documented and publicized the RICO operation run by the Family Court Division and its judges, which you apparently also condone. See:

> Judge William D Maddux, in collusion with Sheriff Dart and Clerk Dorothy Brown, as well as with approval of Chief Judge Timothy Evans runs the Law Division of the Circuit Court of Cook Count as a Criminal Enterprise in violation of RICO. The following has been provided to the FBI and posted on my blogs:
>
> http://cookcountyjudges.wordpress.com/2009/05/19/judge-maddux-dismisses-torts-with-dual-court-assignments-for-same-case-hidden-black-line-trial-call-rico-violation/
>
> http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2009/05/judge-maddux-runs-law-division-cook.html
>
> Circuit Court of Cook County Family Division is Criminal Enterprise and committing RICO violations. See federal RICO suit brought by Dr. Sheila Mannix:
>
> 1:09-cv-00103

Dorothy Brown's Clerk's Office has violated Supreme Court Rules and failed to transmit a notice of appeal in a criminal case, as well as has refused to pepare a record of appeal in that case, along with permitting and condoning her staff in stealing court files from pro se litigants, extorting money from indigent litigants, and causing false arrest of indigent llitigants, as noted in above Internet blogs. As you are fully aware of these crimes and have failed to act to stop further crimes and remedy the above, you are aiding and abetting in such criminal acts, as well as attempting to cover them up.

You are also fully informed that Judge Schultz, Gainer, Alonso, Pantle, Beibel have blatantly violated law, including Illinois Supreme Court Rules and United States Supreme Court Holdings. I also have evidence of misconduct of at least a half dozen other judges including Judges Kuriakos Ciecil, Brosnahan, Petrone, and Donnelly.

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2009/04/presiding-criminal-court-judge-paul-p.html

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2009/02/judge-jorge-alonso-overturns-federal.html

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2009/01/criminal-acts-il-attorney-general-lisa.html

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2008/12/save-life-dr-maisha-hamilton-bennett.html

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2008/12/lawless-corrupt-incompetent-wacko-cook_04.html

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2008/12/lawless-corrupt-incompetent-wacko-cook.html

As Chief Judge of the Circuit Court you are responsible for referring judicial misconduct to the JIB and you have failed to do so. You are also responsible for judicial assignments, yet you leave judges who blatantly violate the law in positions of authority and supervision over other judges. Your failure to do you job is not only irresponsible, but I believe purposeful.

I have also fully informed the FBI about the above schemes and crimes, as well as your refusal to do your job. I believe these acts amount to felony theft of honest services, felony conspiracy to violate rights under color of law, felony violation of rights under color of law, obstruction of justice, extortion, fraud, official misconduct, and wire fraud, as well as other crimes including felony RICO violations.

I respectfully therefore, as a citizen on behalf of the people of Cook County ask for your resignation as Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County.

Sincerely,

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D., M.D.

708 952-9040 or 708 952-0040

CC:

FBI
State Police

Cook County State's Attorney
Cook County Board
Select Advocacy Groups and the Press

Stop Illinois Corruption

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D, M.D.
Founder and Director

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/
http://cookcountyjudges.wordpress.com/

April 13, 2009

Chief Judge Timothy Evans
Circuit Court of Cook County
50 W. Washington, Rm 2600
Chicago, IL 60602

VIA FASCIMLE TRANSMISSION TO: 312 603-5366

Dear Judge Evans:

I have several matters that require your immediate intervention due to illegal acts of your judges:

1. Judge Maddux has as a policy (not written as far as I am aware of) to ONLY HEAR petitions for indigency status in the Law Division at 11:30 a.m. He leaves the bench and REFUSES to question the petitioner or answer any questions of the petitioner. He has one of his four clerks (usually a balding man about 45 yr old with glasses ["glasses"]), who refuses to identify himself as do the other of the four clerks who I'll call ("bald large fat man", "salt and pepper hair", and thing young bald man") bring the petitions to his chambers. A decision is written and the petitions are given to Glasses who REFUSES to return the papers to the petitioner. He instead hands the papers to a clerk, who appears in the courtroom (refuses to ID himself so I'll call ["midget"] and instructs him to take them down to room 801 at the Clerk's office and instructs petitioners to follow him. Midget in 801 tells the petitioners to wait in the line to file papers, which puzzles the petitioners as their papers have been removed from their possession.

It is my contention that the clerk and the judges have no legal authority to steal these documents by removing them from the courtroom instead of returning them to the petitioner!

On April 1, 2009 I went to Judge Budzinski for a status hearing on a case that I had filed and for which I paid the fee. I paid the fee using borrowed money, although I am indigent on food stamps, because Judge Maddux appears to have as a policy for illegally denying legitimate suits and many suits of other persons, with a legally void order stating only that the petitioner cannot sue in good faith. As you know, statutes

require more specific reasons for denying an indigency petition. He almost always does this without basis for a half dozen persons, I am aware of, who continue to file multiple legitimate civil suits against officials for failing to do their jobs and violating civil rights, among other matters, if a person has filed more than one indigency petition. I appealed this to the Illinois Supreme Court who denied leave to file this mandamus action against Judge Maddux. I am now appealing it to the United States Supreme Court and publicizing this illegal conduct of Judge Maddux on the Internet and with the press as it denies my First Amendment right to redress of grievances and my right to have fees waived if indigent! As administrator of the courts you should intervene and ORDER Judge Maddux to cease and desist illegally denying indigent petitions. The actions of Judge Maddux are judicial misconduct as you know.

You should also ORDER Judge Maddux to cease and desist stealing petitioner's papers by not returning them to the petitioner in court.

I also handed Judge Budzinski a petition for indigency status so I could get the fees waived for service of the summons by the Sheriff's office. Judge Budzinski said she could not rule on the petition and that it had to be heard by Judge Maddux. I told Judge Budzinski that she had legal authority to rule on the petition and she admitted that but said it was Judge Maddux' order that ONLY HE can rule on indigency petitions.

PLEASE PROVIDE TO ME A COPY OF THE CIRCUIT COURT RULE, STATUTE, OR JUDGE'S ORDER THAT OTHER CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES IN THE LAW DIVISION CANNOT RULE ON INDIGENCY PETITIONS (ESPECIALLY IN CASES ALREADY FILED WITH THE CLERK), AND THAT CLERKS CAN REMOVE DOCUMENTS FROM THE COURTROOM INSTEAD OF RETURNING THEM TO LITIGANTS AFTER JUDGE'S DECISIONS. I DO NOT BELIEVE SUCH ORDERS EXISTS. It is not to be found on the court's web site or in the statutes!

I went to Judge Maddux' courtroom and told the salt and pepper clerk that I had already filed the complaint and that Judge Budzinski signed an order that the petition for indigency was transferred instanter to Judge Maddux. I showed him both the date stamped complaint and the date stamped and signed order from Budzinski. He said I should wait to 11:30. Finally at about noon glasses told all with indigency petitions to bring their petitions to him after Judge Maddux left the bench. My petition was accompanied by MY COURT FILE CONSISTING OF JUDGE BUDZINSKI"S ORDER AND MY COPY OF THE FILED AND TIME-STAMPED COMPLAINT – I SPECIFICALLY HAD TOLD SALT AND PEPPER THAT THESE WERE MY DOCUMENTS WHICH MUST BE IMMEDIATELY RETURNED TO ME AND DO NOT NEED TO BE FILED WITH THE CLERK. Judge Maddux them makes every one wait through lunch with no idea when he will return the petitions so we can't leave the room (this is inappropriate to hassle and a failure to accommodate a disabled person like me who needs to eat at regular times in order to sustain health and rude to others to make them miss lunch or postpone lunch).

At about 1 p.m. Glasses returned and I requested my papers and asked what Judge Maddux' decision was. He REFUSED TO RETURN MY DOCUMENTS and instead GAVE THEM IN AN ACT OF THEFT TO MIDGIT, WHO BEGAN TO RUN DOWN TO 801! I demanded that Midget stop and return my documents. I told him they were my court file and he should not steal them. I loudly asked the court deputy to prevent Midgit from stealing my documents and she refused. I demanded that Glasses recover my documents and he refused. I asked for the deputy's supervisor as she was failing to perform her duty to stop a theft witnessed by her. Sgt. Boyd came and I requested that he either take a criminal complaint for theft or have a deputy go to 801 and recover my documents/court file from Midget or the clerk. He refused. He also refused to find out the names of these clerks so I could make officials complaints "we don't have authority to do that." This is baloney as a peace officer has authority to stop a theft, interview witnesses and reveal the names of witnesses and the perpetrators to the victim (me).

I then went to Sheriff Dart's Office and asked to speak to his legal council Mr. Kramer and he came out, sort of heard the story and refused to order the deputies to recover my file – saying they would do "nothing" in an act of official misconduct (verified that they would violate law and not do their duty to help a citizen when a crime was committed).

I then called the Chicago Police and an officer and then Sgt. responded. I told them the story and they agreed it sounded like theft. Then Sheriff Asst. Chief Sheriff Nolan came and talked to the CPD for a long time out in the hall. The Sgt. came in and said this was a civil matter and not a criminal act. I asked him if an attorney's briefcase was removed form a courtroom without his permission if that was theft and he agreed. I then pointed out to him that removing my court file from my possession in the courtroom was no different and that I considered his refusal to enforce the law and either recover my court file (in which case I would waive the right to file a criminal complaint) or to write a criminal complaint for theft that I would sign a violation of his oath of office to enforce the law, official misconduct, theft of honest services (federal felony), an illegal penalty on the exercise of my constitutional rights, and a civil rights violation. He refused and left.

I then told A/C Nolan he had two choices, either to recover my court file or write a criminal complaint for theft against Glasses and Midget for me to sign. He said I had two choices – to leave or stay and be arrested. I was sitting calmly in a chair in the reception area next to Lyn's desk.

I refused to leave and said that if he arrested me and refused to enforce the law and either recover my court file or write a criminal complaint for me to sign that I would sue him for theft of honest services, aiding and abetting theft of my court file, official misconduct, unlawful arrest, malicious prosecution, and conspiracy to violate my civil rights under color of law. He then arrested me for trespass.

I DEMAND THAT YOU ORDER JUDGE MADDUX AND GLASSES AND THE CLERK TO IMMEDIATELY RETURN MY COURT FILE – THIS IS PREVENTING ME FROM COPYING THE COMPLAINT AND PRESENTING THE INDIGENCY PETITION TO THE SHERIFF PROCESS SERVERS TO SERVE MY COMPLAINT – This Is Obstruction Of Justice, An Illegally Penalty on the exercise of my constitutional right to redress of grievances and official misconduct as well as a violation of Judge Maddux' oath of office. If you fail to do something then I will consider that you have chosen to aid and abet this crime.

I DEMAND THAT YOU IMMEDIATELY ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO HEAR MY PETITIONS FOR INDIGENCY (I HAVE ANOTHER ONE TO PRESENT AND WILL BE PRESENTING MANY MORE DURING THE NEXT YEAR). I SHOULD NOT HAVE TO APPEAR BEFORE A JUDGE THAT HAS VIOLATED THE LAW REPEATEDLY IN REGARD TO ME!

I DEMAND THAT YOU PROVIDE TO ME THE NAMES OF THE CLERKS – GLASSES, MIDGET, SALT AND PEPPER, BALD LARGE FAT MAN, AND THIN YOUNG BALD MAN (TWO SIT ON JUDGE MADDUX' RIGHT AND TWO SIT AT THE BENCH ON HIS LEFT)

I DEMAND THAT YOU CAUSE JUDGE MADDUX TO CEASE AND DESIST HIS SCHEME OF REFUSING TO GIVE TO PETITIONERS IN THE COURTROOM THEIR PETITIONS ONCE HE HAS RULED ON THEM. This clearly is a scheme to prevent the petitioners from knowing his decision until after they have left the courtroom, waited in line in 801 and been told their petition was granted or denied. The Clerks in 801 then in the past with my petition refused to file the complaint without payment of a fee. As you know the State Statutes REQUIRE the Clerk to file the complaint even if the fee is not paid if accompanied by an indigency petition! I was told by a friend that recently they have decided to file the complaints, but later send letters demanding payment or stating the judge would dismiss the complaints. Judge Maddux uses this procedure willfully and knowingly to PREVENT PETITIONERS FROM IMMEDIATELY REQUESTING THE CASE (PETITION) BE RECALLED SO THAT THEY CAN GIVE JUDGE MADDUX MORE INFORMATION AND REQUEST THAT HE RECONSIDER IMMEDIATELY. This illegally delays motions to reconsider and is discriminatory as judges do not routinely only return decisions on motions to attorneys outside of the courtroom! I don't believe there is any Supreme Court or Circuit Court Rule or Statute that permits Judge Maddux to REFUSE to return documents to litigants in the courtroom!

2. FROM MY WEB SITE (BLOG) http://cookcountyjudges.wordpress.com/ :

Judge Paul P. Biebel Jr Violates Supreme Court Denies Appeal

leave a comment »

Judge Paul P. Biebel Jr. has again violated stare decisis in snubbing his nose at previous United States Supreme Court Rulings and the United States Constitution.

I filed a Notice of Appeal in case no. 04 CR 17571-03 regarding the issue of personal and subject-matter jurisdiction. IT IS CLEAR THAT THE COURT NEVER HAD JURISDICTION. See:

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2008/10/criminal-scheme-of-il-attorney-general.html

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/2009/02/judge-jorge-alonso-overturns-federal.html

The trial court under the following judges in succession violated my rights by holding court without jurisdiction and failing to dismiss and vacate the case *ab initio* based on lack of jurisdiction: Judges Crooks, Fox, Pantle, and Alonso. All these judges are intellectual midgets who need guidance by studying case law. They all make baseless knee-jerk decisions violating higher court rulings and are unable to handle making decisions of law except for basic common variety criminal case issues. They should be barred from any case with complex federal laws or unusual questions of law.

I went to trial on February 17, 2009 and was found not guilty by the jury on Febrary 24, 2009. I am NOT appealing the verdict. I am appealing the jurisdictional pretrial rulings where Judges Fox, Pantle, and Alonso claimed that “Federal Law does Not Apply in this Case” [Judge Alonso] despite the fact that Medicaid is a joint federal state program; that “I don’t care” [Judge Pantle] in response to my complaint and request to argue the jurisdictional issues; and denials of motions to dismiss for insufficient indictment [see:

http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/search/label/Indictment], and for

violation of statute of limitations, for illegally impaneled grand jury, for misstatement of the law to the grand jury, for extensive perjury of the State witness to the grand jury, for violation of speedy trial statutes, for violation of the Supremacy clause, for failure to state a valid charge, and for lack of personal and subject-matter jurisdiction because the sham prosecutor IL Attorney General Lisa Madigan has no legal authority in Illinois to independently appear before a grand jury, obtain an indictment, or prosecute a case without the invitation, review of evidence and decision of charges, consent, and at least minimal participation of the County State’s Attorney - which was never done in this or similar cases.

I filed a Notice of Appeal per IL Supreme Court Rules on March 9, 2009 stating I was appealing the jurisdictional issues and not the verdict. By IL Supreme Court rules the Clerk is REQUIRED to transmit the Notice of Appeal to the IL Appellate Court, and the Circuit Court loses jurisdiction once the Notice of Appeal is filed.

The Clerk of the Circuit Court has in violation of her oath of office to follow the law refused to transmit the Notice of Appeal to the IL Appellate Court because she was ordered by Presiding Criminal Court Judge Paul Biebel Jr (not trial judge) not to transmit the Notice of Appeal or prepare the Record on Appeal.

Therefore, Judge Biebel's order is null and void as he had no jurisdiction to make it and the Clerk MAY NOT follow it. I spoke with Dorothy Brown, Clerk of the Circuit Court today and she promised to look into this and get back to me.

In addition, stare decisis due to United States Supreme Court opinions specifically allows appeals in criminal cases where there have been not guilty court findings IF 1. there is a controversy and 2. if the double jeopardy clause is not invoked by a new trial being required upon reversal of the trial court rulings. See *United States v. Wilson,* 420 U.S. 332, 95 S.Ct. 1013, (1975); and *United States v. Ceccolini, 435 U.S. 268, 98 S.Ct. 1054 (1978);* and *King v DeDonker, 17 Ill.App.3d 1064, 309 N.E.2d 598 (1974).*

In my case there are three controversies that survive the not guilty verdict: 1. jurisdiction, 2. clerk retaining 10 % of the bond would be illegal if the bail orders are declared void when the court is declared to have had no jurisdiction, and 3. pending civil rights suits against AG Madigan and J Pantle for malicious prosecution, wrongful pretrial incarceration, and other torts are only valid if these persons lose absolute prosecutorial or judicial immunity. The only time they lose immunity is if the case is totally void and there is proven to be no jurisdiction - which is the case in this instance.
Double jeopardy is NOT INVOKED if I should lose the appeal of the jurisdictional issues as this would only mean that the case was valid and the not guilty verdict would stand. If I win the appeal and it is declared that there never was jurisdiction of the court or the prosecutor, then Clerk Dorothy Brown must return the $1100 she retained as 10 % of the bond because the bond orders would become void and the case against AG Madigan and Judge Pantle would proceed.

I have not decided between several options as to how to cause Dorothy Brown to prepare the record on appeal and transmit my notice of appeal. The right thing for her to do is to inform Judge Biebel that she refuses to violate Supreme Court Rules, United States Supreme Court rulings, and her oath of office and that she would not honor his illegal and void order, but was transmitting the Notice of Appeal to the IL Appellate Court and was preparing the record on appeal.

I could also make a motion to the IL Appellate Court requesting that they order Dorothy Brown to transmit the Notice of Appeal and prepare the record on appeal, as well as voiding Judge Biebel's illegal order. I could also ask for the Illinois Supreme Court to do the same under a Motion for Supervisory Order or Motion for Mandamus.

Judge Biebel's conduct is a violation of his oath of office, an illegal penalty on the exercise of my constitutional rights, official judicial misconduct, a violation of IL Supreme Court Rules, a violation of the United States Supreme Court Opinions (stare decisis or precedent), unethical, immoral, discriminatory, retaliatory, and criminal.

JUDGE EVANS:

I patiently await your response to my concerns above. The conduct of your judges is simply atrocious and malicious acts of judicial misconduct.

Sincerely,

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D., M.D.

708 952-9040 or 708 952-0040

CC:

FBI
State Police
J. Nicolas Albukerk

Stop Illinois Corruption

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D, M.D.
Founder and Director
http://illinoiscorruption.blogspot.com/
http://cookcountyjudges.wordpress.com/
http://cookcountysheriffdeputies.wordpress.com/

April 19, 2009

Chief Judge Timothy Evans
Circuit Court of Cook County
50 W. Washington, Rm 2600
Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Judge Evans:

I am writing to give you the factual evidence that the Clerk of the Court, Dorothy Brown, as well as Judges Maddux and Biebel have and are continuing to violate law. As you are the administrator of the courts, the buck stops with you and your failure to act to correct these violations is a breech of your oath of office. As you already know, the granting of Applications for Indigency Petitions is NOT a judicial act, but is an administrative act, as is the filing of a complaint at law. You are the Chief Administrator, therefore, you are responsible for those under you who act in an administrative fashion.

Enclosed is a letter to Clerk Dorothy Brown, excluding attachments, clearly informing her of the illegal acts and omissions by her staff. I expect her to correct these acts and omissions ASAP. I expect you as Chief Administrator to order her to correct these acts and omissions.

Sincerely,

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D., M.D.
708 952-9040 or 708 952-0040

CC:

FBI
State Police
Cook County State's Attorney
Select Members Cook County Board
Select Advocacy Groups and the Press

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D, M.D.

August 9, 2012

Honorable Judge Timothy Evans
Chief Judge
Cook County Circuit Court
Rm 2600
50 W. Washington
Chicago, IL 60602

Re: Court Clerk Systemic Errors

Dear Hon. Judge Evans:

This letter is to inform you of systemic errors by the Court Clerk that need to be corrected.

In criminal cases, when a defendant does not show up in court a BFW (Preliminary Bond Forfeiture, Warrant) is issued. Then the defendant has 30 days to show up and have the preliminary bond forfeiture quashed or it becomes final.

Many defendants have good excuse not to have shown up in court – for example: 1) they are hospitalized; 2) they are in custody and the Sheriff refused to bring them to court; 3) there was a death in the family; or 4) they are on active duty in the military and are out of the country. Then they bring proof of the above to the court and the judge quashes the BFW.

However, the Clerks systemically make the following errors:

1) Instead of writing "preliminary bond forfeiture" = pBFW, they write that this is a final bond forfeiture = BFW.

2) The judges although they order the warrant to be quashed, they fail to order the bond forfeiture to be quashed

3) The Clerk therefore fails to write that the bond forfeiture was quashed

4) If the defendant doesn't show up for court the Clerk and judge fail to write that this is a final bond forfeiture.

Therefore, on the State Police rap sheets, all preliminary bond forfeitures, even if quashed and warranted quashed, state that the preliminary bond forfeiture is a final bond forfeiture. This means that when a judge looks at a rap sheet in order to decide bail on a future case, they set fraudulently high bails as they use these "bond forfeitures" THAT HAVE BEEN QUASHED as reason to set an exorbitantly high bail rationalizing that the defendant is a "flight risk".

For example: because I had four (4) "preliminary bond forfeitures" which had been quashed because I was hospitalized each time listed on rap sheet as final bond forfeiture, Judge Daly at Bridgeview set my bail on a MISDEMEANOR case at $50,000 instead of at $1,000 in 2009.

This means my family had to pay $5,000 to get me out of jail (I later won the case) and the court Clerk kept $500. This was theft of my funds as the bond order was VOID because it was based on false information. I expect this high bail to be vacated nunc pro tunc and the $500 returned.

The rap sheets are providing judges FALSE INFORMATION and this is costing defendants dearly. I intend to have all these fraudulent bail orders vacated and the Clerk of your court will then owe me a lot of money.

Please make sure that Clerk Dorothy Brown immediately does something to correct these errors. I had a meeting with Dorothy Brown in Dec. 2009 with an attorney as a witness. I told her about the above and she has failed to correct the errors. This means she is **knowingly and willingly keeping false and incorrect records**, each act of which is a class A misdemeanor crime[1], as you know. I will be filing court pleadings to have all my dockets corrected to reflect this. The number of incorrect court records is staggering as this has been going on for decades. Nine of my cases have such errors.

Sincerely,

Linda L. Shelton, PhD, MD

CC: Judicial Inquiry Board
U.S. Supreme Court

[1] (705 ILCS 105/17) (from Ch. 25, par. 17)

Sec. 17. If any clerk shall fail to keep any such docket, or record book, or any book required by law to be kept by him or her, or to make the proper entries therein at the time required by law, or, when no time is fixed, within a reasonable time, he or she shall be guilty of a petty offense and shall be fined by the court not exceeding $100, and for a subsequent offense he or she may be fined in a like amount, or proceeded against as for a Class A misdemeanor.

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D, M.D.

August 9, 2012

Honorable Judge Timothy Evans
Chief Judge
Cook County Circuit Court
Rm 2600
50 W. Washington
Chicago, IL 60602

Re: Lack of Policy to File and Hear Petitions for
Writ of Habeas Corpus in Misdemeanor Cases

Dear Hon. Judge Evans:

This letter is to inform you that there is NO policy or procedure to have filed and heard a petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus in misdemeanor cases in the Circuit Court of Cook County.

As you can see in attached affidavit of attorney J. Nicolas Albukerk, he tried to file six petitions for Writ of Habeas Corpus with the Clerk of the Court on the 10th floor at the Daley Center. They said there was no procedure and would not assign them a habeas case number or schedule a hearing on these petitions.

Mr. Albukerk and myself over more than a week's time daily called your office and Judge Wrights office as well as the Clerk's office and tried to find out the procedure for filing and having scheduled before the presiding judge of the First Municipal Division these six habeas petitions to no avail.

Therefore, Mr. Albukerk simply date stamped the petitions and they now have been sitting in the criminal case files for these cases for two (2) months.

As you know, this is a violation of the Suspension Clause of the Constitution and 735 ILCS Article X. I have therefore as you know, filed a Petition for Writ of Mandamus with the U.S. Supreme Court that was docketed June 13, 2012 and have asked for them to order you to make a policy and procedure to file and hear misdemeanor habeas petitions.

You have been informed by my serving you with the U.S. Supreme Court petition and its supplements. Therefore you are willingly and knowingly condoning violation of my civil rights and violation of 735 ILCS Article X, which as you know is a crime[1].

[1] 735 ILCS 5/10-106

Sec. 10-106. Grant of relief - **Penalty**. Unless it shall appear from the complaint itself, or from the documents thereto annexed, that the party can neither be discharged, admitted to bail nor otherwise relieved, the court shall forthwith award relief by habeas corpus. **Any judge empowered to grant relief by habeas corpus who shall corruptly refuse to grant the relief when legally applied for in a case where it may lawfully be granted, or who shall for the purpose of oppression unreasonably delay the granting of such relief shall, for every such offense**,

Therefore, **I am demanding that you immediately assign my habeas petitions to Judge Wright for hearing, schedule a hearing, and have the petitions heard using the public interest exception to the mootness doctrine** (Under Illinois law, the petitions cannot be heard as I am now out on bail and therefore not "in custody" according to Illinois law, although I am "in custody" according to federal law. This must be done despite the cases and prosecutions being VOID, due to many constitutional and statutory violations – despite the fact that Judge Harmeling belatedly heard and ILLEGALLY denied my motion for SOJ Chiampas for cause, and Judge Chiampas belatedly heard my motion to dismiss all cases for speedy trial violations and ILLEGALLY denied these motions).

Thank you for your attention to this serious matter amounting to judicial misconduct and systemic constitutional violations in the Circuit Court of Cook County.

Sincerely,

Linda L. Shelton, PhD, MD

CC: Judicial Inquiry Board
U.S. Supreme Court

---

forfeit to the prisoner or party affected a sum not exceeding $1,000. [emphasis added] Refusal to hear an habeas petition is also a violation of a judge's oath of office.

Stop Illinois Corruption

Linda Lorincz Shelton, Ph.D., M.D.

http://cookcountyjudges.wordpress.com

February 12, 2013

Chief Judge Timothy C. Evans
Cook County Circuit Court
50 W. Washington Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, IL 60602

Dear Chief Judge Evans:

I am writing due to a refusal of judges to follow Circuit Court of Cook County rules and state statutes, as well as constitutional rights, as well as a lack of procedure to ask you to remedy this issue and advise as to the procedure. Ms. Rosemary in your office, refused to allow me to speak to you or your assistant about these matters and said I should write to you, which I am now doing.

I have several petitions that legally must be heard that **judges have REFUSED** to hear and **clerks have REFUSED to properly file** in some cases.

1) **Seven Petitions for Writs of Habeas Corpus**[1], **still pending now for eight (8) months**, that prove the cases result from **legally insufficient criminal complaints** and/or that **federal and state speedy trial rights have been violated** making the **cases void** and subject to habeas proceedings, under the Suspension Clause and 735 ILCS Article X, were filed on my behalf by attorney J. Nicolas Albukerk, while I was in custody in June 2012 and still have not been heard. I wrote them.

The Clerks on the 10th floor of the Daley Center have **REFUSED** to issue them separate

[1] Case numbers: 09 M1 223774, 09 M1 238219, 09 M1 261096, 09 M1 258392, 09 M1 260540, 09 M1 286184, 11 M1 241978

civil habeas numbers and only allowed Mr. Albukerk to file them in the six criminal cases' files. This is misconduct on the part of the Clerk of the Court.

The Clerk REFUSED to schedule a date for hearing these petitions. See attached affidavit of J. Nicolas Albukerk. This is misconduct on behalf of the Clerk.

Since that time I have been released and have been diligently trying to have these habeas petitions heard. As of February 11, 2013 when I last went to the Daley Center to accomplish this, the Clerk on the 10th floor again **REFUSED** to schedule hearings on my now new Motion to Hear the Habeas Petitions Nunc Pro Tunc, the secretaries in Judge Wright's Office and his Assistant James Conlin **REFUSED** to schedule a date for Judge Wright to hear the petitions and they told me **Judge Wright REFUSES to hear them.**

They told their deputy to kick me out of the office waiting area in room 1301 where I was patiently waiting for a date for a hearing of my petitions. The deputy was loud and rude and ordered me out of the office on pain of arrest. They therefore assaulted me and are violating my constitutional rights under color of law, which is a federal felony crime, U.S.C. Title 18 U.S.C. § 242 = felony violation of civil rights under color of law.

As you know the right to petition for writ of habeas corpus is the highest right a citizen has under the U.S. Constitution. Violation of this right is extremely serious!

Therefore Judge Wright is Refusing to Do His Job as Presiding Judge of the First Municipal District, and is knowingly violating my highest constitutional right AS HE IS VIOLATING THE SUSPENSION CLAUSE OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, 735 ILCS ARTICLE X, SEVERAL U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDINGS AS FOLLOWS AND CIRCUIT COURT RULE 15.2.

I Now have NO CHOICE but to Report Him to the JIB and I am Initiating a Petition for Supervisory Order to the Illinois Supreme Court and a Complaint to the Justice Department of Official Corruption Against Judge Wright, as well as submitting Articles of Impeachment to the Illinois House of Representatives.

It Is Your Administrative Job As His Boss To Have These Petitions Heard Immediately Nunc Pro Tunc.

The petitions are not moot due to two (2) exceptions to the Mootness Doctrine explained as follows:

PERTINENT RULES, STATUTES, CODES, RIGHTS, AND CASE LAW:

It states in Circuit Court Rule 15.2[2] that petitions for writs of habeas corpus in misdemeanor cases in the 1st Municipal Division **MUST** be heard by the presiding judge of the division.

The Clerk's rules, at least in the felony division are that the petition is given a specific habeas case number as it is a separate civil case from the felony case. This is an ***ex parte* action** and the defendant does **NOT** have to serve the state. As you know, the petition must be heard swiftly and if legitimate, the court serves the state and the state must proceed to prove they have a legal reason to hold the prisoner.

As you know under Illinois law, 735 ILCS Article X only issues of jurisdiction may be heard on habeas petitions or the fact the person is still being held and has served the sentence may be the issue. Being on bail, on probation or on parole does not qualify under Illinois law.

However, under federal habeas law the District Court considers in custody as also being on bail, probation, or parole. Attached is a memorandum of law about habeas petitions that you may wish to share with your judges for education purposes.

The U.S. Supreme Court, whose holdings obviously under the **Supremacy clause** overrule Illinois law, state that when a **sentence is too short to be able to litigate** a habeas petition then the fact one has already served a sentence **Does NOT Cause the Habeas Petition to be Moot** and this qualifies as an exception under the Mootness Doctrine.

---

[2] 15.2 Habeas Corpus
Except in matters of emergency, the following procedures are followed in proceedings for a writ of habeas corpus:
(a) Petitioner with funds. If the petitioner has sufficient funds, the petition shall be filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court, Criminal Division, and the filing fee shall be paid.
(b) Petitioner without funds - with attorney.
(i) If the petitioner is without funds, and has an attorney of his choosing, motion for leave to file a petition for writ of habeas corpus without payment of costs shall be presented to the presiding judge.
(ii) If the petitioner is represented by an attorney of his own choosing the docket fee may be waived by the presiding judge upon a motion supported by the affidavit of the petitioner stating that the petitioner is without funds and that his attorney is rendering services gratuitously.
(iii) If the presiding judge grants the motion, he shall enter an order granting leave to file without payment of costs.
(iv) If the presiding judge denies the motion, he shall endorse the fact of denial on the petition for leave to file.
(c) Petitioner without funds and without attorney.
(i) If the petition states the petitioner is without funds and the petitioner is not represented by an attorney, he shall submit a verified petition to the clerk. **The clerk shall docket the petition and place it on the call of the presiding judge.**
(ii) If the presiding judge finds that petitioner is without an attorney and without funds, the presiding judge shall appoint an attorney to represent the petitioner.
(d) Petition on behalf of another. A person signing a petition for writ of habeas corpus on behalf of another shall appear before the presiding judge in open court and may be examined as to his interest in or relation to the person on whose behalf the petition is presented.
[Adopted May 17, 1976, effective July 1, 1976.]

Also they ruled that if there are palpable **collateral consequences**, such as that a future sentence may be increased or a license may be lost that this also **Does NOT Cause the habeas petition to be Moot** and it qualifies as an exception to the Mootness Doctrine.

HABEAS CORPUS

Exceptions To The Mootness Doctrine

A. In *St. Pierre v. United States*, 319 U.S. 41, 63 S.Ct. 910, 87 L.Ed. 1199 (1943) the Court held that there were **two exceptions to the mootness doctrine when the sentence of a petitioner for a writ of habeas corpus expired**. **First is when the petitioner "could not have brought his case to this Court for review before the expiration of his sentence**." **This applies when the sentence is so short that there is no realistic possibility of bringing the case to court prior to expiration of the sentence.** In *Sibron v. New York*, 392 U.S. 40 at 52, 88 S.Ct. 1889, 20 L.Ed.2d 917 (1968), the Court noted that this was true in a six-month sentence for contempt despite the fact that the petitioner "took all steps to perfect his appeal in a prompt, diligent, and timely manner." The Court in *Sibron* supra, at 53 further noted that: "As *St. Pierre* supra, clearly recognized, a State may not effectively deny a convict access to its appellate courts until he has been released and then argue that his case has been mooted by his failure to do what it alone prevented him from doing."

B. The **second exception** recognized in *St. Pierre* supra at 43, permits adjudication of the merits of a criminal case where "**under either state or federal law further penalties or disabilities can be imposed . . . as a result of the judgment which has . . . been satisfied**". *St. Pierre* supra at 43, implied that it was the burden of the petitioner to show the existence of collateral legal consequences.

C. In *Fiswick v. United States*, 329 U.S. 211, 67 S.Ct. 224, 91 L.Ed. 196 (1946) the Court held that a criminal case had not become moot upon release of the prisoner because the petitioner, an alien, might be subject to deportation for having committed a crime of "moral turpitude". The Court also pointed out that if the petitioner should in the future decide he wanted to become an American Citizen, he might have difficulty proving that he was of "good moral character."

D. The Court *Ginsburg v. State of New York*, 390 U.S. 629, 633, 99 S.Ct. 1274, 1277, 20 L.Ed.2d 195, n. 2 (1968) held that the mere possibility that the Commissioner of Buildings of the Town of Hempstead, New York, might "in his discretion" attempt in the future to revoke a license to run a luncheonette because of a single conviction for selling relatively inoffensive "girlie" magazines to a 16-year-old boy was sufficient to preserve a criminal case from mootness. In *United States v. Morgan*, 346 U.S. 502, 74 S.Ct 247, 98 L.Ed. 248 (1954) the Court ruled that collateral consequences should be considered in determining mootness.

E. Although the term has been served, the results of the conviction may persist. Subsequent convictions may carry heavier penalties, civil rights may be affected. As the power to remedy an invalid sentence exists, we think, respondent is entitled to an opportunity to attempt to show that this conviction was invalid. *Morgan* at 512-513 supra.

F. The Court in *Sibron* at 55 supra, re-iterated that this inquiry was made a presumption in a previous decision: "[I]n *Pollard v. United States*, 352 U.S. 354, 77 S.Ct 481, 1 L.Ed.2d 393 (1957), the Court abandoned all inquiry into the actual existence of specific collateral consequences and in effect presumed that they existed." [emphasis added]

G. The *Sibron* Court **clarified the constitutional importance of giving the petitioner his day in court on a habeas corpus petition after release from custody, in the face of any direct or collateral consequences**.

H. The Court thus acknowledged the obvious fact of life that most criminal convictions do in fact entail adverse collateral legal consequences (FN See generally Note, 53 Va.L.Rev. 403 (1967).) The mere 'possibility' that this will be the case is enough to preserve a criminal case from ending 'ignominiously in the limbo of mootness' *Parker v. Ellis*, 362 U.S. 574, 577, 80 S.Ct 909, 911, 4 L.Ed.2d 963 (1960) (dissenting opinion). Sibron supra, at 55. [emphasis added]

I. [I]t is far better to eliminate the source of a potential legal disability than to require the citizen to suffer the possibly unjustified consequences of the disability itself for an indefinite period of time before he can secure adjudication of the State's right to impose it on the basis of some past action. Df. *Peyton v. Rowe*, 391 U.S. 54, 64, 88 S.Ct. 1549, 20 L.Ed.2d 426 (1968) (FN This factor has clearly been considered relevant by the Court in the past in determining the issue of mootness. See *Fiswick v. United States*, 329 U.S. 211, 221-222, 67 S.Ct. 224, 229-230, 91 L.Ed. 196 (1946). *Sibron* supra, at 56. [emphasis added]

J. None of the concededly imperative policies behind the constitutional rule against entertaining moot controversies would be served by a dismissal in Sibron's case or in further refusal to hear the cases before this bar.

K. *St. Pierre v. United States*, supra, must be read in light of later cases to mean that **a criminal case is moot only if it is shown that there is no possibility that any collateral legal consequences will be imposed on the basis of the challenged conviction**. *Sibron* supreme 57. [emphasis added] The Court therefore concluded that analogously Sibron's petition for writ of habeas corpus was not moot because he "has a substantial stake in the judgment of conviction which survives the satisfaction of the sentence imposed on him. *Sibron* supra, at 57-58. Citing *Fiswick* supra, at 222.

L. Subsequent release of the petitioner does not oust the court of statutory jurisdiction because with a conviction there are presumed collateral consequences that persists after termination of

sentence. *Carafas*. At 237-238 supra. [including inability to engage in certain businesses, inability to vote, inability to serve as official of labor union, inability to serve as juror, impeachment of character, enhancement of future sentence, etc. depending on laws of state] **Even in the case of a non-felony criminal contempt conviction the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals held that even the direct consequence of a fine constitutes consequences that persists after termination of sentence**. *Port v. Heard*, 764 F.2d 423 (1985).

M. In *Lane v. Williams*, 455 U.S. 624, 102 S.Ct. 1322, 71 L.Ed.2d 508 (1982), the U.S. Supreme Court narrowed the presumed collateral consequences doctrine so that termination of sentence did not oust statutory jurisdiction when the issue presented in the petition for habeas corpus involved the conviction and not specifically only the sentence. As the issue of the sentence no longer existed if the petitioner was released from custody (incarceration or parole), then the petition for habeas corpus became moot under the specific circumstance that the petitioner did not question the validity of his conviction, but only applied for the writ based on his sentence.

N. In *Spencer v. Kemna*, 523 U.S. 1, 118 S.Ct. 978, 140 L.Ed.2d 43 (1998), the Court further narrowed the presumed collateral consequences doctrine stating that the presumption of collateral consequences to conviction do not flow to parole violations in order to satisfy Article III injury-in-fact requirement for the Court to retain jurisdiction.

O. **The U.S. Supreme Court ruled that**:

The petitioner in this case was sentenced in 1960. He has been attempting to litigate his constitutional claim ever since. His path has been long-partly because of inevitable delays in our court processes and partly because of the requirement that he exhaust state remedies. **He should not be thwarted now and required to bear the consequences of assertedly unlawful conviction simply because the path has been so long [seven years] that he has served his sentence.** The federal habeas corpus statute does not require this result, and *Parker v. Ellis* must be overruled. *Carafas* supra, at 240. [emphasis added]

P. Therefore, the line of reasoning in the United States of Supreme Court in deciding whether or not a "live" controversy still exists after a petitioner for a writ of habeas corpus has been released from custody, **firmly established the principle that criminal convictions entail collateral consequences that keep the controversy "live" after release when the issues in the habeas petition concern the conviction**, although not when the issues pertain solely to the sentence, nor when the conviction is in regards to a parole violation.

2) **My 1401(f) petition to correct the record, in case 11 M1 6000086, because it does not reflect the correct legal wording of the orders has been filed but Judge Chiampas and Judge Wright have refused to hear it.** Judge Chiampas struck this motion illegally on March 21, 2012 in retaliation for me getting sick in the courtroom and going out into the air-conditioned hallway. This is both an ADA

violation and a violation of my civil rights under color of law. She has REFUSED to correct this judicial misconduct. Therefore, she also is committing a felony crime under U.S.C. Title 18 U.S.C. § 242.

The case, 11 M1 6000086, is where Judge Burch in a misdemeanor case, 09 M1 223774, that was later nolle pros'd unlawfully held me in contempt when I requested a waiver of the Sheriff filing fees for subpoenas. He orally granted it. I wrote the order stating that the fees were waived and the sheriff should serve the subpoenas. Then Judge Burch said it was contemptuous to write that he said the sheriff should serve the subpoenas as he only waived the fees, so he took me into custody when I said that waiving the fees and serving the subpoenas is the same thing. The next day after being in jail overnight Judge Burch, held the sentencing hearing in the lock-up visiting room and sentenced me to one day time served. In August 2011 he ordered that the conviction was "void and held for naught" and had been "purged".

As you are aware, **civil contempt can be purged and criminal contempt cannot**. It is either valid or vacated.

In addition the conviction is void *ab initio* as Judge Burch violated my Sixth Amendment right to a public trial by holding the hearing in the lock-up!

Also, under *In re Marriage Betts*, 200 Ill.App.3d 26 (1990), the Illinois Courts ruled that if sentencing for contempt is on a day other than the day in which the alleged contempt occurs, then the defendant acquires full rights to a jury trial and assistance of counsel.

Therefore, my Constitutional Due Process rights including a jury trial and assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment were violated and this is a violation of U.S.C. Title 18 U.S.C. § 242.

Judge Wright again has REFUSED to hear my newly written and filed on Feb. 8, 2013, 1401(f) Petition to Vacate Void Orders, Correct Docket, Expunge Case, and Refer Judicial Misconduct to the JIB regarding this case.

As chief administrator of the Circuit Court of Cook County **It Is Again Your Administrative Job As His Boss To Have This Petition Heard Immediately Nunc Pro Tunc.**

3) **In case 11 M1 241978 Judge Chiampas has REFUSED to order, due to my indigency (I am on SSI and food stamps per approval of the federal government), under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 607(b) that a notice of appeal be filed by the clerk and two sets of transcripts be ordered from the court reporter without charge to me, so that I can appeal.**

I have therefore filed my own Notice of Appeal within 30 days after Judge Chiampas

unlawfully denied my post-trial motions which documented that she denied me notice (allowed state to change case elected three days prior to trial thus preventing me from having time to subpoena

witnesses -a violation of due process and compulsory process and notice under the Fifth, Sixth, and Fourteenth Amendment as applied to the States).

Again this is a clear violation of U.S.C. Title 18 U.S.C. § 242.

Then I filed on February 8, 2013 and asked it to be scheduled and heard by Judge Wright a 1401(f) Petition to Order Free Transcripts Due to Indigency, which applies to all Seven above noted cases, as the hearings were held at the same time, as well as because speedy trial violations apply to all of them and I am appealing all of them (six cases were nolle pros'd on Dec. 6, 2012 and one was nolle pros'd as a duplicate case on June 11, 2012 after three years of the judges refusing to hear my complaint that it was a duplicate case).

As you know, per *People v. Tannenbaum*, 218 Ill.App.3d 500, 578 N.E.2d 611, 161 Ill.Dec. 253 (1991), a nolle prosequi order is void if there are pending substantive motions. In all these cases there were pending substantive motions regarding habeas corpus and legally insufficient complaints as well as pending habeas petitions. Therefore, the nolle pros orders are appealable in all of these cases and relevant as without dismissal in my favor, I cannot file a tort for malicious prosecution. Failure to deal with this issue gives the appearance that the judges are again purposely violating my civil rights under color of law – preventing me from having remedy under the First Amendment. This again is a violation of U.S.C. Title 18 U.S.C. § 242 and might also be considered an act of conspiracy to violate civil rights under color of law, a violation of U.S.C. Title 18 U.S.C. § 243.

As chief administrator of the Circuit Court of Cook County **It Is Again Your**

Administrative Job As Judge Wright's Boss To Have this oral motion for transcripts and my newly written 1401(f) Petition to Order Free Transcripts Due to Indigency Heard Immediately Nunc Pro Tunc.

4) **In my misdemeanor case, 09 M1 223774, I contacted Milissa Pacelli, the Court Disability Coordinator, that due to severe medical issues I needed accommodations, which were grossly violated as follows and need an investigation by your office:** These accommodations include ability to take my medications to control severe pain, vertigo, and nausea resulting from congenital spinal issues and spinal cord injury and to control cardiac arrhythmias, tremors, and spastic movements exaggerated by emotion; ability to lay down and/or put my feet up, as well as to drink copious amounts of salty fluids periodically to prevent fainting and brief episodes of cardiac arrest due to neurocardiogenic syncope; clear guidelines for deputies due to flashbacks resulting from post-traumatic-stress disorder ("PTSD") which had been induced originally by beatings from and abuse by Sheriff staff. During flashbacks stimulated by officers crowding around me, being loud and aggressive, and grabbing me, I am in an altered state of consciousness and flail my arms in a daytime dream where I believe officers are attacking me. I have a letter from a psychiatrist that officers should avoid being loud and aggressive and should back off during a flashback until it passes and then have a female officer approach me if needed.

During trial, Nov. 26 – Dec 6. 2012, where Judge Chiampas unconstitutionally

allowed the state to **change election of a case three days before trial thus denying me notice and a chance to subpoena witnesses** which denied me compulsory process, I was DENIED my medications, forced to represent myself pro se while in severe pain with vertigo and nausea and she and the officers purposely induced a flashback, then charged me with felony battery for, during the flashback which I don't remember as I was in a temporary altered state of consciousness, for alleged: "she struck her [a sheriff deputy] with her R arm struck her L ear, and pulled her hair in a downward motion," while a half dozen deputies who were apparently mostly male had suddenly pounced on me like a pack of wolves and grabbed each limb carrying me to the lock-up after Judge Chiampas in an unconstitutional act suddenly raised bail from $2,000 personal recognizance to an outrageous and excessive $600,000, causing me to go into mental shock and stand stunned and unable to say anything but "Wa Wa" per witnesses. Witnesses say that then these officers simply ran over and grabbed me aggressively yelling at me, despite the fact that the disability coordinator promised compliance with accommodations! **This clearly is therefore, an act of unlawful arrest and malicious prosecution in violation of the ADA**. [NOTE: transcript reveals standby counsel for me 5 min after I was grabbed confirmed to the court that I was unable to understand him and in no condition to answer him – and will testify that I was in a PTSD flashback or had the symptoms of such, induced by the illegal acts of courtroom services officers – so unable to form intent – during an illegal act of courtroom officers failing to accommodate disabilities and in so doing inducing a flashback and imbalance which due to my neurologic disorder causes me to grab out and fling my arms out for balance – as well as induced an altered mental state when I "misperceive ongoing events" per psychiatrist treating my PTSD – thus unable to form intent – a required element of the charge of felony battery – MAKING THE CHARGE VOID; amended 9-12-16 LS]

I now need accommodations during hearings and trial on this new unconstitutional felony battery charge before Judge Cannon, 12 CR 22504. I have already asked for SOJ as a right due to Judge Boyle's illegal violation of the ADA!

Judge Cannon has unlawfully ordered a fitness exam and I am attaching a memorandum of law about fitness exams that you should share with the judges, as well as institute an education program for the judges about the ADA and fitness exams as they are so incredibly ignorant. I refuse to answer questions with any fitness exam that is unlawfully ordered in violation of rules set out by statute and case law, therefore, the forensic examiner always states he/she is unable to determine fitness.

It is incredible that over the years despite NUMEROUS legitimate complaints concerning procedures, lack of procedures, judicial ignorance, judicial misconduct and misconduct of the Court Clerk and deputies, you have failed to investigate anything or do your job and do anything to provide remedies for these issues, to prevent problems in the future.

Therefore, I am requesting a meeting with you or your staff and judicial representatives to discuss proposals for solutions by me and a network of whistle blowers and activists who also have

serious complaints about lawlessness and illegal conduct of judges in family court and probate court. You have now defended several complaints I have made to higher courts which were never decided on the merits and will be pursued by other means.

I have no confidence that you will do your job and therefore, I feel this letter is just a formality that I can provide to higher courts to prove due diligence in that I have tried everything through normal channels to urge the Circuit Court of Cook County to correct serious deficiencies that amount to felony violation of civil rights under color of law.

I remain as always open to mediation and discussion on these matters and pray daily that you will provide justice and no longer participate in this judicial misconduct.

Most Sincerely and Prayerfully,

Linda Lorincz Shelton, PhD, MD

Cc:

U.S. Attorney General

Press