## No. 1-23-1142

# IN THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

PAUL R. DULBERG and THE PAUL R.	) Appeal from the Circuit Court of the
DULBERG REVOCABLE TRUST	) 1st Judicial Circuit, Cook County,
	) Illinois
Plaintiffs-Appellants	Relief Sought: Appellants' Brief Due Date Extended
••	to December 11, 2023
	)
	)
	)
JOSEPH DAVID OLSEN,	)
CRAIG A. WILLETTE,	)
RALPH E. YALDEN II,	)
YALDEN, OLSEN & WILLETTE LAW	)
OFFICES	)
Defendants-Appellees	)
	)Honorable Michael F. Otto, Judge Presiding
	)Date of Notice of Appeal June 26, 2023
	)Date of Rule 304(a) Judgment May 25, 2023
	)Date of Post Judgment Motion Order: None

# FIRST MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FILE APPELLANTS' BRIEF (Civil)

Plaintiffs-Appellants Paul R Dulberg (Appellant) and the Paul R. Dulberg Revocable Trust move this Honorable Court for an <u>extension of time to file Appellants' Brief to DECEMBER 11, 2023</u> and in support of said motion states as follows:

# I. <u>APPELLANTS PREVIOUSLY FILED A MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE RECORD ON APPEAL</u>

 On July 10, 2023 Plaintiffs-Appellants filed their Request For Preparation of the Record On Appeal pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 312 and 323;

- 2. The Record On Appeal was due on or before August 28, 2023 pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rules 326 and 608(c);
- 3. On August 28, 2023 the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois sent an email to Plaintiffs-Appellants' Attorney indicating that the Record on Appeal was prepared and indicating there was a balance due of \$228.50;
- 4. On August 29, 2023 Plaintiffs-Appellants' Attorney paid the balance due in the electronic method indicated;
- 5. On August 30, 2023 Plaintiffs-Appellants' Attorney received two (2) emails from the Appellate Clerk's Office indication that the First Judicial Appellate Clerk had received the Record On Appeal due on August 28, 2023 late on August 30, 2023;
- 6. The Appeals Clerk of the First Judicial District of Illinois accepted the Record on Appeal on September 7, 2023.
- 7. Appellants' Brief is due 35 days from filing the Record on Appeal (Illinois Supreme Court Rule 343(a)).
- 8. Therefore Appellants' Brief is due October 12, 2023.
- 9. The total number of days requested was 9 days for the Record on Appeal to be filed and the number of days granted was 9 days.
- 10. The total number of days granted on all previous motions was 9 days.
- 11. The total number of days requested, and the total number of days granted on all the previous motions for extension of time filed by other parties are zero days.
- 12. The total number of days that will have elapsed from the date of filing of the Notice of Appeal to the date the case will be ready for disposition if the present extension and no further extensions are granted is 217 days.

- 13. On October 10, 2023 and before filing this motion, Appellants Attorney emailed a copy of this motion and indicated he would be seeking an extension of time for 60 days to file the Appellants' Brief based upon inconsistent Orders filed in the Trial Court, one of which was based on Illinois Supreme Court Rule 304(a), in comparison to the Trial Court transcript of September 21, 2023. (Please see Appellants' Exhibits A through E attached).
- 14. Appellants' Attorney's is a sole practitioner with a full schedule of additional court matters and hearings.
- 15. Within Appellants' Attorneys e-mail to the Defendants' legal representatives was a request that Appellants' Attorney be informed, for inclusion within the motion, whether Defendants' (4) four representing law firms objected to the extension.
- 16. At the time of finagling this Motion for Extension of Time to file Appellants' Brief one law firm replied, "no Objection", one law firm responded indirectly by noticing and setting a Motion Requesting a Status set for October 31, 2023, and the final two law firms have not responded.

Wherefore, Plaintiffs-Appellants prays that this Honorable Court recognize Plaintiffs-Appellants' Attorney good faith efforts to comply with the Illinois Supreme Court rules regarding the preparation and filing of Appellants' Brief, grant 60 additional days up to and including December 11, 2023 to file and serve Appellants' Brief and any additional relief this Honorable Court deems equitable and just.

Dated: October 11, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Alphonse A. Talarico

ARDC 6184530

707 Skokie Boulevard suite 600

Northbrook, Illinois 60062

(312) 808-1410

contact@lawofficeofalphonsetalarico.com

**VERIFICATION BY CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO SECTION 1-109** 

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 he verily believes the

same to be true.

/s/ Alphonse A. Talarico

**PROOF OF DELIVERY** 

4

I am sending this MOTION TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR FILING APPELLANTS'

**BRIEF**, proposed Order and Notice of Filing to: see Service list as follows

by an approved electronic filing service provider (EFSP) on October 11, 2023 at 4:45 p.m.

I certify that everything in the *Proof of Delivery* is true and correct. I understand that a false

statement herein is perjury and has penalties provided by law under 735 ILCS 5/1-109.

Dated: October 11, 2023

/s/ Alphonse A. Talarico ARDC 6184530 707 Skokie Boulevard suite 600 Northbrook, Illinois 60062 (312) 808-1410 contact@lawofficeofalphonsetalarico.com

5

## **EXHIBIT A**



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

ORDI	ER	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
Baudin Law Offices, et al.	)	
Law Offices of Baudin & Baudin, Baudin &	)	
Baudin & Baudin, an Association of Attorneys,	)	
KELLY N. BAUDIN a/k/a Baudin & Baudin,	)	
	)	
V.	)	Case No. 2022 L 010905
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
REVOCABLE TRUST,	)	
PAUL DULBERG and THE PAUL DULBERG	)	

This matter coming before the Court for hearing on Defendants, Joseph David Olsen, Craig A. Willette, and Raphael E. Yalden II's Combined Motion to Dismiss Count III of Plaintiffs' Complaint at Law, Plaintiffs present through counsel, Alphonse Talarico, and personally present, Defendants present through counsel, Jason W. Jochum, the Court having heard argument on the Defendants' Combined Motion to Dismiss Count III and reviewed the briefs and submissions by the parties, the Court being duly advised in the premises,

# IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

4271 4020

- 1. For the reasons stated on the record, Defendants, Joseph David Olsen, Craig A. Willette, and Raphael E. Yalden II's Combined Motion to Dismiss Count III of Plaintiffs' Complaint at Law is granted, with prejudice. There being no further allegations against these Defendants, they are dismissed from this matter, with prejudice.
- Further, the Court finds that, pursuant to Ill. Sup. Ct. R. 304(a), there is no just cause or reason for delay of enforcement of this order, and it is final and appealable.

Dated: May 25, 2023

Hon. Michael F. Otto

Order Prepared By: Jason W. Jochum

LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH, LLP

550 W. Adams Street, Suite 300 Chicago, Illinois 60661 (312) 345-1718 Jason.Jochum@lewisbrisbois.com Firm I.D. No. 41737 Judge Michael F. Otto

MAY 2 5 2023

Circuit Court - 2065

#### EXHIBIT B



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

)
) Case No. 2022 L 010905
)
)
)
)
)

## **ORDER**

This matter coming before the Court for hearing on Defendant ADR Systems of America, L.L.C.'s Section 2-615 Motion to Dismiss, the parties being present, and the Court being duly advised in the premises,

# IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. For the reasons stated on the record, Defendant ADR Systems' Motion to Dismiss is granted and Plaintiffs' Complaint is dismissed without prejudice;
- 6) 2. This matter as to ADR is continued for status to July 31, 2023 at 9:45 a.m.

Hon. Michael Otto

Robert A. Chapman CHAPMAN SPINGOLA, LLP

190 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3850 Chicago, Illinois 60603 (312) 606-8752 rchapman@chapmanspingola.com wdickmann@chapmanspingola.com Firm I.D. No. 29411

Counsel for Defendant ADR Systems of America, L.L.C.

Judge Michael F. Otto

MAY 2 5 2023

Circuit Court - 2065

### **EXHIBIT C**



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

PAUL DULBERG and THE PAUL DULBERG	)	
REVOCABLE TRUST,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
V.	)	Case No. 2022 L 010905
KELLY N. BAUDIN, et al.	)	
Defendants.	)	

## **ORDER**

This matter coming before the Court for hearing on Defendants Kelly N. Baudin, William Randal Baudin, II and Kelran Inc. a/k/a The Baudin Law Group, Ltd.'s (the "Baudin Defendants") motion to dismiss; and for status on Defendant Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company's ("Allstate") motion for summary judgment; a hearing having been held and the Court being fully advised in the premises;

# IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 4226
- 1. The Baudin Defendants' motion to dismiss is GRANTED on statute of limitations grounds, only. In light of the order of dismissal, the Court makes no ruling on the other grounds for dismissal asserted in the Baudin Defendants' motion as they are moot. The Baudin Defendants are hereby dismissed with prejudice from this cause.



- 2. The previously-set hearing on Defendant Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company's ("Allstate") motion for summary judgment, set for September 21, 2023, at 11:15 a.m., shall stand.
- 3. The hearing on the Allstate's motion will be held in-person and via Zoom (Meeting ID: 768 225 2047 | Passcode: 902018 | Call In #: 312-626-6799).

Judge Michael F. Otto

Order Prepared By:

Jeremy N. Boeder Date: August 29, 2023

AUG 2 9 2023 Circuit Court – 2065

TRIBLER ORPETT & MEYER, P.C. 225 W. Washington Street, Ste 2550

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 201-6400

jnboeder@tribler.com

Firm I.D. No. 39950

Attorneys for Baudin Defendants

Entered:

Hon, Michael F. Otto

## **EXHIBIT D**

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

PAUL R. DULBERG, Individually, and THE PAUL R. DULBERG REVOCABLE	)
TRUST,	ý ,
Plaintiffs,	)
v.	) No. 2022 L 10905
KELLY N. BAUDIN A/K/A BAUDIN & BAUDIN, BAUDIN & BAUDIN AN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS, LAW OFFICES OF BAUDIN & BAUDIN, BAUDIN & BAUDIN LAW OFFICES, WILLIAM RANDAL BAUDIN II A/K/A BAUDIN & BAUDIN, BAUDIN & BAUDIN AN ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS, LAW OFFICES OF BAUDIN & BAUDIN, BAUDIN & BAUDIN LAW OFFICES, KELRAN, INC A/K/A THE BAUDIN LAW GROUP, Ltd., JOSEPH DAVID OLSEN, A/K/A YALDEN, OLSEN & WILLETTE LAW OFFICES, CRAIG A WILLETTE LAW OFFICES, RAPHAEL E YALDEN II, A/K/A YALDEN, OLSEN & WILLETTE LAW OFFICES, ADR SYSTEMS OF AMERICA, LLC., ASSUMED NAME ADR COMMERCIAL SERVICES, ALLSTATE PROPERTY AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,	Calendar U  Calendar U  Calendar U  Calendar U
COMPANI,	)
Defendants.	)

# ORDER

This cause coming before the Court for hearing and ruling on Defendant Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company's Motion for Summary Judgment, Counsel for Plaintiff, Paul R. Dulberg, Individually, and The Paul R. Dulberg Revocable Trust ("Plaintiff"), Counsel for Defendant, Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company ("Allstate"), and Counsel for the "Olsen Defendants" all appearing before the Court, the Court having heard oral argument from Plaintiff and Defendant Allstate and having considered all briefs and exhibits, including Plaintiff's recently filed counter-affidavit, the Court being fully advised in the premises, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. Allstate's Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED for the reasons stated on the record. This is a final and appealable order.

Prepared by:	ENTERED:	
Christine V. Anto		
Michelle E. Tinajero		
AMUNDSEN DAVIS, LLC (Firm ID. No. 42907)		
150 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 3300		
Chicago, Illinois 60601	Judge	Date
T: (312) 894-3278		
canto@amundsendavislaw.com		

mtinajero@amundsendavislaw.com

Judge Michael F. Otto SEP 2 1 2023 Circuit Court – 2055

	EXHIBIT E	Page 1
1		
	IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF CO	OOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
2	COUNTY DEPARTMENT - L	AW DIVICION
3	COUNTI DEFARIMENT - E	AW DIVISION
4		
	PAUL R. DULBERG and THE PAUL )	
5	R. DULBERG REVOCABLE TRUST, )	
	)	
6	Plaintiff, )	
	)	
7	vs.	No. 2022 L 010905
	)	
8	KELLY N. BAUDIN, et al,	
	)	
9	Defendants. )	
10		
11	Zoom video conference of	
12	held before the HONORABLE I	
13	Courtroom 1407, taken pursuant	_
14 15	at 11:15 a.m., Thursday, So	eptember 21, 2023.
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	Reported by: Connie L. James, C.	SR
23	License No. 084.00	2510
24		

	Page 3
1	INDEX
2	
3	HEARING ON MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT:
4	
5	Arguments:
6	By Ms. TinajeroPg. 5
	By Mr. TalaricoPg. 7
7	By Ms. TinajeroPg. 14
	By Mr. TalaricoPg. 16
8	
9	Court's Ruling on the MotionPg. 16
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

THE COURT: Good morning. Would everyone please identify themselves for the record?

MR. TALARICO: Good morning, Your Honor.

Alphonse Talarico. I represent the Plaintiffs.

MS. TINAJERO: Good morning, Judge Otto. My name is Michelle Tinajero. I represent Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company.

THE COURT: Thank you.

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Mr. is it Mr. Jochum?

MR. JOCHUM: Jochum, Your Honor. Sorry.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning.

MR. JOCHUM: Jason Jochum representing what we refer to as the Olsen Defendants, Joseph Olsen, Craig Willette and Raphael Yalden. They were dismissed earlier, but I'm just observing because we're still on appeal.

THE COURT: Thank you. I see we are also joined by Mr. Dulberg, individually, as well as Thomas Kost, K O S T, who is identified in his Zoom window as, the quote, full trustee of Paul R. Dulberg Revocable Trust, unquote.

We're up today for hearing on Allstate's
Motion For Summary Judgment, which has been fully
briefed. Anything to discuss before we move forward

Page 5

1 | with that hearing?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

2.3

24

Mr. Talarico for the Plaintiff?

MR. TALARICO: Judge, no, nothing.

THE COURT: Ms. Tinajero, ready?

MS. TINAJERO: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. You'll have the first and last word.

I will say for the record I have read the briefs, I have, of course, reviewed the exhibits as well as the authority that the parties have cited. So no within should feel that they need to read their brief to me, but I will, of course, give both sides an opportunity to be heard.

Ms. Tinajero, it's your motion, you'll have the first and last word.

MS. TINAJERO: Thank you, Your Honor. I will keep it brief this morning since you have gone through the briefs.

19 ARGUMENT BY

20 MS. TINAJERO:

The arguments set forth in our Motion For Summary Judgment are very straight forward. You know, as to the unsigned agreement, the position Plaintiffs have taken that a party is bound by and, therefore, can

Page 6

breach an unsigned, undated agreement is a legally flawed position. Simply put, Allstate cannot be bound by an unsigned agreement.

As to the binding mediation agreement, which is the only executed valid agreement between the parties, which is undisputed, to the extent terms were modified and/or admitted between the unsigned agreement and the executed binding mediation agreement, it is not alleged Allstate does not maintain that it played any role in drafting anything about the mediation agreement. And, importantly, such amendments were made before the binding mediation was executed.

Additionally, the monetary parameters set forth in the agreement remains the same in both the unsigned agreement and the executed binding mediation agreement.

The damage that Dulberg identifies in the complaint, you know, in an amount in excess of \$261,000 do not flow from any breach complained of as against Allstate. And it's our position that there are no set of facts under which Dulberg can prove a breach of an unsigned agreement or the executed binding mediation agreement.

2.0

2.2

Further, Dulberg executed a release, which is attached to our Motion For Summary Judgment. The terms of the release are clear, certain, free from doubt and Dulberg admits to signing the release in his reply to Allstate's affirmative defenses. That's all I have, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Tinajero.

Mr. Talarico?

ARGUMENT BY

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

MR. TALARICO:

I think I would like to start in reverse order. I would like to address, Judge, the release.

Mr. Dulberg -- I filed on behalf of
Mr. Dulberg, he signed a counter-affidavit, which was
sent to the Court and I believe it's actually been
delivered personally to your courtroom today. It was
filed yesterday. Mr. Dulberg had been sick for a few
days and he couldn't cooperate or give me any of his
time, but I filed it yesterday and it's in opposite to
the release, the reasons why the release is not
effective. His reasoning is that he was forced to do
this against his will.

In his counter-affidavit he indicated, and I think copied transcripts of e-mails that he received

from his own attorney forcing -- telling him that if he didn't sign the release, the Judge would hold him in contempt and he would be jailed, different than the general terms of contract by signing a release, which is a contract, under those terms cannot be enforced against the person that's being threatened with jail, and/or being held in contempt. Plus, that particular release makes no sense, Judge.

If you really think about all of the things they talk about in their motion and affidavit, especially the affidavit.

I would like to bring up the fact that the statement, the affiant says the money was paid and then the releases were sent out to be signed. Judge, I would ask you to take judicial notice that insurance companies do not pay first and then send out releases.

Furthermore, since this matter was already adjudicated and an order was entered by the arbitration judge, there was no need for a release; that Allstate had paid, according to their own affidavit, and now they're trying to enforce and ask for and force Mr. Dulberg to sign a release. I think that brings up a considerable amount of questionable contrary facts just on its own, Judge.

2.0

2.2

what I'm saying and see that summary judgment is so inappropriate, that's just one of hundreds of things that we are at different ends of the spectrum on. And I think that's all been supplied to Your Honor, but, most importantly, this release issue, it is contrary to the logic that the money was paid first and released. In my practice, Judge, but I've never settled with an insurance company that would pay first and then ask for a release. That's all I have to say today, Judge. Thank you.

2.0

2.2

2.3

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Talarico, the only argument you want to make today is a brand new argument based on, I believe, duress that did not appear anywhere in your response brief. It is based exclusively on an affidavit that was filed yesterday and hand delivered to the Court minutes before this proceeding began.

That's the only argument you want to make?

You don't want to address anything that Ms. Tinajero

spelled out in the motion or the reply regarding the

enforceability of an unsigned agreement, which is the

entire basis of Count 5? I just want to make sure that

you have a full opportunity to make whatever arguments

Page 10

1 | you wish.

2.1

2.4

- 2 FURTHER ARGUMENT
- 3 BY MR. TALARICO:

First, I would like to get back to the release. The release was filed yesterday, Your Honor. It was filed and it was accepted. I sent it out to Your Honor this morning at about 6:00 a.m. with the attached exhibits and all the other counsel of record. What response I got was please send a hard copy from your support staff. So I had a hard copy delivered to the courtroom today, but this was filed yesterday.

Judge, this was filed pursuant to, and I think it's clear there, Subsection C of the Motion For Summary Judgment. I'm allowed to do that, Your Honor. And I just complied with the statute, 735 5 -- Well, you know, Judge, better than I know. But 105 Subsection C says I can file counter-affidavits up to the time of hearing and I did that.

So I don't think I violated anyone and I tried -- I sent a message to everybody that if anybody objects, they want more time to review, they want more time to respond, we have no objection. And I also -- counsel suggested the reason why Mr. Dulberg is here because if the Court wants to examine him as to the

affidavit, he's more than willing to answer questions of the Court.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

THE COURT: This is not an evidentiary hearing.

MR. TALARICO: You're right, Your Honor. I just made that option.

THE COURT: The other question I asked you, and, again, you focused exclusively on this 11th hour affidavit, which only addresses the effectiveness of the release, I want to make sure that you've had the opportunity to address today, if you choose, because I didn't see anything really in your brief that addresses why the draft agreement attached as Exhibit 6B to the complaint would be enforceable?

MR. TALARICO: Why it wouldn't be enforceable? Is that what you said? I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Why it would be enforceable because that's your claim. Count 5 is for breach of contract.

MR. TALARICO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: The breach that you claim in

Paragraph 106 is that Defendant breached the contract

by not following the terms regarding amending the

contract, but the only amendments that you cite are the

changes between Exhibit 6B and Exhibit 11. So for

there to possibly be a breach of contract, Exhibit 6B

must have been enforceable, otherwise you can't possibly have a claim for its breach. And Ms. Tinajero on behalf of Allstate has argued in the motion and the reply that because Exhibit B was unsigned it was not enforceable.

2.3

THE COURT: Judge, Exhibit B was the only exhibit permitted by the bankruptcy court. It was presented to the bankruptcy judge as unsigned and the bankruptcy judge, Judge Lynch, said to the trustee "sign the contract and you can go forward." Trustee never signed it. They refused to sign -- They didn't actually refuse to sign it, but he didn't. Then another contract appeared.

One of the things we said, Judge, is that this matter -- this binding mediation agreement had been already presented to the trial court judge maybe 6 months before. So there's all of these issues of what's the valid contract, names are changing from the Defendant being liable, the contract now says a relative of the Dulbergs is liable to Paul, but there's a person, David Dulberg, he exists.

Again, the bankruptcy judge saw an unsigned contract and told and instructed his trustee to sign it.

We have an enforceable contract, I believe.

And I think that the fact that all of these things were done -- and forgive me, Judge, because I don't practice bankruptcy -- but in violation of the stay that had been in effect that whole time. I think that with all of those issues I should be allowed as representative of the Plaintiff to do some discovery upon to see really what the truth of the matter is, we've had allegations back and forth.

THE COURT: You said that the bankruptcy court directed the trustee to sign the agreement. So what possible relevance can any prior alleged violations of the stay have to do with Allstate's liability under any contract?

MR. TALARICO: Judge, the terms of the contract, we say that the signed contract is a contract. The terms of the contract as accepted and signed by all the parties were -- when I say parties I mean Dulberg denies he signed it, but, anyway, the terms of the contract are sufficient, they say that the breach is that they changed the terms of the contract from the contract they presented to the Court; that the plain language of the contract says if you do this you have to do it, you have to submit hard copies, you have to

2.0

2.2

2.3

- do it in advance, I think it's 2 weeks, you have to get permission by the ADR. None of that was done. And both Baudin and the attorney for Allstate were participants in that. So I believe that's a breach of contract.
  - THE COURT: Mr. Talarico, that assumes that the unsigned contract was enforceable. What factual or legal support do you have for that proposition because I saw not a single case cited in your brief at all?

    And the extensive factual recitation appears completely irrelevant. So what did you point me to that I overlooked in your brief that provides factual or legal support for the proposition that the unsigned contract is enforceable?
  - MR. TALARICO: Judge, I will rest now. I said what I have to say. What I pointed you to was the fact that the only contract empowered was the unsigned one. So I'm going to stay on that and I'm finished talking. Thank you, Judge.
    - THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Talarico.
- 21 Ms. Tinajero, if you wish?
- 22 | FURTHER ARGUMENT

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- 23 BY MS. TINAJERO:
- Judge, just briefly. I will say as to the

counter-affidavit that was filed this morning, or at least a courtesy copy of which we only received this morning, it's Allstate's position it should be stricken.

2.3

A briefing schedule was entered in this case. Dulberg, Plaintiff's counsel received an extension of time to file his response. But, more importantly, procedural matters aside, all the information contained in the counter-affidavit it doesn't create a genuine issue of material fact as to Allstate's breach of an unsigned agreement:

Any representations that the Baudin

Defendants made or the Olsen Defendants made to Dulberg
in the course of the binding mediation proceedings, any
execution of the binding mediation agreement or in

Dulberg's execution of the release have no bearing on
the specific claim against Allstate here, which is
breach of an unsigned contract. That's all, Your

Honor.

MR. TALARICO: Your Honor, may I respond?

THE COURT: You had a full opportunity to argue,

Mr. Talarico, but in the interest of making a complete

record, what did you wish to say, bearing in mind that

Ms. Tinajero will have the last word?

Page 16

#### 1 FURTHER ARGUMENT

- 2 BY MR. TALARICO:
- 3 Yes. I'm repeating myself but --
- 4 THE COURT: Then why are you taking everybody's
- time if all you're going to do is repeat yourself?
- 6 MR. TALARICO: One sentence, Judge, will be all I
  7 want.
- 8 I'm allowed to do that pursuant to 735 ILCS 9 5/2-1005(c). Thank you, Judge.
  - THE COURT: All right. You did, indeed, repeat yourself, but I suppose if you wanted to say that a second time for the record, fine.
- 13 | COURT'S RULING

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

- 14 ON THE MOTION:
  - Plaintiff's counsel is correct, Section 2

    1005 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure, 735 ILCS

    5/2-1005, Subparagraph (c), does permit an opposing

    party to, quote, prior to or at the time of the hearing

    on the motion file counter-affidavits, unquote.
  - I remain unconvinced of the wisdom of that provision of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure, but there's nothing unconstitutional about it and judges don't ignore or overlook a statute simply because they can't understand why in the world that would be the

Page 17

law. So, yes, there is nothing procedurally improper about launching an affidavit at the opposing parties and the Court hours before a hearing on a fully briefed Motion For Summary Judgment. So I have received the affidavit.

2.0

2.2

The affidavit, as I said, essentially seeks to lay ground work for a claim of duress in executing the release. I don't see anything about duress by Allstate and I don't see anything in the affidavit, nor have I heard anything in counsel's argument today, that would suggest that Allstate was not entitled to rely on the release, but the release issue is only one of the arguments that Allstate makes in support of its Motion For Summary Judgment.

Even if I were to find that there were an issue of material fact as to the enforceability of the release, Allstate is entitled to summary judgment on Count 5 of the complaint as pled because the only breach of contract that the Plaintiff alleges is failure to follow, quote, the terms regarding amending the contract. But the only amendments of the contract that the Plaintiff identifies are changes from an unsigned version of the contract to the final signed version of the contract.

The Plaintiff provides no authority to support the proposition that the unsigned contract was binding on Allstate or anyone else. And if the contract, itself, was not binding, definitionally the terms regarding amending the contract, quote, unquote, cannot have been bind. There is no other breach pled. So Allstate ask entitled to summary judgment.

2.0

2.2

In addition, even if hypothetically, because I understand Mr. Talarico's point, that the unsigned version of the contract was the version presented to the bankruptcy judge in advance, even if theoretically there might be some potential claim for hoodwinking the bankruptcy judge, or something like that, I don't know what it would be, even if hoodwinking the bankruptcy judge, quote, unquote, were a basis for finding a contract enforceable, even so the breaches that the Plaintiff claims did not cause any injury.

Mr. Talarico notes that there were a few changes and one does appear to have introduced a typographical error in terms of the individual who would be responsible to the Plaintiff, but both contracts, the unsigned and the signed, were identical as far as Allstate's obligation and there is no suggestion, there is not even any suggestion, let alone

an issue of material fact that Allstate paid the full amount that it was obligated to pay under either version of the contract.

2.3

So Allstate is entitled to summary judgment not only on the grounds that there was no breach, but, even if there were a breach, there was no injury.

The motion for summary judgment is granted in its entirety.

And the parties will have to remind me, I don't believe there are any other parties remaining, but, perhaps, I'm overlooking someone.

Mr. Talarico, to your knowledge are there any other party defendants remaining in the case?

MR. TALARICO: Not at this moment, Your Honor. There are no more, you've already released everyone.

THE COURT: Okay. So then today's order will be final and appealable.

Ms. Tinajero, I'll ask you to draft a short written order. It doesn't need to say anything more than that the parties appearing on Allstate's Motion For Summary Judgment, Court having heard argument of both sides, having considered all briefs and all exhibits, including the recent affidavit by Plaintiff Paul Dulberg grants summary judgment for the reasons

```
Page 20
     stated on the record. This is a final and appealable
 1
 2
     order.
                 Thank you, everybody. Have a good day.
 3
     We're in recess.
 4
            MS. TINAJERO: Thank you, Judge.
 5
            MR. TALARICO: Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
           (Whereupon the hearing concluded at 11:40 a.m.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

2.2

23

24

# [& - appearing]

&	5	addition 18:8	alleges 17:19
	-	additionally	allowed 10:14
<b>&amp;</b> 2:12,13	5 3:6 9:23	6:13	13:6 16:8
0	10:15 11:17	address 7:12	allstate 2:8 4:6
<b>010905</b> 1:7	17:18	9:20 11:10	6:2,9,20 8:19
084.002510	<b>5/2-1005</b> 16:9	addresses 11:8	12:3 14:3
1:23 21:3,20	16:17	11:11	15:17 17:9,11
1	<b>550</b> 2:14	adjudicated	17:13,17 18:3
<b>1005</b> 16:16	6	8:18	18:7 19:1,4
<b>1005</b> 10:16 <b>105</b> 10:16	<b>6</b> 12:17	admits 7:4	allstate's 4:22
<b>105</b> 10.10 <b>106</b> 11:20	<b>600</b> 2:6	admitted 6:7	7:5 13:13 15:3
100 11:20 11 11:23	<b>60062</b> 2:6	adr 14:2	15:10 18:23
<b>11</b> 11.23 <b>11:15</b> 1:14	<b>60601</b> 2:10	advance 14:1	19:20
11:40 20:7	<b>60661</b> 2:14	18:11	alphonse 2:5,5
11:40 20.7 11th 11:7	<b>6:00</b> 10:7	affiant 8:13	4:4
<b>14</b> 3:7	<b>6b</b> 11:12,23,24	affidavit 7:14	amending
<b>1407</b> 1:13	7	7:23 8:10,11	11:21 17:20
<b>150</b> 2:10	7 3:6	8:20 9:16 11:1	18:5
<b>16</b> 3:7,9	<b>707</b> 2:6	11:8 15:1,9	amendments
2	<b>735</b> 10:15 16:8	17:2,5,6,9	6:11 11:22
	16:16	19:23	17:21
<b>2</b> 14:1 16:15	8	affidavits 10:17	amount 6:18
<b>2022</b> 1:7		16:19	8:23 19:2
<b>2023</b> 1:14	808-1410 2:7	affirmative 7:5	amundsen 2:9
21:18	<b>894-3200</b> 2:11	agreement 5:23	answer 11:1
<b>21</b> 1:14	a	6:1,3,4,5,7,8,11	anybody 10:20
<b>25th</b> 21:18	<b>a.m.</b> 1:14 10:7	6:14,15,16,22	<b>anyway</b> 13:19
<b>261,000</b> 6:18	20:7	6:23 9:22	appeal 4:16
<b>27558</b> 21:19	accepted 10:6	11:12 12:15	appealable
3	13:17	13:11 15:11,15	19:17 20:1
<b>300</b> 2:14	action 21:15	<b>al</b> 1:8	appear 9:14
<b>312</b> 2:7,11,15	actually 7:15	allegations	18:19
<b>3300</b> 2:10	12:11	13:9	appeared 12:13
<b>345-1718</b> 2:15	adams 2:14	alleged 6:9	appearing 2:2
		13:12	19:20

appears 14:10	bearing 15:16	bring 8:12	complained
arbitration	15:23	brings 8:22	6:19
8:18	began 9:18	brisbois 2:13	complaint 6:18
argue 15:21	behalf 7:13	c	11:13 17:18
argued 12:3	12:3	<b>c</b> 2:1 10:13,17	complete 15:22
argument 5:19	believe 7:15	16:9,17	completely
7:9 9:13,13,19	9:14 13:1 14:4	case 14:9 15:5	14:10
10:2 14:22	19:10	19:13	complied 10:15
16:1 17:10	<b>better</b> 10:16		concluded 20:7
19:21	<b>bind</b> 18:6	casualty 4:7	conference
arguments 3:5	binding 6:4,8	cause 18:17	1:11 2:2
5:21 9:24	6:12,15,22	certain 7:3	connie 1:22
17:13	12:15 15:14,15	certificate 21:1	21:3,20
aside 15:8	18:3,4	certified 21:4	considerable
asked 11:6	bisgaard 2:13	certify 21:4,13	8:23
assumes 14:6	boulevard 2:6	changed 13:21	considered
attached 7:2	<b>bound</b> 5:24 6:2	<b>changes</b> 11:23	19:22
10:8 11:12	<b>brand</b> 9:13	17:22 18:19	contained 15:8
attorney 8:1	<b>breach</b> 6:1,19	changing 12:18	contemplate
14:3 21:14	6:21 11:17,19	<b>chicago</b> 2:10,14	9:1
authority 5:10	11:24 12:2	choose 11:10	contempt 8:3,7
18:1	13:20 14:4	circuit 1:1	contract 8:4,5
avenue 2:10	15:10,18 17:19	cite 11:22	11:17,20,22,24
<b>b</b>	18:6 19:5,6	cited 5:10 14:9	12:10,13,18,19
	breached 11:20	civil 16:16,21	12:23 13:1,14
<b>b</b> 12:4,6	breaches 18:16	<b>claim</b> 11:17,19	13:15,16,16,17
back 10:4 13:9	<b>brief</b> 5:12,17	12:2 15:17	13:20,21,22,23
bankruptcy	9:15 11:11	17:7 18:12	14:5,7,13,17
12:7,8,8,22	14:9,12	claims 18:17	15:18 17:19,21
13:4,10 18:11	briefed 4:24	clear 7:3 10:13	17:21,23,24
18:13,14	17:3	<b>code</b> 16:16,21	18:2,4,5,10,16
<b>based</b> 9:14,15	briefing 15:5	commencing	19:3
<b>basis</b> 9:23	briefly 14:24	1:13	contracts 18:22
18:15	<b>briefs</b> 5:9,18	companies 8:16	contracts 16.22 contrary 8:23
baudin 1:8	19:22	company 4:7	9:6
14:3 15:12	17.22	9:9	J.0

[cook - extent] Page 3

	T	I	
cook 1:1	craig 4:13	drafting 6:10	entire 9:23
cooperate 7:18	create 15:9	dulberg 1:4,5	entirety 19:8
copied 7:24	csr 1:22 21:3	4:18,20 6:17	entitled 17:11
<b>copies</b> 13:24	21:20	6:21 7:1,4,13	17:17 18:7
<b>copy</b> 10:9,10	d	7:14,17 8:22	19:4
15:2	<b>d</b> 3:1	10:23 12:21	error 18:20
correct 16:15		13:18 15:6,13	especially 8:11
21:11,17	damage 6:17	19:24	essentially 17:6
<b>counsel</b> 10:8,23	dated 21:18	dulberg's 15:16	et 1:8
15:6 16:15	david 12:21	dulbergs 12:20	everybody
counsel's 17:10	davis 2:9	duress 9:14	10:20 20:3
count 9:23	day 20:3 21:18	17:7,8	everybody's
11:17 17:18	days 7:18	e	16:4
counter 7:14,23	declare 21:16		evidentiary
10:17 15:1,9	defendant 2:8	e 2:1,1 3:1 7:24	11:3
16:19	11:20 12:19	earlier 4:15	examine 10:24
county 1:1,2	defendants 1:9	effect 13:5	excess 6:18
course 5:9,12	2:12 4:13	effective 7:21	exclusively
15:14	15:13,13 19:13	effectiveness	9:16 11:7
court 1:1 4:1,8	defenses 7:5	11:8	executed 6:5,8
4:11,17 5:4,6	definitionally	either 19:2	6:12,15,22 7:1
7:7,15 9:12,17	18:4	employee 21:14	executing 17:7
10:24 11:2,3,6	delivered 7:16	empowered	execution
11:16,19 12:6	9:17 10:10	14:17	15:15,16
1	denies 13:19	<b>ends</b> 9:4	<b>exhibit</b> 11:12
12:7,16 13:10	department 1:2	enforce 8:21	
13:10,22 14:6	different 8:3	enforceability	11:23,23,24
14:20 15:21	9:4	9:22 17:16	12:4,6,6
16:4,10 17:3	directed 13:11	enforceable	<b>exhibits</b> 5:9
19:16,21	discovery 13:7	11:13,14,16	10:8 19:23
court's 3:9	discuss 4:24	12:1,5 13:1	exists 12:21
16:13	dismissed 4:14	14:7,14 18:16	extension 15:6
courtesy 15:2	division 1:2	enforced 8:5	extensive 14:10
courtroom 1:13	doubt 7:3	entered 8:18	extent 6:6
7:16 10:11	<b>draft</b> 11:12	15:5	
	19:18		

[f - james] Page 4

•	foregoing 21.6	hoand 5:12	importantly
f	foregoing 21:6	heard 5:13	importantly
<b>f</b> 1:12	21:11,17	17:10 19:21	6:11 9:6 15:7
<b>fact</b> 8:12 13:2	<b>forgive</b> 13:3	hearing 1:11	improper 17:1
14:16 15:10	forth 5:21 6:14	3:3 4:22 5:1	inappropriate
17:16 19:1	13:9 21:7	10:18 11:3	9:3
facts 6:21 8:23	forward 4:24	16:18 17:3	including 19:23
<b>factual</b> 14:7,10	5:22 12:10	20:7 21:9	indicated 7:23
14:12	<b>free</b> 7:3	held 1:12 8:7	individual
failure 17:20	<b>full</b> 4:20 9:24	hold 8:2	18:20
far 18:23	15:21 19:1	<b>honor</b> 4:3,10	individually
feel 5:11	<b>fully</b> 4:23 17:3	5:5,16 7:6 9:5	4:18
file 10:17 15:7	further 7:1	10:5,7,14 11:4	information
16:19	10:2 14:22	15:19,20 19:14	15:8
<b>filed</b> 7:13,17,19	16:1 21:13	20:6	injury 18:17
9:16 10:5,6,11	furthermore	honorable 1:12	19:6
10:12 15:1	8:17	hoodwinking	instructed
final 17:23	g	18:12,14	12:23
19:17 20:1	general 8:4	<b>hope</b> 9:1	insurance 4:7
financially	genuine 15:9	<b>hour</b> 11:7	8:15 9:9
21:15	give 5:12 7:18	<b>hours</b> 17:3	interest 15:22
<b>find</b> 17:15	<b>go</b> 12:10	hundreds 9:3	interested
<b>finding</b> 18:15	<b>going</b> 14:18	hypothetically	21:15
fine 16:12	16:5	18:8	introduced
finished 14:18	<b>good</b> 4:1,3,5,11	i	18:19
first 5:6,15	20:3	identical 18:22	irrelevant
8:16 9:7,9 10:4	granted 19:7	identified 4:19	14:11
flawed 6:2	grants 19:24	identifies 6:17	issue 9:6 15:10
flow 6:19	ground 17:7	17:22	17:12,16 19:1
focused 11:7	grounds 19:5	identify 4:2	<b>issues</b> 12:17
follow 17:20	8	ignore 16:23	13:6
following 11:21	h	ilcs 16:8,16	j
force 8:21	<b>hand</b> 9:17	illinois 1:1 2:6	jail 8:6
<b>forced</b> 7:21	<b>hard</b> 10:9,10	2:10,14 16:16	jailed 8:3
forcing 8:1	13:24	16:21 21:17	james 1:22 21:3
iorcing 0.1		10.21 21.1/	21:20
			Z1.ZU

. 0.10.4.10	12.22	10.20	
jason 2:13 4:12	language 13:23	message 10:20	0
jochum 2:13	launching 17:2	michael 1:12	<b>o</b> 4:19
4:9,10,10,12,12	law 1:2 2:5	michelle 2:9	objection 10:22
joined 4:17	17:1	4:6	objects 10:21
joseph 4:13	laws 21:16	michigan 2:10	obligated 19:2
judge 4:5 5:3	<b>lay</b> 17:7	<b>mind</b> 15:23	obligation
7:12 8:2,8,14	legal 14:8,12	minutes 9:17	18:23
8:19,24 9:8,10	legally 6:1	modified 6:7	observing 4:15
10:12,16 11:18	lewis 2:13	<b>moment</b> 19:14	offices 2:5
12:6,8,9,9,14	liability 13:13	monetary 6:13	okay 5:6 9:12
12:16,22 13:3	liable 12:19,20	money 8:13 9:7	19:16
13:15 14:15,19	license 1:23	<b>months</b> 12:17	olsen 2:12 4:13
14:24 16:6,9	<b>llp</b> 2:13	morning 4:1,3	4:13 15:13
18:11,13,15	logic 9:7	4:5,11 5:17	opportunity
20:5	<b>lynch</b> 12:9	10:7 15:1,3	5:13 9:24
judges 16:22	m	<b>motion</b> 3:3,9	11:10 15:21
judgment 3:3	<b>m0tion</b> 16:14	4:23 5:14,21	opposing 16:17
4:23 5:22 7:2	made 6:11 11:5	7:2 8:10 9:21	17:2
9:2 10:14 17:4		10:13 12:3	opposite 7:19
17:14,17 18:7	15:13,13 21:8 mails 7:24	16:19 17:4,13	option 11:5
19:4,7,21,24		19:7,20	order 7:12 8:18
judicial 8:15	maintain 6:9	move 4:24	19:16,19 20:2
k	make 9:13,19 9:23,24 11:9	n	otto 1:12 4:5
<b>k</b> 4:19	makes 8:8	<b>n</b> 1:8 2:1,10 3:1	overlook 16:23
keep 5:17	17:13	name 4:5	overlooked
kelly 1:8	making 15:22	names 12:18	14:12
know 5:22 6:18	material 15:10	need 5:11 8:19	overlooking
10:16,16 18:13	17:16 19:1	19:19	19:11
knowledge	matter 8:17	never 9:8 12:10	own 8:1,20,24
19:12	12:15 13:8	new 9:13	p
kost 4:18	matters 15:8	northbrook 2:6	
1	mean 13:18	<b>notes</b> 18:18	<b>p</b> 2:1,1
1.7.22.21.2.20	mediation 6:4,8	21:12	<b>paid</b> 8:13,20 9:7 19:1
l 1:7,22 21:3,20	6:10,12,15,22	notice 1:13	
	12:15 15:14,15	8:15	paragraph
			11:20

parameters	played 6:9	provides 14:12	recorded 21:9
6:13	please 4:1 10:9	18:1	refer 4:13
participants	pled 17:18 18:6	provision 16:21	refuse 12:12
14:4	plus 8:7	pursuant 1:13	refused 12:11
particular 8:7	<b>point</b> 14:11	10:12 16:8	regarding 9:21
parties 2:2 5:10	18:9	<b>put</b> 6:2	11:21 17:20
6:6 13:18,18	pointed 14:16	q	18:5
17:2 19:9,10	position 5:23		relative 12:20
19:20 21:14	6:2,20 15:3	question 11:6	21:13
party 5:24	possible 13:12	questionable 8:23	release 7:1,3,4
16:18 19:13	possibly 11:24	questions 11:1	7:12,20,20 8:2
<b>paul</b> 1:4,4 4:20	12:2	quote 4:20	8:4,8,19,22 9:6
12:20 19:24	potential 18:12	16:18 17:20	9:10 10:5,5
<b>pay</b> 8:16 9:9	practice 9:8	18:5,15	11:9 15:16
19:2	13:3		17:8,12,12,17
penalty 21:16	presented 12:7	r	released 9:7
perjury 21:16	12:16 13:22	r 1:4,5 2:1 4:20	19:15
permission	18:10	raphael 4:14	releases 8:14
14:2	<b>prior</b> 13:12	read 5:8,11	8:16
permit 16:17	16:18	ready 5:4	relevance
permitted 12:7	procedural	really 8:9 11:11	13:12
person 8:6	15:8	13:8	<b>rely</b> 17:11
12:21	procedurally	reason 10:23	remain 16:20
personally 7:16	17:1	reasoning 7:21	remaining
<b>pg</b> 3:6,6,7,7,9	procedure	reasons 7:20	19:10,13
place 21:7	16:16,21	19:24	remains 6:14
<b>plain</b> 13:22	proceeding	received 7:24	remind 19:9
plaintiff 1:6 2:4	9:18	15:2,6 17:4	repeat 16:5,10
5:2 13:7 17:19	proceedings	recent 19:23	repeating 16:3
17:22 18:1,17	15:14 21:6	recess 20:4	reply 7:4 9:21
18:21 19:23	property 4:6	recitation	12:4
plaintiff's 15:6	proposition	14:10	reported 1:22
16:15	14:8,13 18:2	record 4:2 5:8 10:8 15:23	reporter 21:4
plaintiffs 4:4	prove 6:21	16:12 20:1	reporter's 21:1
5:23		10.12 20.1	

	T		Ι .
represent 4:4,6	17:8,9	specific 15:17	supplied 9:5
representations	seeks 17:6	spectrum 9:4	support 10:10
15:12	<b>send</b> 8:16 10:9	spelled 9:21	14:8,13 17:13
representative	sense 8:8	<b>staff</b> 10:10	18:2
13:6	sent 7:15 8:14	<b>start</b> 7:11	suppose 16:11
representing	10:6,20	stated 20:1	sure 9:23 11:9
4:12	sentence 16:6	statement 8:13	t
respond 10:22	september 1:14	statements	t 4:19
15:20	21:18	21:8	take 8:15
response 9:15	set 5:21 6:13,20	statute 10:15	take 8.13
10:9 15:7	21:7	16:23	
responsible	settled 9:8	<b>stay</b> 13:4,13	21:6,12
18:21	<b>short</b> 19:18	14:18	talarico 2:5,5
rest 14:15	shorthand 21:4	stenographic	3:6,7 4:3,4 5:2
reverse 7:11	21:12	21:9	5:3 7:8,10 9:12
review 10:21	sick 7:17	straight 5:22	10:3 11:4,14
reviewed 5:9	sides 5:12	street 2:14	11:18 13:15
revocable 1:5	19:22	stricken 15:4	14:6,15,20
4:20	sign 8:2,22 12:9	submit 13:24	15:20,22 16:2
<b>right</b> 4:11 11:4	12:11,12,23	subparagraph	16:6 18:18
16:10	13:11	16:17	19:12,14 20:6
role 6:10	signature 21:19	subsection	talarico's 18:9
ruling 3:9	signed 7:14	10:13,17	talk 8:10
16:13	8:14 12:10	sufficient 13:20	talking 14:18
	13:16,17,19	suggest 17:11	telling 8:1
S	17:23 18:22	suggested	terms 6:6 7:2
s 2:1 4:19	signing 7:4 8:4	10:23	8:4,5 11:21
saw 12:22 14:9	simply 6:2	suggestion	13:15,17,19,21
saying 9:2	16:23	18:24,24	17:20 18:5,20
says 8:13 10:17	single 14:9	suite 2:6,10,14	thank 4:8,17
12:19 13:23	skokie 2:6	summary 3:3	5:16 7:7 9:11
schedule 15:5	smith 2:13	4:23 5:22 7:2	14:19,20 16:9
second 16:12	sorry 4:10	9:2 10:14 17:4	20:3,5,6
section 16:15	11:15	17:14,17 18:7	theoretically
see 4:17 9:2	11.13		18:11
11:11 13:7		19:4,7,21,24	

Veritext Legal Solutions

things 8:9 9:3	trustee 4:20	violated 10:19	10:11
12:14 13:2	12:9,10,23	violation 13:4	Z
think 7:11,24	13:11	violations	<b>zoom</b> 1:11 2:2
8:9,22 9:5	<b>truth</b> 13:8	13:12	4:19
10:13,19 13:2	trying 8:21	vs 1:7	<b>T.</b> 19
13:5 14:1	typographical	W	
thomas 4:18	18:20	<b>w</b> 2:14	
threatened 8:6	u	want 9:13,19	
thursday 1:14	unconstitutio	9:20,23 10:21	
time 7:19 10:18	16:22	10:21 11:9	
10:21,22 13:5	unconvinced	16:7	
15:7 16:5,12	16:20	wanted 16:11	
16:18 21:7,8	undated 6:1	wants 10:24	
<b>tinajero</b> 2:9 3:6	under 6:21 8:5	we've 13:8	
3:7 4:5,6 5:4,5	13:13 19:2	weeks 14:1	
5:14,16,20 7:7	21:16,16	willette 2:12	
9:20 12:2	understand	4:14	
14:21,23 15:24	16:24 18:9	willing 11:1	
19:18 20:5	undisputed 6:6	window 4:19	
today 4:22 7:16	unquote 4:21	wisdom 16:20	
9:10,13 10:11	16:19 18:5,15	wish 10:1 14:21	
11:10 17:10	unsigned 5:23	15:23	
today's 19:16	6:1,3,7,15,22	word 5:7,15	
<b>told</b> 12:23	9:22 12:4,8,22	15:24	
transcribed	14:7,13,17	work 17:7	
21:10	15:11,18 17:23	<b>world</b> 16:24	
transcript	18:2,9,22	written 19:19	
21:12	<b>V</b>	X	
transcripts			
7:24	valid 6:5 12:18	<b>x</b> 3:1	
trial 12:16	version 17:23	y	
tried 10:20	17:24 18:10,10	yalden 2:12	
true 21:11,17	19:3	4:14	
trust 1:5 4:20	<b>video</b> 1:11 2:2	yesterday 7:17	
		7:19 9:16 10:5	

# IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS COUNTY DEPARTMENT, LAW DIVISION 2022L010905

## **SERVICE LIST**

Jason W. Jochum
George J. Manos
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
550 West Adams Street, Suite 300
Chicago, Illinois 60661
P: (312) 345-1718/F: (312) 345-1778
Jason.Jochum@lewisbrisbois.com
George.Manos@lewisbrisbois.com
Zachary.McGourty@lewisbrisbois.com

Robert A. Chapman
CHAPMAN SPINGOLA, LLP
190 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3850
Chicago, Illinois 60603
P:(312) 630-9202
F:(312) 630-9233
rchapman@chapmanspingola.com
wdickmann@chapmanspingola.com

Christine V. Anto Amundsen Davis, LLC 150 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 3300 Chicago, Illinois 60601 P: (312) 894-3200 canto@amundsendavislaw.com

# mtinajero@amundsendavislaw.com JSchuth@amundsendavislaw.com

Jeremy N. Boeder
Tribler Orpett & Meyer, P.C.
225 W. Washington Street, Suite 2550
Chicago, Illinois 60606
jnboeder@tribler.com
docket@tribler.com