

FILED
11/7/2024 2:23 PM
IRIS Y. MARTINEZ
CIRCUIT CLERK
COOK COUNTY, IL
2024L012534
Calendar, I
30114033

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

CLIFFORD LAW OFFICES, P.C.,

Plaintiff,

v.

JACK J. CASCIATO and CASCIATO LAW
OFFICES, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES PLAINTIFF, CLIFFORD LAW OFFICES, P.C. (CLO), by and through its attorneys Much Shelist, P.C., complaining of the Defendants JACK J. CASCIATO (“CASCIATO”) and CASCIATO LAW OFFICES, LLC (“CLO”), as follows:

BACKGROUND OF THE CONTROVERSY

1. While employed by Plaintiff, Defendant JACK J. CASCIATO (CASCIATO) conceived of and took all necessary steps to establish a new law firm which began operation on the very day he gave his resignation via email suddenly and without notice. For a yet unknown period of time before his resignation, Defendant CASCIATO engaged in a scheme to build up a stable of cases that he would bring along to his new firm. To this end, Defendant CASCIATO thereafter convinced clients to discharge Plaintiff CLO from their cases, delayed in signing up at least one case that came to him while at Plaintiff CLO only to file it once at his new firm, misled Plaintiff CLO as to the case value of a matter so he could pursue it on his own, claimed to be the referring attorney on a matter that he did not refer to Plaintiff CLO and even outright abandoned a matter he left behind by failing to communicate its true status to Plaintiff CLO.

2. Without knowledge of the aforesaid efforts, Plaintiff CLO made accommodations to see to the orderly transfer of case files that Defendant CASCIATO indicated he wanted to bring to his new firm. Plaintiff CLO further sought to negotiate in good faith the appropriate division of attorney's fees on those cases. More of Defendant CASCIATO's misconduct is still being uncovered through an effort to piece together his cryptic communications and activities for a period of months before his sudden resignation via email.

3. At the heart of this matter are seven known cases for which Plaintiff CLO seeks a declaratory judgment from the Court as to its proprietary interest and its proper compensation.

4. Also at issue are two recently uncovered cases, DEL REAL and MIKOLAS, for which the Plaintiff CLO seeks an equitable accounting and damages for breach of fiduciary duty, conversion, interference with a contractual relationship.

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

5. All parties herein are residents of Cook County, Illinois. Plaintiff CLO is a professional corporation based in Cook County, Illinois. Defendant CASCIATO LAW OFFICES, LLC is an Illinois limited liability company based in Cook County, Illinois. Defendant JACK J. CASCIATO resides in Cook County, Illinois.

6. On information and belief, all events complained of herein occurred in Cook County, Illinois.

7. Jurisdiction and venue are properly with this Court because all of the parties reside in Cook County, Illinois, and the events complained of herein occurred in Cook County, Illinois.

COUNT I- DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

8. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraph 1-7 above.

9. Plaintiff CLO is a nationally renowned, well-established and respected personal injury firm which had previously employed Defendant CASCIATO as a non-equity partner.

Defendant CASCIATO resigned at the end of February 2024 to start his own firm, taking with him seven CLO files upon which he had been actively engaged. Contrary to the practices of Plaintiff CLO which were well-known to Defendant CASCIATO, he took those files without securing an agreement as to Plaintiff CLO's proprietary interest. Subsequent to his leaving Plaintiff CLO, efforts to reach an agreement have not been successful, and a question of law exists as to the rights of the parties with respect to this matter.

10. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant CASCIATO was an attorney duly licensed to practice law in the State of Illinois.

11. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant CASCIATO was employed as a non-equity partner by Plaintiff CLO, a professional corporation.

12. As a non-equity partner, Defendant CASCIATO received an annual salary, discretionary annual bonus, a company vehicle and mobile phone, as well as retirement, medical and dental benefits. Defendant CASCIATO was also able to earn referral fees on any cases he originated into the firm.

13. Upon his hiring on April 3, 2018 at Plaintiff CLO, Defendant CASCIATO was provided with all of the resources necessary to grow his legal career. Defendant CASCIATO was given access to work on high profile matters and was financially and professionally supported. While at Plaintiff CLO, Defendant CASCIATO authored a number of professional legal articles and spoke at various legal conferences. This support enhanced Defendant CASCIATO's ability to generate legal business for the firm and for himself by elevating his standing in the legal community which resulted in him having increased case referrals into Plaintiff CLO.

14. On February 29, 2024, Defendant, JACK J. CASCIATO suddenly resigned via email.

15. On February 29, 2024, a new law firm, CURCIO AND CASCIATO, LLC registered with the Illinois Secretary of State.

16. After Defendant CASCIATO's resignation CLO's managing partner, Hon. Henry R. Simmons (ret.) (SIMMONS) took over the communications with Defendant CASCIATO on behalf of the firm to assist in the orderly transition of files to CURCIO & CASCIATO, LLC.

17. On or about March 5, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO provided SIMMONS a list of seven CLO cases he wished to bring with him to his new firm. Those clients include Qusai Alkafaween, Danielle DeChristopher, Nathan Prescott, Alexis Vincenzo, Kristen Webb, Alea Wenig, and Tomasz Wieczorek.

18. Each of these seven clients ultimately signed a contingency fee representation agreement with Plaintiff CLO.

19. Defendant CASCIATO had claimed to have brought these seven matters into Plaintiff CLO.

20. After Defendant CASCIATO's resignation, Plaintiff CLO received communications from the seven CLO clients mentioned above indicating their intention to follow Defendant CASCIATO to his new firm and end their relationship with Plaintiff CLO.

21. SIMMONS continued to communicate with Defendant CASCIATO regarding how Plaintiff CLO would be reimbursed for the costs it expended on those seven matters.

22. Per CLO policy, Defendant CASCIATO would be entitled to a referral or origination fee from Plaintiff CLO's gross attorneys' fee from these matters upon their resolution.

23. Per CLO policy, when an attorney leaves the firm, Plaintiff CLO is entitled to a percentage of the attorneys' fees on each case that ultimately leaves with the departing attorney.

24. Since Defendant CASCIATO's sudden and planned departure, there has followed extensive correspondence between the parties in which Defendant CASCIATO has refused to

negotiate the attorney fee structure on these seven cases as a percentage but rather has insisted that Plaintiff CLO is only entitled to *quantum meruit* compensation.

25. Plaintiff CLO denies that it is entitled only to fees derived from *quantum meruit* given that Plaintiff CLO was in contractual privity with the clients for the seven matters; rather Plaintiff CLO is entitled to attorney fees as a percentage of the recovery, consistent with its original contract, CLO policy and custom.

26. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between Plaintiff CLO and Defendant CASCIATO with respect to this fee issue on these seven matters.

27. As a result of the foregoing, Plaintiff CLO seeks a declaration, pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-701, that it is entitled to fees as a percentage of the recovery, consistent with its original contract, CLO policy and custom.

28. Plaintiff CLO has no other adequate or effective remedy at law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff CLO prays that this Court enter judgment declaring that it is entitled to fees as a percentage of the recovery from the seven matters, and such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

COUNT II– BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

29. Plaintiff CLO restates and realleges paragraphs 1-7 above.

30. Plaintiff CLO is a nationally renowned, well-established and respected personal injury firm which had previously employed Defendant CASCIATO as a non-equity partner.

31. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant CASCIATO was an attorney, duly licensed to practice law in the State of Illinois.

32. At all times relevant hereto, Defendant CASCIATO was employed as a non-equity partner by Plaintiff CLO

33. As a non-equity partner, Defendant CASCIATO received an annual salary, discretionary annual bonus, a company vehicle and mobile phone, as well as retirement, medical and dental benefits. Defendant CASCIATO was also able to earn referral fees on any cases he brought into the firm.

34. Upon and at all times after his hiring on April 3, 2018, by Plaintiff CLO, Defendant CASCIATO was provided with all of the resources necessary to grow his legal career. Defendant CASCIATO was given access to work on high profile matters and was financially and professionally supported. While at Plaintiff CLO, Defendant CASCIATO authored a number of professional legal articles and spoke at various legal conferences.

35. This support enhanced Defendant CASCIATO's ability to generate legal business for the firm and for himself by elevating his standing in the legal community, which resulted in increased case referrals to Plaintiff CLO.

36. On February 29, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO suddenly resigned from Plaintiff CLO via an email to Plaintiff CLO's President and founding partner, Robert A. Clifford (CLIFFORD).

37. On February 29, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO's new law firm, CURCIO AND CASCIATO, LLC registered with the Illinois Secretary of State.

38. On February 29, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO announced his new firm, CURCIO & CASCIATO via the following images posted on social media:



39. In the weeks following Defendant CASCIATO's resignation from Plaintiff CLO, SIMMONS took over the communications with Defendant CASCIATO on behalf of the firm, along with the orderly transition of files to CURCIO & CASCIATO.

40. Defendant CASCIATO's misconduct is still being uncovered through an effort to piece together his cryptic communications and activities for a period of months before his sudden resignation via email.

41. When Defendant CASCIATO resigned at the end of February 2024 to start his own firm, he took with him the DEL REAL and MIKOLAS matters after misleading Plaintiff CLO as to the existence and nature of the cases.

DEL REAL CASE

42. On or about March 13, 2023, a paralegal employed by Plaintiff CLO as one of Defendant CASCIATO's support staff, was contacted by a friend whose mother had suffered a serious injury while at work. The paralegal spoke to the friend and provided the details of her conversation to Defendant CASCIATO.

43. On or about March 14, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO instructed Plaintiff CLO's intake coordinator to create an internal inquiry file tracking the DEL REAL case in Plaintiff CLO's Client Management software. Defendant CASCIATO further instructed the intake coordinator to enter the inquiry as a referral to himself, despite the fact that the friend of the paralegal assigned to him had never met Defendant CASCIATO before being introduced to Defendant CASCIATO by the paralegal assigned to him.

44. On or about March 16, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO had a telephone conversation with the friend of the paralegal assigned to him to discuss the circumstances of her mother's injury and potential representation by Plaintiff CLO ("DEL REAL case").

45. On or about March 21, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO served a "Litigation Hold and Preservation" letter upon a potential defendant in the DEL REAL case.

46. On or about March 23, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO had another telephone call with the friend of the paralegal assigned to him regarding the DEL REAL case.

47. On or about March 27, 2023, a formal contract for representation was entered into between Plaintiff CLO and ROSALBA DEL REAL.

48. On or about June 30, 2023, the paralegal assigned to Defendant CASCIATO, as instructed by Defendant CASCIATO, made a formal request for any OSHA investigative report concerning the DEL REAL case.

49. On or about July 6, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO received acknowledgement of that request from the U.S. Department of Labor (US DOL).

50. On or about September 15, 2023, Plaintiff CLO received from US DOL the requested OSHA report.

51. On or about September 15, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO told the paralegal assigned to him that he forwarded that report to an occupational safety expert for purposes of analyzing potential product or manufacturer liability for DEL REAL's claims.

52. No record of that transmittal or of any opinion on the merit of DEL REAL's claims exists in Plaintiff CLO's internal Case Management software or systems, nor is there an invoice for the alleged occupational safety expert's analysis.

53. Defendant CASCIATO never shared with anyone at Plaintiff CLO the results of said investigation or analysis, nor the name of the occupational safety expert to whom he provided the OSHA report.

54. As part of Plaintiff CLO's internal inquiry monitoring system, Defendant CASCIATO advised SIMMONS that he would likely reject the DEL REAL case because he believed the potential claims were solely in workers' compensation, which is outside the practice areas of Plaintiff CLO.

55. On information and belief, Defendant CASCIATO later referred the DEL REAL matter to a workers' compensation attorney under his own name.

56. During team meetings with the paralegal and legal assistant assigned to him, Defendant CASCIATO advised them that no attorneys' lien needed to be issued on behalf of Plaintiff CLO in the DEL REAL case in keeping with Plaintiff CLO's policy, because he would likely reject the case because the potential claims were outside the practice areas of Plaintiff CLO.

57. Upon information and belief, no attorneys' lien was ever served upon the defendants or their insurance companies on behalf of Plaintiff CLO in the DEL REAL case.

58. On or about February 14, 2024, the paralegal assigned to Defendant CASCIATO emailed Defendant CASCIATO requesting an update as to whether he would reject the DEL REAL case. Defendant CASCIATO responded that "[w]e need some time. Likely another month."

59. Days later, on or about February 29, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO suddenly resigned from CLO via an email to Plaintiff CLO's President and founding partner, Robert A. Clifford (CLIFFORD).

60. On or about March 5, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO provided SIMMONS with a list of cases he intended to take with him to his new firm. The DEL REAL case was not among the cases listed.

61. Thereafter, SIMMONS reassigned the DEL REAL case to another partner at Plaintiff CLO.

62. On March 13, 2024, the DEL REAL plaintiffs emailed Defendant CASCIATO at his CLO email address advising "[m]y sister Rosalba asked me to contact you and to send you some information, what information do you need?"

63. On or about March 20, 2024, DEL REAL discharged Plaintiff CLO via email and requested that Plaintiff CLO transfer her file to Defendant CASCIATO.

64. In accordance with this discharge, Plaintiff CLO sent the DEL REAL file to Defendant CASCIATO at CURCIO & CASCIATO, who then sent Plaintiff CLO a check in the amount of \$220.00 representing the costs Plaintiff CLO incurred in obtaining the OSHA report. No other costs were expended by Plaintiff CLO during the investigation of the DEL REAL case.

65. On or about April 12, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO filed a Complaint at Law in the DEL REAL matter in the Law Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County, alleging negligence and strict product liability.

MIKOLAS CASE

66. Between September 1, 2023 and September 2, 2023, Defendant CASCIATO exchanged emails with CAITLIN MIKOLAS (MIKOLAS), regarding her potential medical negligence claims against Fox Valley Orthopedics.

67. In those emails, MIKOLAS asked Defendant CASCIATO “what the next steps are for moving forward with you [CASCIATO].

68. In those emails, Defendant CASCIATO advised MIKOLAS that “[he] would send some paperwork on likely Wednesday that needs to be filled out.”

69. On September 7, 2023, MIKOLAS forwarded to Defendant CASCIATO a voicemail she received from the allegedly negligent doctor.

70. On September 15, 2023, MIKOLAS forwarded her medical records from Fox Valley Orthopedics to Defendant CASCIATO.

71. At some point thereafter, Defendant CASCIATO advised CLIFFORD that he “just brought in” a case involving a surgery negligently performed on the incorrect ankle, referencing MIKOLAS.

72. On or about February 2, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO received an itemized bill for the physical therapy MIKOLAS had undergone for her injuries. Defendant CASCIATO responded that “[the bill] is something we can obtain when a suit is filed but thanks for passing it along.”

73. Days later, on or about February 29, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO suddenly resigned from CLO via email.

74. On or about March 5, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO provided SIMMONS a list of cases he intended to bring with him to his new firm. MIKOLAS was not among the cases listed.

75. On or about March 20, 2024, Defendant CASCIATO, through his new firm CURCIO & CASCIATO, filed suit on behalf of MIKOLAS in the Law Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County.

76. At no time before leaving Plaintiff CLO did Defendant CASCIATO open an inquiry for the MIKOLAS matter, in direct violation of Plaintiff CLO's policy, protocol and procedure.

77. At no time before leaving Plaintiff CLO did Defendant CASCIATO advise SIMMONS that he was investigating the MIKOLAS case.

78. A search for the MIKOLAS case in Plaintiff CLO's Case Management software yielded no results whatsoever.

ABANDONED CASE

79. While at Plaintiff CLO and by the time of his sudden resignation, one of Defendant CASCIATO's cases had been settled, which settlement was approved in the Law Division of Cook County with respect to dependency and distribution; however the status on this matter was never conveyed to Plaintiff CLO by Defendant CASCIATO.

80. Upon investigation by Plaintiff CLO and SIMMONS, it became clear that not only had this file been abandoned by Defendant CASCIATO, but all of the proper heirs were never located or named, rendering the Law Division approval order incorrect. Consequently, at much time and expense, Plaintiff CLO has retained an investigator to locate all rightful heirs and is working to correct the Law Division documents and to amend and finalize the probate documents.

81. At all relevant times Defendant CASCIATO had a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff CLO.

82. As a partner and as an agent of the firm, Defendant CASCIATO owed Plaintiff CLO numerous fiduciary duties, including the duties of honesty and full disclosure, good faith and fair dealing, loyalty, accounting, and the duty of care.

83. Egregiously and in bad faith, Defendant CASCIATO intentionally acted adversely to the interests of Plaintiff CLO and acted in a manner contrary to his role at Plaintiff CLO and for his own personal gain by his conduct, including:

- a. concealment of the MIKOLAS matter when he represented to CLIFFORD that he had “brought in” a medical negligence case involving a procedure on “the wrong ankle,” i.e. the MIKOLAS matter, when in fact Defendant CASCIATO hid the existence of the MIKOLAS matter and did not include it in his list of cases he intended to take with him to his new firm;
- b. concealment of the DEL REAL matter when he:
 - i. represented to CLIFFORD and Plaintiff CLO that he would likely reject the DEL REAL matter, when in fact, Defendant CASCIATO never intended to do so;
 - ii. omitted the DEL REAL case from his list of cases he intended to take with him to his new firm, only to engineer the discharge of Plaintiff CLO days later;
 - iii. represented to Plaintiff CLO that he is due a referral fee on the DEL REAL civil and workers’ compensation matters when it was not his referral;
 - iv. represented to Plaintiff CLO that he needed “likely another month” before deciding whether to reject the DEL REAL matter when he actually intended to depart Plaintiff CLO before then.

- c. his efforts to mislead Plaintiff CLO by converting client files, failing to issue a proper attorneys' lien in the DEL REAL case, refusing to account to Plaintiff CLO and secretly setting up another law firm while still employed at Plaintiff CLO, Defendant CASCIATO breached these fiduciary duties to CLIFFORD and Plaintiff CLO.

84. Plaintiff CLO has been injured by Defendant CASCIATO's numerous breaches of his fiduciary duties in an amount exceeding Fifty (\$50,000.00) Thousand Dollars.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff CLO demands judgment in its favor against Defendants in such amount as the court or jury may determine along with its costs of suit herein sustained.

COUNT III – CONVERSION

85. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 29-84 as if fully set forth herein.

86. Defendant CASCIATO converted the DEL REAL and MIKOLAS cases when he misrepresented to Plaintiff CLO the cases he intended to bring with him to CURCIO & CASCIATO, LLC, including those cases, thereby gaining unauthorized and wrongful assumption of control over them.

87. Defendant CASCIATO wrongfully began to litigate these matters to his own benefit, without obtaining consent or permission and thereby wrongfully prevented Plaintiff CLO from prosecuting these two matters, as was Plaintiff CLO's right.

88. Defendant CASCIATO referred the workers' compensation matter for the DEL REAL case in his own name without obtaining consent or permission from Plaintiff CLO and thereby wrongfully prevented Plaintiff CLO from doing so, as was Plaintiff CLO's right.

89. Plaintiff CLO has demanded possession of the DEAL REAL and MIKOLAS cases.

90. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant CASCIATO's misconduct, Plaintiff CLO has suffered and continues to suffer harm in an amount in excess of Fifty (50,000.00) Thousand Dollars.

WHEREFORE Plaintiff CLO demands judgment against Defendants and in its favor in such amount as the Court or Jury shall assess along with its costs of suit herein sustained.

COUNT V – ACCOUNTING

91. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 29-84 as if fully set forth herein.

92. At all relevant times Defendant CASCIATO had a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff CLO.

93. As a partner and as an agent of the firm, Defendant CASCIATO owed Plaintiff CLO numerous fiduciary duties, including the duties of honesty and full disclosure, good faith and fair dealing, loyalty, accounting, and the duty of care.

94. As set forth above, Defendant CASCIATO engaged in misrepresentations and breaches of fiduciary duties toward Plaintiff CLO, including as to the accounts of Plaintiff CLO.

95. Moreover, because of Defendant CASCIATO's misrepresentations to Plaintiff CLO regarding files and records, Defendant CASCIATO has sought to conceal the full extent of his wrongdoing and the harm Defendant CASCIATO has caused and continues to cause Plaintiff CLO.

96. On information and belief, the two identified cases herein represent known matters which suggest a pattern of secretive acts likely taken regarding the deceptive handling of case inquires for months before Defendant CASCIATO's sudden resignation.

97. Plaintiff CLO has no other adequate or effective remedy at law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff CLO seeks an accounting of all case inquiries Defendant CASCIATO received from March 2023 to the date of his sudden resignation on February 29, 2024,

including their status, all of the related communications, the amount of any funds received in their resolution and all other relief, injunctive or otherwise, that this Court deems just and appropriate.

COUNT VI – INTERFERENCE WITH A CONTRACTUAL RELATIONSHIP

98. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 29-84 as if fully set forth herein.

99. Defendants JACK J. CASCIATO and CASCIATO LAW OFFICES, LLC were aware that Plaintiff CLO had a contractual relationship with DEL REAL which was valid and enforceable at all times relevant to this action.

100. Defendants JACK J. CASCIATO and CASCIATO LAW OFFICES, LLC tortiously interfered with the contractual relationship that Plaintiff CLO had with DEL REAL by intentionally and unjustifiably conspiring to have DEL REAL discharge Plaintiff CLO and request that Plaintiff CLO transfer her file to Defendant CASCIATO, after which Defendant CASCIATO filed suit in the Law Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County.

101. Plaintiff CLO has been harmed by Defendants JACK J. CASCIATO and CASCIATO LAW OFFICES, LLC, by the intentional interference with their contractual relationship with DEL REAL and thereby suffered damage in an amount in excess of Fifty (\$50,000.00) Thousand Dollars.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff CLO demands judgment in its favor against Defendants in such amount as the court or jury may determine along with its costs of suit herein sustained.

Dated: November 7, 2024

CLIFFORD LAW OFFICES, P.C.

By: /s/ Steven P. Blonder
One of its Attorneys

Steven P. Blonder (sblonder@muchlaw.com)

MUCH SHELIST, P.C.

191 N. Wacker Dr., Suite 1900

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 521-2000

Firm ID: 48345

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

CLIFFORD LAW OFFICES, P.C.,

Plaintiff

v.

JACK J. CASCIATO and CASCIATO LAW OFFICES, LLC ,

Defendant

No. _____

CIVIL ACTION COVER SHEET - CASE INITIATION

A Civil Action Cover Sheet - Case Initiation shall be filed with the complaint in all civil actions. The information contained herein is for administrative purposes only and cannot be introduced into evidence. Please check the box in front of the appropriate case type which best characterizes your action. Only one (1) case type may be checked with this cover sheet.

Jury Demand ☒ Yes ☐ No**PERSONAL INJURY/WRONGFUL DEATH****CASE TYPES:**

- ☐ 027 Motor Vehicle
☐ 040 Medical Malpractice
☐ 047 Asbestos
☐ 048 Dram Shop
☐ 049 Product Liability
☐ 051 Construction Injuries
 (including Structural Work Act, Road
 Construction Injuries Act and negligence)
☐ 052 Railroad/FELA
☐ 053 Pediatric Lead Exposure
☐ 061 Other Personal Injury/Wrongful Death
☐ 063 Intentional Tort
☐ 064 Miscellaneous Statutory Action
 (Please Specify Below**)
☐ 065 Premises Liability
☐ 078 Fen-phen/Redux Litigation
☐ 199 Silicone Implant

TAX & MISCELLANEOUS REMEDIES**CASE TYPES:**

- ☐ 007 Confessions of Judgment
☐ 008 Replevin
☐ 009 Tax
☐ 015 Condemnation
☐ 017 Detinue
☐ 029 Unemployment Compensation
☐ 031 Foreign Transcript
☐ 036 Administrative Review Action
☐ 085 Petition to Register Foreign Judgment
☐ 099 All Other Extraordinary Remedies

By: /s/Steven P. Blonder

(Attorney)

(Pro Se)

(FILE STAMP)

COMMERCIAL LITIGATION**CASE TYPES:**

- ☐ 002 Breach of Contract
☐ 070 Professional Malpractice
 (other than legal or medical)
☐ 071 Fraud (other than legal or medical)
☐ 072 Consumer Fraud
☐ 073 Breach of Warranty
☐ 074 Statutory Action
 (Please specify below.**)
☒ 075 Other Commercial Litigation
 (Please specify below.**)
☐ 076 Retaliatory Discharge

OTHER ACTIONS**CASE TYPES:**

- ☐ 062 Property Damage
☐ 066 Legal Malpractice
☐ 077 Libel/Slander
☐ 079 Petition for Qualified Orders
☐ 084 Petition to Issue Subpoena
☐ 100 Petition for Discovery

** Breach of Fiduciary Duty

Primary Email: sblonder@muchlaw.com

Secondary Email: _____

Tertiary Email: _____

Pro Se Only: ☐ I have read and agree to the terms of the Clerk's Office Electronic Notice Policy and choose to opt in to electronic notice from the Clerk's Office for this case at this email address: _____

IRIS Y. MARTINEZ, CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS