1		D STATES DISTRICT			
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION				
3	DAVID MARTIN,	)			
4	Plaintiff,	)			
5	VS.	)	No. 22 CV 6296		
6 7	ATTORNEY GENERAL KWAME GREGORY EMMETT AHERN, J COOK COUNTY CLERKS, COO	IR., UNNAMED )	Chicago, Illinois April 5, 2023 9:10 a.m.		
8	Defendants.				
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - TELEPHONIC STATUS HEARING				
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANDREA R. WOOD				
11	APPEARANCES:				
12		MR. DAVID MARTIN, 5352 South Prince			
13	(	Chicago, Illinois (773) 893-0813			
14		martinvthompson@g	mail.com		
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22	Court Reporter: E	Brenda S. Varney,	CSR, RMR, CRR		
23		Official Court Ře			
24 25	(	Chicago, Illinois (312) 554-8931 brenda_varney@iln	60604		
		_ ,	<u> </u>		

(Proceedings heard via telephone:)

THE CLERK: Calling the next case, 22 CV 6296, Martin versus Ahern, et al., for status.

MR. MARTIN: David Martin.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Martin. Thank you.

And I don't know if we have anyone on the line representing any of the defendants. I don't see anyone, but let me just double check to make sure that none of the defendants are represented this morning. No one is speaking up.

Okay. Mr. Martin, I see that you've filed a motion for entry of default.

MR. MARTIN: Correct.

THE COURT: And that's as to just the one judge. It looks like you're seeking default against Judge Ahern.

MR. MARTIN: Correct.

THE COURT: So the summons that was returned executed shows that they were just served on March 20th and that their answers are due April 10th.

It looks like your default is based on service of the original complaint which was filed back in November of 2022, but you did file an amended complaint. And so the amended complaint is the current complaint against the defendants so they would not be required to appear until after they were served with the amended complaint and their time had run. And

based on the return of summons from the sheriff that you filed, it looks like they still have several days before they would be due to answer. So, based on that, your motion for entry of default as to Judge Ahern is premature.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. So did you want me to re-file it, or do we just simply wait and --

THE COURT: So I'm going to set -- I will set another status date to see if they file.

I will say, in looking at your amended complaint, it does look like most of the things that you've included in there are things that you have to take to state court that I would not have jurisdiction over as a federal court judge.

I will give a more detailed read because there's more in the complaint than what there was before, but I do want to make sure that you're aware that if I don't have subject matter jurisdiction, I have an obligation to dismiss the case.

I will give it a good read and make sure that I know one way or the other, but, either way, they do still have until April 10th to respond.

I'll set another --

MR. MARTIN: Well --

THE COURT: Yes? You have a question?

MR. MARTIN: Well, sure. I'm trying to figure out what makes you believe you don't have jurisdiction.

THE COURT: It appears that what you want is for me

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

to tell the state court that they should be doing things differently in your cases that are pending there. And, as a general rule, a federal court just doesn't have jurisdiction to do that.

You either have to appeal and go through the entire state system, and then you can go to the United States Supreme Court, or, if your case is over, sometimes, in limited circumstances, you can bring a suit for damages, but there are certain doctrines. One is called the *Younger* doctrine, one is called *Rooker-Feldman*. Basically, they all stand for the idea that I have to respect the jurisdiction of the state courts.

And there are things that are going on there. They have the obligation to fix it, and you have to exhaust your efforts to get them to fix it before you can ask me to make them do something differently.

So, for example, in your relief section, you're saying that you want me to order them to give you a fair and impartial hearing and you want me to order the certification of the circuit court record and you want me to order the Cook County Clerk to do certain things. The state court has to do that. I can't order the court clerk to change the court records, the circuit court.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. So if I could respond?

THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. So with regards to the

Rooker-Feldman doctrine, I think that's not really going to apply to this. And the reason I'm going to argue that is first off, I was actually never served for that particular -- I was never served for the issue of college expenses so I never received notice and opportunity.

And then, from there, a jury trial was already pending. So before the plaintiffs in the state case filed for contribution of college expenses, I had already requested a jury trial. And that jury trial basically involves the exact same set of facts and circumstances as the contribution of college expenses case.

So, basically, I have a right to a jury. And I speak about a lot of that stuff in the actual complaint. So they're violating, you know, the federally protected constitutional right.

The purpose of the 1983 statute is to protect the federal rights of citizens, so, you know, I argue that they're actually violating my right to a trial by jury.

There's also extrinsic fraud, I allege, because they actually transferred the case to a judge who I'm alleging is biased. They're refusing to certify the record, and they're essentially trying to evade the actual jury trial.

And I'm also -- when I look back, even though I was never served, I did go back and dig through the court records, and there's no -- there's Zoom information that was actually

provided. Even though I wasn't served, I did go back and I looked at the Zoom information. The Zoom information was incorrect.

So extrinsic fraud is basically anything that prevents a person from presenting their case in court. So as regards to the state court, I'm not able to actually -- I wasn't able to actually present a case there because the Zoom information was incorrect, and that led to the actual judgment.

And most of this -- you mentioned the appeal several times. Most of this is actually about the appeal because in order for me to appeal, I actually need these state court records. And if I don't have the state court records, I can't appeal. The appeal would be 100 percent completely ineffective.

So I think that you have jurisdiction to provide injunctive relief according to *Pulliam v. Allen* which basically says that you can provide injunctive relief, and it's based on the concept of the writ of mandamus even though it's in federal court. You do have that power and you do have the ability to provide relief.

I think I'm asking for any remedy the Court can provide because, essentially, what I'm trying to do is get the court record so that I can appeal.

Another aspect of this is that the clerks themselves

are -- I'm alleging that the clerks themselves are actually sabotaging the record as I explained. Some of the documents have been altered. And then once I put forth an effort to get that corrected, then documents are missing. And it just creates a situation where it's just going to be impossible to appeal this thing if I'm not able to get a federal court judgment.

So this is mostly about the appeal. None of it is really about the actual judgment for the contribution of college expenses but, you know, more so just to get the appeals record.

But on top of that, even the statute that they're using for contribution of college expenses I'm alleging is unconstitutional because of vagueness and because of the jury violation.

So I honestly believe that you are 100 percent in your right under 1983 to provide relief here. And I believe that *Rooker-Feldman* doesn't really apply because like I said, I was never served, there was a jury trial requested, and most importantly, the case is still pending in state court. Right? I still have the jury trial to attend, you know, so that case is pending. So *Rooker-Feldman* doesn't really apply.

So I would like to see the defendants respond to this so that I can properly respond to any *Younger* doctrine arguments they may have or *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine arguments

they may have, but, honestly, Rooker-Feldman does not apply.

I haven't really had a chance to look at the *Younger* doctrine because I'm just hearing about it.

THE COURT: Yes. So Younger deals with a situation where you have a case that's ongoing in state court, and it basically says that you can't ask the federal court to do something in a separate case that would basically keep the state court proceeding from moving forward sort of independently. In other words, I can't jump in and interfere with an ongoing state court case.

I will consider everything that you've said, and I will take a look at it again.

At this point, based on the return of service from the sheriff, the defendants still have until April 10th in order to answer the complaint because they weren't served until March. So I will set a date after they're due to answer, and we'll see if they file anything.

I will take a look at the complaint. Even if they don't appear, even if they don't file something asking me to dismiss based on subject matter jurisdiction, I have an obligation to look at these issues and to consider them. That is clear from the Court of Appeals that I answer to that I have an obligation to do that. But, for now, we need to see if they're going to answer.

Their answer date is -- I think I said April 10th so

```
I'm going to ask my courtroom deputy to set another telephone
 1
 2
    hearing to give them time potentially to answer and for me to
 3
    review your amended complaint.
 4
             Due to my trial schedule -- I do have a trial that's
 5
    going on in the second half of April -- I'm going to set our
 6
    date at the beginning of May. The same call-in number.
 7
    Laritza is going to give you the date and time now.
 8
             Laritza, can we get a date and time in the beginning
 9
    of May?
10
             MR. MARTIN: And just to --
11
             THE CLERK: Sure.
12
             MR. MARTIN: I have two quick questions after that.
13
             THE COURT: Okay. Let me get a date and time, and
14
    I'll let you ask your question.
15
             THE CLERK: Yes, Judge. We can do May 2nd at 10:30.
16
             THE COURT: Would you be able to call in then?
17
             MR. MARTIN:
                          May 2nd? Could we do -- is it possible
18
    to do something around May 15th?
19
             THE COURT: Sure.
20
             Laritza, if you could take a look at our calendar.
21
             THE CLERK: Yes, Judge. We can do May 16th at 9:30.
22
             MR. MARTIN: That sounds great.
23
             THE COURT: Very good.
24
             One thing I do want to make sure that you do,
25
    Mr. Martin, is I understand that you disagree about subject
```

matter jurisdiction. I might look at it and I might decide that you're right. Either way, I don't want you to lose any of your rights in state court because you didn't file a notice of appeal or anything else that you're required to do in state court. So make sure that even while you're arguing with me about subject matter jurisdiction here that you're still doing everything you need to do to preserve your rights in state court. Okay?

MR. MARTIN: Right. There's a lot of craziness going on so I've actually already been to the appeals court, and it got pushed back down because of subject matter jurisdiction. They said that I need to have my jury trial first. So this court really isn't holding up any litigation in state court.

So my question was: Would I be able to address your concerns in some type of a document and get the opportunity to respond to your concerns for the *Younger* doctrine and the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine just so that I have something?

THE COURT: Sure. Here's what I will do, actually, because I appreciate that you've thought about the issue and you want a chance to respond. I will not dismiss your case without giving you an opportunity to put something in writing. So if I look at your complaint and I think there's a subject matter jurisdiction issue, I will issue an order, and it will tell you exactly what my concerns are, and it will give you a time period to respond in writing.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. And the last thing is that I do 1 intend -- just to let you know, I do intend to file an entry 2 of default for Kwame Raoul. 3 4 THE COURT: So as soon as you get past that date on the docket -- hopefully, you have access online to be able to 5 6 see the docket entries or you're getting notice by mail, but 7 you will see that the sheriff -- I guess you filed the proof 8 of service, actually. 9 MR. MARTIN: Right. THE COURT: Okay. So it says April 10th for Attorney 10 11 General Raoul as well. So, after that date, you file what you 12 feel you need to file. 13 MR. MARTIN: Okay. And you do not need me to re-file the default for Ahern? 14 15 THE COURT: A formal request. You don't need to re-file the proof of service. It would be best for you to 16 17 re-file the request for entry of default since the first one 18 is premature so it will be terminated as a pending motion. 19 MR. MARTIN: Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much. 20 Bye-bye. 21 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 22 (Proceedings adjourned at 9:24 a.m.) 23

24

25

## CERTIFICATE

_			
	۱		
	,		
	2	つ	2

I, Brenda S. Varney, certify that the foregoing is a complete, true, and accurate transcript from the record of proceedings on April 5, 2023, before the HON. ANDREA R. WOOD in the above-entitled matter.

## /s/Brenda S. Varney, CSR, RMR, CRR

<u>July 18, 2024</u>

Date

Official Court Reporter United States District Court Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division

1 4