1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION		
3	DAVID MARTIN,)	
4	Plaintiff	,	
5	vs.)	No. 22 CV 6296
6 7	ATTORNEY GENERAL KWAME RAOUL, JUDGE GREGORY EMMETT AHERN, JR., UNNAMED COOK COUNTY CLERKS, COOK COUNTY,		Chicago, Illinois August 10, 2023 9:22 a.m.
8	Defendants.)		
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - TELEPHONIC STATUS HEARING		
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANDREA R. WOOD		
11	APPEARANCES:		
12	For the Plaintiff: MR. DAVID MARTIN 5352 South Princ		
13		Chicago, Illinois (773) 893-0813	
14		martinvthompson@g	mail.com
15	For the Defendants: ILLINOIS ATTORNEY GENERAL BY: MS. MARY ALICE JOHNSTON		
16		115 South LaSalle Chicago, Illinois	Street, 27th Floor 60603
17	(312) 814-4417 mary.johnston@ilag.gov		
18		, ,	
19			
20			
21			
22	Court Reporter:	Brenda S. Varney,	CSR, RMR, CRR
23	·	Official Court Re 219 South Dearbor	porter n Street, Suite 2144D
24		Chicago, Illinois (312) 554-8931	
25		brenda_varney@iln	d.uscourts.gov

(Proceedings heard via telephone:)

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

MR. MARTIN: David Martin here.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Martin.

And do we have counsel for the two defendants who have appeared?

MS. JOHNSTON: Good morning, Your Honor. Mary Johnston on behalf of the Defendants Ahern and Raoul.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So over the last couple of weeks, I've received some filings by the parties, and there's some disagreement about how to proceed.

As I understand it, Mr. Martin would like to amend his complaint. He has filed a motion to amend the complaint which now names -- well, I think it's going to name the two additional clerks who were previously unnamed, though I'm only seeing Gretchen Peterson individually named who I believe was not previously named. And then it also includes an affidavit.

So let me start by making sure that I know exactly what Mr. Martin is doing with the amended complaint because I thought, Mr. Martin, you were also naming the other people from the clerk's office that you didn't have identities for before.

MR. MARTIN: I can kind of go into the amended

complaint and give you a quick summary of it, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Keep it brief. If you could just focus on what's different from the amended complaint as opposed to the original complaint.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, Judge, definitely.

So there is an affidavit, and that affidavit is for Ahern. It's an affidavit that was supposed to have gone in the complaint originally. It originally was in the complaint, but I amended the complaint, and I forgot to add it in the first amendment. But I did have a reference point to it where I referenced it, but I just didn't add it. So in this amended complaint, I've added that affidavit as it pertains to Ahern.

There's also named Gretchen Peterson. She's the only one I'm naming because she's the chief deputy clerk, and I have also had some direct communication with her. So I named her.

And I've added some exhibits for Gretchen Peterson which was not originally added. And I also added additional counts for Gretchen Peterson.

And I've added the Illinois Department of
Unemployment Security as a defendant. And the reason they
were added is because there were some things that happened at
the same time that I filed my complaint in federal court, and
I never got a chance to actually add them. So I'm adding them
now because there were a chain of events that happened

sometime just a little bit after I filed the federal 1 2 complaint, and I just never got a chance to add them. 3 And I've added some counts in 13, 14, and 15. Now, with all that --4 5 THE COURT: So if I can just pause you there, you say 6 that you named the Illinois Department of Employment Security. 7 What I see is that you've named an unknown employee. 8 Are you naming an individual, or are you trying to 9 name the entire department? 10 MR. MARTIN: Well, unfortunately, I can't get the 11 individual's name without getting a subpoena because what's 12 happened is that they've taken some action to essentially deny 13 my unemployment benefits which I believe were kind of like 14 retaliatory with all this stuff going on. But I don't know 15 who that was, and I can't name them until I get some type of 16 interrogatory or some type of subpoena. 17 THE COURT: So you do want to name the individual; 18 you just don't have the information yet? 19 MR. MARTIN: Exactly. 20 Now, with all that --21 THE COURT: That's what you've done. 22 MR. MARTIN: Right, but with all that said, I may 23 have to withdraw this amended complaint because as I

understand it, the defendants want to -- I'm not sure what

they're trying to do, but, you know, I have -- there has been

24

25

progress made in terms of Ahern and Raoul. And I don't want to lose the progress that this Court has made so I'm afraid I may have to withdraw the complaint or try to sever Ahern and Raoul from the other defendants or withdraw the affidavit.

So I would ask this Court: What exactly is the defendants trying to respond to as it pertains to the amended complaint? Because there's nothing in the complaint that would allow them to re-file a motion to dismiss or, you know, file an answer or anything like that. There's nothing in the complaint as it pertains to Ahern or Raoul so I just want to make that clear.

So I ask this Court --

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, I understand that you're saying that the allegations are the same. Because you have filed an amended complaint, it completely takes the place of the old complaint. So let me step back.

If I grant your motion for leave to file an amended complaint, the amended complaint is a new complaint. Under the rules, they do get to file a new response. Their old response is effectively moot because they responded to a complaint that is no longer the operative complaint in this case. That other complaint is no longer relevant if I grant your motion for leave to amend.

Now, under the rules, when there's an amended complaint that is filed, the defendants who have already

appeared would normally have 14 days rather than 21 days to respond. So if I grant your motion for leave to amend, they will get an opportunity to file a motion to dismiss.

They've asked for a lot longer than 14 days so I will find out from them why they think they need more than 14 days, and then I'll make a decision on when they will respond. But they will get an opportunity to file a new motion. And that's, in part, because if they were filing an answer, they have to respond to everything in the complaint, including the allegations that talk about what other people did. So that is how the rules work.

It's up to you if you no longer want to proceed with an amended complaint and go back to the old one, but if I do allow your amended complaint, they will get a chance to make a new motion-to-dismiss filing.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. So with that said, I'm just going to go ahead and withdraw that amended complaint.

And if I could do a verbal motion to sever Ahern and Raoul and split the cases, I'll take a verbal motion. If you want me to write it, I'll write it, but for the most part, I'm going to go ahead and withdraw that complaint for now.

THE COURT: I don't understand what you mean by a motion to sever because the original complaint right now just has the two defendants in it.

Who are you seeking to put into another case?

MR. MARTIN: I could file another case for Gretchen Peterson and the Illinois Department of Unemployment, but I don't want to lose the progress that this Court has made on Ahern and Raoul.

THE COURT: So that's fine. So what you would need to do is file a new complaint against the additional defendants if you don't want to add them here. And you are perfectly entitled to do that.

So the motion for leave to amend which is at Docket Number 28 for me then is voluntarily withdrawn.

I'm going to take a step back because I know the defendants had already asked for additional time for their reply brief. I understand that you oppose that, Mr. Martin, but I'd like to hear from defense counsel what their timeline is, what they're asking for now that they've heard that you are not going to file an amended complaint --

MR. MARTIN: If I could --

THE COURT: Mr. Martin, yes.

MR. MARTIN: I apologize for the interruption.

If I could, I'm asking the Court to deny the motion.

And the reason I'm asking the Court to deny it is because they've missed the deadline. And it's not in this court, but in other courts, I'm constantly being held to standards of a lawyer, and these are professionals. This is what they do all day every day, and, you know, they've missed their deadline to

actually respond.

But not only that, it's the way that they're missing the deadline. Like, they didn't really give a reason on why they missed the deadline. And I'm asking this Court to deny that and either move on with a verdict on that.

So that's it. There's other reasons, but for the most part, that's just kind of a quick summary, and that's just that they missed the deadline to respond to the actual complaint. They missed that twice. And now they're missing a deadline to actually respond to my answer, and they didn't even provide a reason for why they missed that deadline. So I'm just asking this Court to just kind of move this case forward.

THE COURT: So I will hear what their explanation is.

I believe that their reply date was August 3rd, and that's the day that they filed their motion asking for more time.

One thing that did happen, Mr. Martin, before their reply date is you filed your motion for leave to amend. And that was filed on -- I think it was a Friday. And then, you know, the following week, just a week ago today, they filed their request for an extension.

So I do think that because if I granted your motion it would moot their work and require them to have to go and figure out whether they needed to respond differently because

of the new defendants and the new allegations that that is one reason. And your motion for leave to amend was filed just a few days before their reply brief was due.

That is one of the risks of seeking to amend a complaint while a motion to dismiss is pending is that it can wipe out the briefing.

That said, they've also -- I also want to make sure that any request that I decide to give them is a reasonable one. So I'd like to hear from Ms. Johnston as to what her position is in light of our discussion today.

Ms. Johnston?

MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Your Honor.

So you summarized exactly why it is that we filed that request to potentially either moot out or extend the reply date. As you said, it was a question of whether or not there would be a new operative complaint hanging in the air. I just didn't know what was going to be the appropriate course of action until that question was resolved.

I believe in the motion that I filed, as you said, a week ago today, I requested if the complaint was not going to be amended an extension then until August 17th which would be one week from today to then just file the reply brief and complete briefing on the motion to dismiss that's already out there.

I might ask -- and I apologize, but there have been

some pressing issues that came up last minute in the office.

If I could ask instead of having one week to reply potentially just pushing that out to Tuesday, August 22nd, to file the reply brief and wrap up briefing on the motion to dismiss.

THE COURT: Which would be two additional business days but essentially about ten days from today.

MR. MARTIN: Right. Exactly, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So I'll give you a chance to reply, Mr. Martin. So they want to file their reply brief by the 22nd which is a week from this coming Tuesday.

MR. MARTIN: So I think the defendants have a history of basically missing these deadlines, and it's causing unnecessary delay. And I think that yes, I did file an amended complaint, but that amended complaint would have had absolutely no bearing on their reply.

I get it. Like, they would do work on the amended complaint, and there's a potential chance that the amended complaint would undo the work -- I'm sorry -- that they did on the complaint. But, for the most part, there's not that many days in between when I actually filed the amended complaint and when their reply brief was due.

I can check the exact number of days, but I don't see a reason why they couldn't have just filed their reply -- I mean their -- yeah. I don't see a reason why they just couldn't file their reply along with a motion to mark their

motion to dismiss as moot. I don't know. It's just that they have a history of, you know, delaying the Court.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Martin, I did grant your prior request for an extension of time because you had a tragedy in your family, so I thought that was a reasonable request.

I will say I don't think that the request by defense counsel is out of line at all. I think that the amended complaint, as I said, under the rules would have mooted the prior complaint and the motion that they filed. I think it was reasonable for them to make the request that they did.

They might have moved a little bit more quickly, but, again, your request for leave to amend was on a Friday. They filed their motion the following Thursday. And they also knew that there was a status hearing coming up within seven days of that.

So with all of that said, I think their request is reasonable. It's not going to hold up much, if at all, the time for me to rule on the motion. So I'm going to go ahead and grant their request that the reply be due, I think, the 22nd because given other cases that I already have scheduled for next week, I wouldn't be issuing a ruling next week in any case on a fully briefed motion to dismiss. So I think the couple of extra days is not going to delay matters at all materially. So I am going to allow them that additional time till the 22nd. And then the motion will be fully briefed and

I can rule on it based on the papers.

I know you've asked for oral argument. This is not the type of motion where I would generally find oral argument useful regardless of whether there were attorneys on both sides or not. This is the type of legal issue where I can make a decision based on the briefs. You've explained your position very clearly and what the facts are and what you're looking for so I'm confident that I understand your position and can make a proper ruling.

Also, I will say not having oral argument will also probably lead to a faster ruling because scheduling oral argument which would be an in-person hearing in the courtroom, again, that's time that I can spend going over the briefs and preparing a written ruling. So I'm not going to schedule oral argument.

I will take the matter under advisement for ruling based on the briefs once I get the reply brief on the 22nd.

I'll set another status date which will be set as a post ruling status date, and if the case is going forward, we'll be in a position to talk about discovery and what we need to do to get it ready for trial.

If the case is not going forward, then you'll have your other steps that you can consider, whether it's a motion for reconsideration or appeal or filing the case elsewhere or whatever it may be.

MR. MARTIN: So one quick question and not to take up too much of the Court's time, so with the filing of the other case, is it possible to give me a waiver since essentially I'm severing?

And a separate question. Would it be against the Court's rule to file -- would it have any negative impact if I was to re-file the amended complaint in this case after the Court's ruled on Ahern?

THE COURT: So would it have any -- so a couple of things. One, if you file a new lawsuit, you have to either pay the filing fee or file an application to proceed in forma pauperis and file a financial affidavit.

It gets treated as a separate case so when you file it, if you think it's related to this case, then there is a box that you check where you say it's related to this case, and then it might get sent to me as a related case.

If you don't think it's related to this case, then it will be randomly assigned, and it will be up to the judge who gets the case to decide whether you should have the fee waived.

Either way, whoever considers it will have to have an application to proceed in forma pauperis. That's not up to me; that's the court's policy. The clerk of court pays close attention to make sure that everybody is either paying the fee or they get a waiver from the judge. So if it's a separate

case, it has to be considered separately.

For the amended complaint, after I rule on the motion to dismiss, you can file a motion for leave to amend.

I'd have to see if the defendants who are already in the case have any objection to that, but it is certainly possible to file a motion for leave to amend really at any time during the early stages of the case.

The rules say that leave to amend should be freely given, but if it's going to prejudice the other parties, that would be a reason for me to say no. So if it's early in the case and there's not much discovery, it's entirely possible that I would say that's fine. In fact, I would expect to say that it's fine.

If the defendants' motion to dismiss is granted, however, you might not have the option of amending the complaint against them. Some of the arguments that they have raised are ones based on subject matter jurisdiction. That would mean, you know, this case would have to be dismissed and there wouldn't be, you know, a reason to amend it. But it really would depend on whether their motion is successful or whether it fails.

If their motion fails and the case is going forward, there's no reason you can't file another motion for leave to file an amended complaint.

Does that answer your question, Mr. Martin?

1 MR. MARTIN: Yes. Thank you, Judge. THE COURT: And then all of this will, of course, be 2 3 in the order for today. I believe we're sending you orders by email to your 4 Gmail account; is that correct, Mr. Martin? 5 6 MR. MARTIN: That's correct. I've been getting all 7 the orders. I'm good to go on those. 8 THE COURT: Good. I'm glad to hear that. So I will have the matter fully briefed by August 9 10 22nd. I will issue a ruling. I will set a regular 60-day 11 status. 12 Laritza, if you can look for what can be a telephone 13 status in 60 days. 14 If the case is going forward, we'll have a case plan. 15 If the case is dismissed, then the status may be dismissed as 16 well. 17 Laritza. 18 THE CLERK: Yes, Judge. We can do October 10th at 19 9:15. 20 THE COURT: Will the parties be able to call in then? 21 MR. MARTIN: I will. 22 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Very good. Thank you for this hearing. 24 Thank you for your time. Have a good day. 25 MR. MARTIN: Take care.

1	MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Your Honor.		
2	(Proceedings adjourned at 9:46 a.m.)		
3	* * * * *		
4	CERTIFICATE		
5			
6	I, Brenda S. Varney, certify that the foregoing is a		
7	complete, true, and accurate transcript from the record of		
8	proceedings on August 10, 2023, before the HON. ANDREA R. WOOL		
9	in the above-entitled matter.		
10			
11			
12	/s/Brenda S. Varney, CSR, RMR, CRR June 17, 2024		
13	Official Court Reporter Date		
14	United States District Court Northern District of Illinois		
15	Eastern Division		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			