

19-8236

ORIGINAL

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

IVA BROOKS —PETITIONER  
(Your Name)

vs.

Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

MAR 18 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

AARON FOSTER —RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

IVA BROOKS

(Your Name)

5480 S CORNELL #619

(Address)

CHICAGO ILLINOIS 60615

(City, State, Zip Code)

1-312-285-1285

(Phone Number)

RECEIVED

APR - 8 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

CONFLICTS PRESENTED

5 pages

## CONFLICTS PRESENTED

Although laws and statutes can often have interpretations and use of judicial discretions, the conflicts presented within this petition are not particularly of what happened within this case more so as to how the matters had been implemented is the majority of the conflicts presented for an appeal. The violating manner which some specifics had been enacted, is what had been exhibited to the Appellate Court of Appeals however had obviously been an oversight due to improficiency of format of a non attorney pro se not of legal profession which also received misappropriated advice from clerk's office staff of what to file.

The points of conflict outlined draw question in regard to discrepancies of exactly what happened, who said what, what had not been said, what had not been done, why motions were negated, what had been granted and why, and what substantiated the Circuit Court judge's discretionary decisions which did display bias and violations of rights of the parties contributing to the decisions and subsequent outcomes which directly conflict with practices, codes of conduct, codes of procedures and of implementing decisions subject to statutes.

Substantial conflicts which explicitly show how an in-court oral motion of the respondent for a "rule 215 on the mom" had been granted without any substantiating evidence, no evidence presented, nor the obligation of an explanation of Circuit Court judge's decisions subject to statute.

There are violations of uniformity subject to review by the Supreme Court under certiorari jurisdiction which can be remedied in acceptance, review and an appeal. The United States Supreme Court can correct such violations through use of discretionary jurisdiction to review lower court decisions which severely conflict with laws and or statutes and or how laws and or statutes are upheld in protection of rights subject to statutes honed within each state. Direct, strong partial, weak and or non-genuine conflicts are presented.

## CONFLICTS PRESENTED

This strong-partial conflict involves matters of rights which directly violate rights within the state of Illinois statutes such as right to an attorney in processing an arrest on contempt, indirect civil contempt and or any arrest/contempt matter which can and did lead to other matters which can and did violate due process. The absence of the assigned State's Attorney on behalf of the state and or petitioner of which the judge knew there had been a State's Attorney for child support for the petitioner which is to be present for court hearings and or proceedings however the non-attorney pro se petitioner would not had know protocols for representation which subsequently is how the omission of the State's Attorney came about in the two matters of the Domestic Relations child support case. For instance, the Department of Human Services filed child support on behalf of the petitioner, the State's attorney for Child Support has an interest in the matter and is to be notified by the court and present for hearings in all matters of child support. However, the Circuit Court judge which also heard the case in matters of parenting-time, informed the parties on a particular court appearance that the case is being heard in regard to parenting-time and not child support that particular day. The State's Attorney for child support subsequently withdrew from the entire case after the Circuit Court judge stated the matters being heard were not regarding however there had still been unresolved matters of child support which simply were not being heard on that particular court appearance of which both the issues of child support and or parenting time were heard by the same judge. The Circuit Court judge proceeded the duration of the case matters of child support and parenting-time without notifying the State's Attorney regarding any matters of child support. However, the petitioner brought the matter to the attention of the court during the informal hearings since the case had never actually had a trial regarding neither matter of child support nor parenting-time. This oversight conflicts with the reason, purpose, intent, or the involvement

## CONFLICTS PRESENTED

of DHS and the State's Attorney's for child support. Furthermore, the Circuit Court judge failed to inform litigants, both of which were pro se at that time, of the rules and or procedures, which state, the State's Attorney for child support is to be informed and present in matters of child support especially since that is the original purpose of the case in the first place. The long extended delays disregarding petitioner's motions for substitution of judge and substitution of guardian ad litem without the court's explanation/reason subject to statute in conjunction with the undeniable violation of parental rights conflicts with determining remedy in the better and or best interest of the child which whom rights have been subsequently violated without reason nor explanation subject to statute.

Obligations of the lower courts judges of informing litigants pro se and or otherwise of decisions of the case and or processes which the case is to be handled is an obligation of the judge which had not happened in this case regarding any of the case matters of child support, parenting-time, contempt, an emergency, reasons for granting motions/petitions in question by a pro se litigant, nor of informing a litigant if and when representing counsel is to be present during the case is the strong-partial conflict presented.

The processes which a pro se litigant is to facilitate filings and or having rights to file motions and or petitions as pro se in protection of rights and or to proceed in matters of the case should not be prohibited as it had been with this case within the Circuit Court judge's decision barring the petitioner from filings without leave to file which is an obstruction to file for leave to file and a violation of constitutional rights within the right to due process and a non-genuine conflict to remedy matter in the better and or best interest of the domestic relations child support case. At no point had the Circuit Court judge fulfilled obligations to inform litigants of the processes, procedures, statutes by which decision had been made, rules and or rights which is a direct

## CONFLICTS PRESENTED

violation of due process and inevitably contradicts points and or purposes of much our amendments and rights in these matters within statutes which are clear and obvious opposed to those which are obscure and rely on interpretation and or judge's discretion. The manner in which the case had been facilitated of the Circuit Court judge's decisions, is an unprecedented display of violations of rights in what had been a simple matter of child support and parenting-time which both litigants had not had the extreme adversity as do many of the cases within domestic relations court regarding parenting-time and child support. The Circuit Court direct and indirect conflicts far exceeds discord between the litigants regarding child support and parenting time of which conflicts of the case posed unnecessary afflictions to the parties, and subsequently cause unnecessary intrusions, irretrievable loss of valuable time and attention of the United States Supreme Court to remedy matters not just within this case but so as to not have these sorts of conflicts inhibit our liberties especially in matters of child support and parenting-time.

The case also conflicts procedurally having not had an actual trial just informal hearings of child support and or parenting-time which also had responses of the respondent regarding court documented visitation scheduling. Violations of codes of procedure lead to more serious matters of an indirect civil contempt by which the petitioner had been compliant however the judge's discretion is undoubtedly questionable as to why such harsh rulings of an electronic home monitoring for contempt, which prohibited petitioner from representations, employment and an intrusion of her personal dwelling, all of which no attorney representation for petitioner. The case had not followed plenary rules regarding parenting-time, emergency motions/petitions and or impartiality within judge's discretions and how procedures of the case are continued and or carried out which inevitably sets an unclassified standard which conflicts with statutes, codes of conduct and codes of procedures which violate basic civil, parental and or human rights as it

## CONFLICTS PRESENTED

has happened within this case. Such conflicting acts are an abomination to laws and statutes which are to protect us within the constitutions especially the child in this matter.

These noted conflicts within the "Question Presented" and "Reasons petition should be granted" outline the manner of how rights of the petitioner and child have been violated and exhibit more of a conflict to the lower court's misrepresentation of the court's obligations and an oversight of the concerns of the parents within these case filing of the initial purpose and intent for bringing child support and or parenting-time matters to the courts to remedy in the better and or best interest of the child, with respect to the litigants. These conflicts also exhibit continuous oversights within our justice system which invalidate our democracy far too often. These violations can be remedied through review of the specific contents of the court case matters which conflict with statutes and or how actions of the court came about, were enacted and have been decided which are subject to statutes within the state and or jurisdictions.

Essentially the reasons in which the case came about had not been the focus, subject, importance and or priority of the respondent nor of the Circuit Court judge as shown in this petition for remedy and an appeal.

Specific questions of conflict in regard to the case help to resolve, if and or how decisions could be upheld and or overturned for this petition of writ of certiorari even in the simplest of matters.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED  
questions 1 through 40

BROOKS v FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

questions presented

1. is there violation of the petitioner's civil, parental, human rights
2. had the assigned guardian ad litum actively participated to facilitate communications, parenting time, child support in the best/better interest of the child
3. had the petitioner given reasonable effort within her rights to comply with the granted order dated FEB/28/2017
4. was an in-court oral motion for a rule 215 mental exam stated by the respondent's attorney(s) FEB/28/2017
5. who in-court oral motioned for the rule 215 mental exam during the informal hearing feb/28/2017
6. was the petitioner present in-court for the entire emergency hearing sep/20/2017
7. was there previous mention of any mental health concerns of petitioner to the court whereas petitioner's mental health would be in question in care of her child prior to the in-court oral motion of the respondent FEB/28/2017
8. was there evidence to substantiate granting an emergency visit day summer 2017
9. did the respondent receive consistent scheduled parenting-time with the child
10. does the court ordered electronic home monitoring for an indirect civil contempt violate petitioner's rights regarding contempt and or is the court order EHM contempt unconstitutional as it pertains to the case
11. was there substantiating and or factual merit/evidence presented to/in-court to substantiate granting the Sep/20/2017 emergency petition
12. is the filed SEP/20/2017 emergency petition omitted from the Certification of Record on Appeal
13. is the court ordered electronic home monitoring contempt cruel and unusual forceful means to attempt to force petitioner to comply with the unsubstantiated granted in-court oral motion for a rule 215 mental exam
14. does excessive force, coercion and or use of 'court tactics' violate Illinois Civil Code of Procedure
15. had the petitioner been represented by an attorney, represented by an attorney regarding contempt, and or had an attorney filed an appearance representing the petitioner
16. were the matters of the case sent through the protocols of the lower courts to be remedied before pursuit to the higher courts

questions presented

17. had petitioner sought counsel / legal advice through legal assistance attorney agencies, referral programs and or private attorneys
18. did the respondent's attorneys violate attorney's code of conduct taking full advantage of the petitioner not being represented by an attorney
19. did the judge obstruct justice by attempting to prohibit petitioner from filings
20. did the respondent's attorneys practice extremely unethical court tactics which affected the outcomes and or decisions of the case
21. did an attorney for the respondent complete filing paperwork for substitution of judge
22. had petitioner parented, compromised, represented, disputed and or argued and abrogated in the better and or best interest of the child
23. did the circuit court judge exhibit bias and an inability to render impartiality in ruling of the case matters
24. is there abuse of judge's discretion
25. has rights of the child subsequently been violated within this case
26. did staff and or the appellate court attorney give legal advice to petitioner which subsequently had been misappropriated advice advising petitioner to file a petition for rehearing in the Illinois Appellate Court
27. were there other filings which could had been filed for petitioner to seek remedy through the Appellate court instead of filing petition for rehearing
28. was there substantiating and or factual merit/evidence presented to/in-court to substantiate granting the Mar/2018 restraining order by the same judge hearing the case regarding child support and parenting-time.
29. how was the non attorney pro se petitioner not of legal profession supposed to know what the contents of a Certification of Record on appeal should completely consist of and or if something is omitted and or intentionally omitted from the Certification of Record
30. were there procedural errors which had been brought to the attention of the lower courts which directly conflict with statutes
31. had the Circuit Court judge hearing the case explained decisions by statute at any point
32. were there unclear, uncertain and or unclarified orders given to both pro se litigants
33. had the judge addressed the petitioner in an unrespectable tone and manner
34. had petitioner reasonably and or respectfully brought matters of procedural errors to the attention of the court/judge

questions presented

35. had petitioner reasonably complied with the orders
36. had the State's Attorney for child support representing DHS been informed, included and present for all matters regarding child support
37. had there been a conflict of interest between any Illinois Supreme Court judge and any of the justices of the Illinois Appellate Court which ruled on and or took no part in the case subsequently affecting decisions of the case
38. are there conflicts between statutes and how matters of this case had been decided, upheld and or implemented
39. does the guardian ad litem have an undisclosed ulterior motive and or intent regarding any party within this case, having had possibly requesting to be assigned to this particular case
40. were there informal meetings between attorneys and or litigants which were not plenary which affected the outcome and or decisions of the case

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IVAN BROOKS —PETITIONER (Your Name)

vs.

AARON FOSTER —RESPONDENT(s)

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page

[ ] All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceedings in the court whose judgement is subject of this petition is as follows:

A. Guardian ad Litem: Lester L Barclay, Barclay Law Group Chicago Illinois 60602

B. Respondent's counsel: (?)

the additional listed parties have an uncertainty of disposition as to whether they were representative of the respondent having not had filed an appearance(s) and or withdraw with notice and or proof of service

1. Masah Renwick / Masah S. SamForay
2. Lakeside Law Group
3. Nicole Scott
4. Renwick Firm
5. Foray Firm

petitioner IVA BROOKS  
respondent AARON FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. \_\_\_\_\_

IVA BROOKS —PETITIONER (Your Name)

vs.

AARON FOSTER —RESPONDENT(s)

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Petitioner not required to list

petitioner IVA BROOKS  
respondent AARON FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. \_\_\_\_\_

APPENDAGE

IVA BROOKS —PETITIONER (Your Name)

vs.

AARON FOSTER —RESPONDENT(s)

OPINIONS AND JURISDICTION

There are no opinions

Illinois Appellate Court

- A. April/15/2019 Appellate Court Order allowed
- B. May/16/2019 Appellate Court Order allowed
- C. Aug/15/2019 Appellate Court Order
- D. September/24/2019 Appellate Court dismissed Summary Order
- E. October/21/2019 Appellate Court Order denying rehearing

Illinois Supreme Court

- F. December/20/2019 Supreme Court Order denying review
- G. Feb/27/2020 Supreme Court Order denying reconsideration

petitioner IVA BROOKS  
respondent AARON FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

4 pages

Petitioner: IVA BROOKS  
Respondent: AARON FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

statement of the case

The case began as a simple matter of receiving child support through the centralized payment processor for child support in Illinois. The respondent received scheduled parenting-time with the child inclusive of an out-of-court parenting-time schedule of an alternating weekend schedule before having received the documented court ordered parenting-time. The respondent filed motions for court ordered parenting-time in response to child support. The case handling of the Circuit Court judge had not represented many of the purposes and reasons for the division of Domestic Relations Parentage and Child support and present weak conflict . The documented biases/abuses of the Circuit Court judge, the unethical courtroom practices of the respondent's attorneys, court tactics of representatives of the respondent as well as misappropriated and or miscommunicated information of that of staff of the courts has gotten the case presented to the United States Supreme Court for several violations of rights of both the petitioner and child which have a strong partial conflict to statutes and or provisions as to how statutes are to be interpreted, upheld and or use of judge's discretion.

I, a non-attorney pro se , have shown considerable good faith effort in spite of the misappropriated information for filings given by several court clerk's office staff. I presented pertinent information in motion filings of which had gone negated for undisclosed reasons before and after the feb/28/2017 in-court oral motion but do some particular formatting rules of the Appellate court specific content within the statement of facts, argument and reconsiderations went without a granted appeal. This matter is not about discontentment of rulings however a serious oversight of facts presented for an appeal of decisions of the courts which conflict with implementation of statutes subject to decisions of the case and or the order in which matters had been facilitated . The First District Illinois Appellate Court Summary Order dated Sep/24/2019 is inaccurate in its disposition. On the contrary, it is not a dissatisfied disposition of

statement of the case

myself, the petitioner, however an appeal to the First District Illinois Appellate Court regarding violations of rights of both myself and child and the injustices which could so very easily happen to anyone subject to the misappropriation of orders and or the presence of procedures which pose conflict. The proper protocols had been attempted to facilitate matters at the Circuit Court level however representatives from the Circuit Court of Cook County Office of the Honorable Chief Judge had not replied, therefore an appeal had been filed in pursuit to remedy conflict in the case mishandling matters and to receive remedy regarding violations of rights of both myself and child whereby there is strong argument of conflicting statutes. There are several documented violations of due process, abuse of the judge's discretion and an admission of the appellate court's administrative staff attorney giving advice to myself, the petitioner, which had been misappropriated instructions and or advice to file a petition for rehearing which affected and influenced decisions and or outcomes of the case matters within the appeals processes. Although there is no legal leniency given to pro se litigants regarding case filings and the proficiency to/in/for filings, there are some obvious oversights a pro se which is not of the legal profession nor an attorney would had reasonably known. Some specifics obturate non-attorney pro se litigants from receiving an impartial and fair review for an appeal particularly in reference to the certification of record on appeal not containing all the filed documents and or documents which should be within the Certification of Record on Appeal, which a non-attorney pro se would not have had proficient knowledge of how the record on appeal is supposed to be cataloged nor what consist of full contents of a Certification of Record on Appeal. Also noting, a non-attorney pro se not of legal profession typically would not have knowledge of court tactics, especially unethical court tactics, and the codes of conduct and codes of procedure which judges and or court representatives are to comply within. The lack of respect for myself as a parent and the respondent's disregard to the continued willingness to compromise and or co-parent in the

statement of the case

better interest of my daughter prompted the initial opposition to decisions of the Circuit Court judge. The case handling which had been obviously biased, favoring the respondent, prompted the initial substitution of judge which went ignored which also poses conflict subject to statutes. The documented personal biased disposition of the Circuit Court judge, began to be more of a position of power and less of that of the interest of the child and a total disregard for myself and our rights. Civil rights which had been violated as a result of decisions of the Circuit Court judge have been an unnecessary affliction to our lives and conflicts with the guidelines and statutes in regard to the child's better and or best interest. The case decisions and or the manner in which the matters in question came about such as the granted order for the rule 215 mental exam, is not subjective, it's invasive, unnecessary and could lead and did lead to other violations of rights. At no point had the Circuit Court judge fulfilled judicial obligations subject to Rule 23 nor had the Circuit Court judge attempted to remedy the several documented violations of rights. It is extremely concerning that a simple matter of child support and parenting time of which both parents exhibited some compliance however the case shows an obvious biased disposition of the judge against myself, the petitioner. The Circuit Court of Cook County Domestic Relations division of Parentage and Child Support judge showed an abuse of judge's discretion within the case matter conflicting with the appointed role of the guardian ad litem by statutes.

An abuse in the decision regarding granting the FEB/28/2017 in-court oral motion of the respondent and the persistent disregard for petitioner's rights is the purpose and intent for the substitution of judge motions which went negated for several months which directly conflicts with Illinois Rule 311. The human respect aspect of the violations of human rights within the court case is what alarmed and prompted continued opposition to decisions of the Circuit Court judge. The judge's responsibility to render fairness and impartiality in rulings is not a request, it is an obligation to laws of our country with respect to all positions as judge which has been bestowed

statement of the case

upon representatives of our judicial branch of government. The manner in which the Circuit Court judge handled the case and decisions are not comparable to the situations of the case, not at all. Although victimized, my disposition has remained constant in fairness, equity and in the better and or best interest of my daughter in matters of parenting-time and child support which corresponds with statute of the better and or best interest of the child contrary to the untruths stated of the respondent which conflict with statute of the child's best interest.

Surely, I have been more than fair and reasonable in co-parenting matters especially considering many of the decisions had to be made in urgency and or portentous circumstances, I as a single parent, have had to make decisions in responsibility to myself, my child and our families. I have maintained respect for the judicial processes within my rights however there must be accountability for such a lack of better decisions from the courts within these case matters which conflict with statutes, codes of conduct and codes of procedures.

I, a non-attorney pro se, have since represented myself to the best of my legal ability with a time of essence concern to have these matters remedied through the judicial processes. I, a non attorney pro se, present this writ of certiorari for consideration for review and an appeal of decisions of the lower courts in Illinois.

## REASONS PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED

7 pages

Petitioner: IVA BROOKS  
Respondent: AARON FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

reasons petition should be granted

There are several reasons this petition for Writ of Certiorari should be granted including but not limited to; the conflicts of the decisions, implementation of orders, procedural errors which greatly affected the outcomes of the case and subsequent decision in other matters and well as the conflict between an unclassified standard of practice which also conflicts with laws, statutes and implementation of orders.

- 1) several violations of rights of parties in the case matters which had not been remedied through the lower courts, some of which were due to oversights which should not become a standard of practice of the lower courts.
  - A. oversights of the Circuit Court which had not facilitated matters with time of essence concern in a case involving child custody which conflict with other jurisdictions and or cases
  - B. serious mishandlings of the Circuit Court judge which misused and or abused use of judge's discretion in matters which conflict with other jurisdictions/cases;
    1. child support; allowed business owner to provide check stubs in lieu of the court ordered tax records
    2. parenting-time; granted respondent request, no interim parenting time during compliance to orders when there had not been consistent non-compliance to validate such a harsh disposition without reason
    3. Contempt; petitioner had been compliant, contempt orders extremely unreasonable and unconstitutional as it pertains to this case to the rule to show cause on contempt,
    4. emergency petitions; not an emergency in either emergency petition filed by the respondent which conflicts with other similar EP cases

reasons petition should be granted

5. restraining orders (orders of protection) conflicts with cases for an order of protection (RO initial duration of two years) without cause, reason nor substantiating evidence
6. petitioner's motions; negated and or ignored without cause which conflicts with statutes

C. The Circuit Court judge's inability to render fair and or impartial rulings)

- 2) The case had not been remedied through the Appellate Court processes due to petitioner not having an attorney nor being proficient in some of the specifics of the Appellate Court processes and not being of the court/legal profession however had addressed the case with a time of essence concern in good faith effort in the better andor best interest of herself and child
- 3) There is also lack of concern, involvement, and or lack of a participatory disposition of the assigned guardian ad litem which non-participatory dispositions prohibited use of mediations through the assigned guardian ad litem to receive assistance in the betterinterest of my daughter, the child.
- 4) The Circuit Court judge lost sight of the intentions and purposes of the Division of Parentage and Child support within the states and instead abused powers and or privileges bestowed upon elected and of appointed judicial persons by showing documented bias and continuously negating petitioner by not complying to Rule 23.
- 5) the Circuit Court judge showed an inability to render fair and or impartial rulings on several mentioned matters which have caused loss of irretrievable valuable time which no one can give back, negating parenting- in an interim in the better interest of the child. The obvious biases have been an affliction and violations of civil, parental, and or human rights.

reasons petition should be granted

- 6) I, the petitioner, have addressed these matters as a non-attorney pro se not of the legal profession with good faith effort, time of essence concern and limited to no legal assistance due to much of the injustices within these case matters.
  - a. unsubstantiated Mar/26/2018 restraining order which should not become standard practice, the Circuit Court judge had not given an explanation on rulings which said rulings prohibited petitioner from receiving legal assistance through legal assistance agencies/ services, petitioner did qualify to receive legal assistance. (Rule 23)
  - b. the petitioner filed several motions in the Circuit Court to repeal/reverse the unsubstantiated restraining order (order of protection) however the Circuit Court judge denied motions without explanation and continued to negate petitioner motion filings and or facts petitioner presented with proof presented by the petitioner (Rule 23)
- 7) respondents representation remained uncertain, respondent having not filed an appearance and or withdrawal with proofs of service of which should not become a standard of practice
- 8) petitioner regularly communicated with the clerk's office to understand the processes of the appeals process and the instructions given of the clerk's office in regard to filings
- 9) this matter could have been facilitated through the Office of the Honorable Chief Judge of the Circuit Court however there had not been reply from representatives of the office of the honorable chief judge, stating they "had not received email/fax correspondences regarding this case" however there is verifiable proof of correspondences sent, This oversight should not become standard practice

reasons petition should be granted.

- 10) there are documented violations of the Rules of Professional conduct in regard to lawyers' responsibilities, whereby the attorneys conduct extremely unethical court practices, and the respondent's counsels have lacked to represent respondent in the better and or best interest of the child which also violated Rules of Professional conduct regarding lawyers which should not become a standard of practice.
- 11) respondent's attorney violated attorney's code of conduct taking full advantage of the pro se petitioner not being represented by an attorney
- 12) respondent's attorney's practiced extremely unethical court tactics intentionally improperly completing paperwork which is the responsibility of the courtroom clerk which also helps protect the integrity of the courtroom and practices, these unethical acts which should not become a standard of practice affected outcomes and or decisions of the case (for example: substitution of judge, matter of right / for cause paperwork)
- 13) there had not been an emergency in either of the respondent's filed emergency motions/petitions subject to statute, therefore decisions exhibited another biased disposition of the Circuit Court judge and the inability to be impartial
- 14) violations of the rules which should not become standard practice of how the violations came to pass
  - a. Rule 13 not properly filing appearances and or withdrawals of representation
  - b. Rule 1.1, 1.3, Rule 1.4 serious lack of good faith effort of the guardian ad litem
  - c. violations of rule 405, methods of proving character

BROOK v FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

reasons petition should be granted

- d. violations of rule 701 and 702, whereby judge's opinion had been verbally and expressed openly in-court by the Circuit Court judge showing a continuous inability to be impartial
- e. violations of Rule 23 of which the lower court judge the case was assigned to had not adequately explained decisions/rulings to the parties/litigants whether represented by counsel or not
- f. unquestionable violations of due processes
- g. violations of due process regarding Powers of Circuit Court whereas the judge and or opposing counsel did not show "good cause" on motions of the petitioner which had not been represented by counsel 735 ILCS 5/3-111
- h. there are emergency petitions which did not constitute as an emergency subject to 750ILCS 5/602.7(a) and or III Rev. STAT ch37, par 802-10{705LCS 405/2 10 I)

15) there are documented records of clerk's office staff giving advice which had been misappropriated advice which affected outcomes and or decisions of the case which should not become standard practice

16) the Circuit Court judge obstructing justice by subjecting petitioner to a court ruling which barred petitioner from filing any motions without leave of court which is an obstruction simply by attempting to prohibit filings for leave to file motions/petitions which is a violation of due process which should not become standard of practice

17) there had been intentional omissions of court documents that should have been

reasons petition should be granted

within the Certification of Record on Appeal which the pro se would not had reasonably discovered to supplement the record within the Appellate Court processes

- 18) the Circuit Court judge abused use of judge's discretion in a manner which should not become standard of practice within use of judge's discretion
- 19) the court ordered electronic home monitoring contempt is cruel and unusual means to force petitioner to comply with an unsubstantiated granted in-court oral motion for a rule 215 mental exam which violated petitioner's rights especially considering there had not been non-compliance throughout the domestic relation child support court case
- 20) there had not been a trial only informal hearings which should not become a standard of conflicting practices
- 21) the violation respondent had not been honest of intent, reason purpose in facilitating matters nor been responsible for the child in the better interest of the child now and or for long term well-being of the child which definitely should not become standard of practice of the courts
- 22) the child's rights had been violated
  - a. inadequate representation for the child of the appointed guardian ad litem which should not become standard practice
  - b. the obvious non-participatory disposition of the guardian ad litem to facilitate amicable resolution in the better and or best interest of the child
  - c. guardian ad litem had not represented in the better and or best interest of the child in regard to child support

reasons petition should be granted

- d. the guardian ad litem had not facilitated interim parenting-time in the better/best interest of the child, no reason for not having had parenting-time and or an interim parenting-time schedule
- e. guardian ad litem exhibited an ulterior motive disposition for reiterating the FEB/28/2017 order of which he had not had verifiable record of an opinion on granting the FEB/28/2017 in-court oral motion of the respondent which this process of violations should never become standard practice
- f. the child had been taken from a stable living arrangement/environment with no substantiating reasons provided by the court nor had the guardian ad litem which knew statements within the filed SEP/20/2017 emergency petition were false and or inaccurate and an unethical court tactic which should not become standard of practice which lead to the 'legal kidnapping' of the child from the petitioner

23) the parties civil, parental and or human rights had been violated in manners which should had never been, conflicting with the good intent of the litigants in the better and or best interest of the child

## CONCLUSION

3 pages

Petitioner: IVA BROOKS  
Respondent: AARON FOSTER  
ILLINOIS

## conclusion

The documented violations of human rights, civil rights and parental rights warrant for an appeal. This brief recall of the case, petitions filings, motions and event occurrences within the domestic relations child support case support petitioner's argument and justify an appeal subject to statute. This petition for writ of certiorari is not a matter of dissatisfaction of decisions but that of the obvious bias of the Circuit Court judge, the judge's inability to be impartial and or violations or rights which conflict with laws and or statutes and or implementation of decisions subject to statutes and or the interpretation of laws and statutes. The injustices within this case whereby a child taken from a responsible, loving mother which has not had history of mental illness, never used illicit drugs, no alcohol abuse, had not abused nor neglected the child and a mom which whom has been more than reasonable to the respondent (father of the child), and the respondent knowingly abused and used unethical court tactics through the use of unethical legal representation with an intent to 'legally kidnap' the child is not just an injustice its an atrocity. This petition for writ of certiorari which is now presented to the United States Supreme Court on the duly noted violations which pose conflict of how statues and or rulings are to be upheld and or enacted regarding parenting-time 750 ILCS 5/517, 705 ILCS 405/2-17, 750 ILCS 5/602, an emergency 750 ILCS 5/602.7, best interest of the child 750 ILCS/602.7(a), child support 750 ILCS5/505, orders of protection 750 ILCS 60/214, role of the guardian ad litem 750 ILCS 405/2-10, amongst several other inexcusable mentioned conflicting violations of rights of both the petitioner and child by the respondent, the Circuit Court judge hearing the case through informal hearings all of which have affected myself, the petitioner, the child our families and our

conclusion

lives. The deceptive court practices have caused delays in judicial processes to remedy irretrievable loss of valuable time, caused unnecessary discords, unnecessary dysfunction within the familial relations, been a waste of court time and of allocated funds, all of which conflict with statutes and or rules in regard to these issues. Hopefully there is minimal long term adverse effects to my daughter, the child and our families. There is not mental illness nor history of mental illness to substantiate granting orders in the conduct and manner which they had been enacted. The petitioner had not kept the child from the respondent for scheduled parenting-time, had made certain there were open lines of communications, had kept availability for respondent to have unsupervised non-court documented time with the child, and petitioner had been very reasonable regarding child support. The conflicts presented have not only been problems in our lives, it could potentially set a standard of court practices and procedures which conflict with statutes and use of judge's discretion. Although there are amateur errors within the appellate case contents the case warrants an appeal based on the conflicts.

I, a non attorney pro se petitioner, not of legal profession and not of proficiency in law, have still been actively involved in my daughter's life in a reciprocal conduct and manner, fostering a continued great relationship with my daughter in spite of the inequity, violations of rights and or partiality which occurred within the case matters. Certainly, afflictions of our recent past of the oppressive mentalities during the 1950s and 1960s civil rights movement whereby women's rights were objectified, non-existent and or negated, is not the direction we desire for the

conclusion

future of our nation and most certainly not for myself and child. The subjective decisions have been an unnecessary encumbrance causing lack of parental presence, missed life events and a better quality of life and or pursuit thereof. I am seeking acceptance for an appeal to the US Supreme Court of the petition for writ of certiorari on the basis of the contents within this petition and truths and or facts exhibited for an appeal of decisions of the lower courts of Illinois.

This petition for writ of certiorari should be granted

Respectfully submitted, Eva Brook Foster

Date: March 18 2020