
In the
Supreme Court of the United States

IN RE ABDUL MOHAMMED, PETITIONER

**On Petition for Writ of Mandamus/Prohibition to
the Executive Committee of the United States
District Court for the Northern District of
Illinois and United States Court of Appeal for
the 7th Circuit**

**APPENDIX TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDAMUS/PROHIBITION**

Abdul Mohammed
Pro Se Petitioner
258 E. Bailey Rd, Apt C,
Naperville, IL 60565
(630) 854-5345
aamohammed@hotmail.com

September 27, 2021

ABDUL MOHAMMED,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
vs.
PRAIRIE STATE LEGAL SERVICES INC ET.AL
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES,

CASE # 20-2419

AMENDED MOTION FOR TRANSFER

NOW COMES, the Plaintiff Abdul Mohammed, appearing for himself as Pro Se, with his Amended Motion to Transfer the instant case to another circuit and states as follows:-

1. Since the entering of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois' Executive Committee's (hereinafter Executive Committee) illegal orders, the members of the Executive Committee, J.Jorge Alonso, J. Gary Feinerman, Chief Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer, J.Ronald Guzman, J.Robert Gettleman, J. John Blakey, J.Iain Johnston, Thomas Bruton, J.Frank Easterbrook, J.Michael Kanne, J.Diane Wood, J.Michael Brennan, J.Amy St.Eve, J. Ilana Rover, J.Michael Scudder, J..David Hamilton, and Chief Judge Diane Sykes has harassed the Plaintiff and his three minor children and retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children as follows:
 - a) J.Feinerman ruled that the Plaintiff's 8-year-old son's school can deprive Plaintiff's son of his lunch and the one or more of the 7th Circuit judges mentioned above affirmed J.Feinerman's ruling that Plaintiff's 8-year-old son's school can deprive Plaintiff's son of his lunch;
 - b) Further J.Feinerman dismissed Case # 19-cv-6525 when Plaintiff asked a question as follows:
"Ms. Deanes,
I have the following question for Judge Feinerman:
How come it is OK to only ban me from dropping Lunch for my son whereas other parents can drop Lunch for their children? Please answer the above question via email either to me or to my attorney, Marco Rodriguez. Sincerely,
Abdul Mohammed".
 - c) Further Plaintiff's 8-year-old son has been unlawfully deprived of his lunch by his school, by J.Feinerman by members of the Executive Committee and by the judges named above;
 - d) Further, all the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above retaliated against Plaintiff and his three minor children by threatening sanctions for filing a complaint with USDOJ as described in Exhibit-2;
 - e) Further, all the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children by threatening sanctions, contempt of court, and a fine of \$1000.00 for filing a complaint with Chief Judge of 7th Circuit Diane Sykes against the several judges of this court, members of the Executive Committee and forced the Plaintiff to withdraw his complaint as described in Exhibit-2;
 - f) Finally, all the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above, retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children by having Plaintiff's home raided at 6:30 AM by Naperville Police and several Federal Agents

and the Plaintiff was threatened by the Federal Agents for filing complaints against the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above;

- g) Further Plaintiff was threatened by Federal Agents upon orders of the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above, to watch out what he files against the judges named above;
- h) Further Federal Agents threatened Plaintiff during the raid to not make them come again to his home and do this in front of his children;
- i) Further judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above, used Plaintiff's three minor children as "human shields" to protect themselves from Plaintiff's complaints against them when the judges caused the Federal Agents to threaten the Plaintiff "to not make them come back again to do this in front of his children".
- j) Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above caused the raid of Federal Agents and Naperville Police upon Plaintiff's home to threaten the Plaintiff with false arrest and false imprisonment if the Plaintiff files any complaint against the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above;

2. There is active investigation pending with United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) against the members of the Executive Committee, J.Jorge Alonso, J. Gary Feinerman, Chief Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer, J.Ronald Guzman, J.Robert Gittleman, J. John Blakey, J.Iain Johnston, Thomas Bruton, J.Frank Easterbrook, J.Michael Kanne, J.Diane Wood, J.Michael Brennan, J.Amy St.Eve, J. Ilana Rover, J.Michael Scudder, J..David Hamilton, and Chief Judge Diane Sykes

3. Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above after committing actions as described above, represent that they are impartial when they heard matters related to the Plaintiff and his three minor children which is nothing but preposterous;

4. Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above entered orders against Plaintiff with prejudice towards his race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, ethnicity, disabilities, etc.

5. Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above entered orders against Plaintiff in retaliation for Plaintiff's protected activity including but not limited to complaints against the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above.

6. The adverse rulings against the Plaintiff by judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above are "derived from an extrajudicial source" or "reveal such a high degree of favoritism or antagonism as to make fair judgment impossible." *Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555.

7. "Findings by a trial judge unsupported by the record are evidence that the judge has relied on extrajudicial sources in making such determinations indicating personal bias and prejudice." *Peacock Records, Inc. v. Checker Records, Inc.*, 430 F.2d 85, 89 (7th Circuit. 1970).

8. All the rulings against the Plaintiff by judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above are treason, violation of oath of office, judicial trespass, and fraud upon the court.

9. Further, when Plaintiff appealed the Executive Committee's Orders, the 7th Circuit in concert with the judges and members of the Executive Committee named above unlawfully affirmed the Executive Committee's Orders without answering the questions asked by Plaintiff in his Appellant's Brief.

10. Further, Plaintiff was not provided Notice and Opportunity to be heard, Adequate Record of Review and Substantive Findings of Frivolousness and Harassment pursuant to *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, No. 11-57231 (9th Cir. 2014), before the Executive Committee entered orders against the Plaintiff.
11. Further, the 7th Circuit remained silent on *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, No. 11-57231 (9th Cir. 2014) when it affirmed the Executive Committees Orders against the Plaintiff.
12. Further, most of the cases filed by Plaintiff in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (hereinafter District Court) cannot be taken into account when entering restricting orders against Plaintiff pursuant to *Goolsby v Gonzalez*, Case # 11-cv-00494-LJO-GSA-PC, (E.D.Cal).
13. Further many of the cases filed in the District Court in which the Plaintiff is involved were removed by the Defendants to the District Court from State courts and such cases can also be not taken into account when entering restricting orders against the Plaintiff pursuant to *Goolsby v Gonzalez*, Case # 11-cv-00494-LJO-GSA-PC, (E.D.Cal).
14. Further, when Plaintiff appealed the dismissal of Case # 18-cv-8393, the 7th Circuit in concert with the judges and members of the Executive Committee named above unlawfully affirmed J.Feinerman's judgment which dismissed the case as a sanction without answering Plaintiff's questions.
15. Further, Case # 20-cv-50133 was dismissed under Rule 8 without allowing the Plaintiff to amend his complaint after the court invoked Rule 8 violation in violation of various decisions of the 7th Circuit court and other Circuits, by J.Johnston in concert with the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above in retaliation for his lawsuit against J.Johnston and several other judges of this court and the 7th Circuit.
16. Further, when Plaintiff unknowingly appealed an order from NLRB, the 7th Circuit entered sanctions against Plaintiff in concert with the judges and members of the Executive Committee named above despite Plaintiff's representation to the 7th Circuit that he did not know that NLRB's Order cannot be appealed.
17. Litigiousness alone is not enough, either: "The plaintiff's claims must not only be numerous but also be patently without merit." *Molski*, 500 F.3d at 1059 (quoting *Moy*, 906 F.2d at 470).
18. Already a judge (J.Tharpe) of the District Court has refused to follow Executive Committee's illegal orders against the Plaintiff.
19. Judge Tharpe has not sent *Mohammed v T-Mobile USA Inc*, Case # 21-cv-2706 to the Executive Committee for review as he does not feel that cases removed by the Defendants from the State Courts to District Court can be reviewed by the Executive Committee.
20. Plaintiff has informed Judge Tharpe about the existence of the Executive Committee Orders against him, and Judge Tharpe has acknowledged that he is aware of the Executive Committee Orders against Plaintiff.
21. Further denial of this Motion will also be considered another count of retaliation against Plaintiff by the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named in the pending complaint with USDOJ and will be reported to USDOJ.
22. Further denial of this Motion will be considered another violation of 18 U.S.C. Sections 1512 and 1513.

23. The actions of the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above were intentionally committed to cause a physical and mental injury to Plaintiff and his three minor children and such actions have caused extreme physical and mental injury to Plaintiff and his three minor children.

24. Plaintiff's minor children live in constant fear of early morning raids by Federal Agents and the Naperville Police.

25. Based on the arguments made above all the judges of the 7th Circuit are disqualified to hear any matter involving the Plaintiff or his three minor children.

26. *Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp.*, 486 U.S. 800, 819 (1988), the court explained that "if a transferee court can find the transfer decision 'plausible,' it should accept jurisdiction."

27. Pursuant to *Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp.*, 486 U.S. 800, 819 (1988) this case can be transferred to another circuit.

Wherefore, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff prays to this court.

- a) Enter an order transferring this case to another circuit that shares a border with the 7th circuit;
- b) Enter an Order for any such other relief as the court may deem just and proper.

Dated:- 09/13/2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Abdul Mohammed,
Pro Se Plaintiff,
258 East Bailey Rd, Apt C,
Naperville, IL 60565

ABDUL MOHAMMED,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

vs.

DAN BRIDGES ET.AL
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES,

CASE # 21-1591

AMENDED MOTION FOR TRANSFER

NOW COMES, the Plaintiff Abdul Mohammed, appearing for himself as Pro Se, with his Amended Motion to Transfer the instant case to another circuit and states as follows:-

1. Since the entering of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois' Executive Committee's (hereinafter Executive Committee) illegal orders, the members of the Executive Committee, J.Jorge Alonso, J. Gary Feinerman, Chief Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer, J.Ronald Guzman, J.Robert Gettleman, J. John Blakey, J.Iain Johnston, Thomas Bruton, J.Frank Easterbrook, J.Michael Kanne, J.Diane Wood, J.Michael Brennan, J.Amy St.Eve, J. Ilana Rover, J.Michael Scudder, J.David Hamilton, and Chief Judge Diane Sykes has harassed the Plaintiff and his three minor children and retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children as follows:
 - a) J.Feinerman ruled that the Plaintiff's 8-year-old son's school can deprive Plaintiff's son of his lunch and the one or more of the 7th Circuit judges mentioned above affirmed J.Feinerman's ruling that Plaintiff's 8-year-old son's school can deprive Plaintiff's son of his lunch;
 - b) Further J.Feinerman dismissed Case # 19-cv-6525 when Plaintiff asked a question as follows:
"Ms. Deanes,
I have the following question for Judge Feinerman:
How come it is OK to only ban me from dropping Lunch for my son whereas other parents can drop Lunch for their children? Please answer the above question via email either to me or to my attorney, Marco Rodriguez. Sincerely,
Abdul Mohammed".

- c) Further Plaintiff's 8-year-old son has been unlawfully deprived of his lunch by his school, by J.Feinerman by members of the Executive Committee and by the judges named above;
- d) Further, all the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above retaliated against Plaintiff and his three minor children by threatening sanctions for filing a complaint with USDOJ as described in Exhibit-2;
- e) Further, all the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children by threatening sanctions, contempt of court, and a fine of \$1000.00 for filing a complaint with Chief Judge of 7th Circuit Diane Sykes against the several judges of this court, members of the Executive Committee and forced the Plaintiff to withdraw his complaint as described in Exhibit-2;
- f) Finally, all the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above, retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children by having Plaintiff's home raided at 5:30 AM by Naperville Police and several Federal Agents

and the Plaintiff was threatened by the Federal Agents for filing complaints against the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above;

- g) Further Plaintiff was threatened by Federal Agents upon orders of the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above, to watch out what he files against the judges named above;
- h) Further Federal Agents threatened Plaintiff during the raid to not make them come again to his home and do this in front of his children;
- i) Further judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above, used Plaintiff's three minor children as "human shields" to protect themselves from Plaintiff's complaints against them when the judges caused the Federal Agents to threaten the Plaintiff "to not make them come back again to do this in front of his children".
- j) Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above caused the raid of Federal Agents and Naperville Police upon Plaintiff's home to threaten the Plaintiff with false arrest and false imprisonment if the Plaintiff files any complaint against the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above;

2. There is active investigation pending with United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) against the members of the Executive Committee, J.Jorge Alonso, J. Gary Feinerman, Chief Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer, J.Ronald Guzman, J.Robert Gettleman, J. John Blakey, J.Iain Johnston, Thomas Bruton, J.Frank Easterbrook, J.Michael Kanne, J.Diane Wood, J.Michael Brennan, J.Amy St.Eve, J. Ilana Rover, J.Michael Scudder, J..David Hamilton, and Chief Judge Diane Sykes
3. Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above after committing actions as described above, represent that they are impartial when they heard matters related to the Plaintiff and his three minor children which is nothing but preposterous;
4. Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above entered orders against Plaintiff with prejudice towards his race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, ethnicity, disabilities, etc.
5. Further, the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above entered orders against Plaintiff in retaliation for Plaintiff's protected activity including but not limited to complaints against the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above.
6. The adverse rulings against the Plaintiff by judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above are "derived from an extrajudicial source" or "reveal such a high degree of favoritism or antagonism as to make fair judgment impossible." *Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555.
7. "Findings by a trial judge unsupported by the record are evidence that the judge has relied on extrajudicial sources in making such determinations indicating personal bias and prejudice." *Peacock Records, Inc. v. Checker Records, Inc.*, 430 F.2d 85, 89 (7th Circuit. 1970).
8. All the rulings against the Plaintiff by judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above are treason, violation of oath of office, judicial trespass, and fraud upon the court.
9. Further, when Plaintiff appealed the Executive Committee's Orders, the 7th Circuit in concert with the judges and members of the Executive Committee named above unlawfully affirmed the Executive Committee's Orders without answering the questions asked by Plaintiff in his Appellant's Brief.

10. Further, Plaintiff was not provided Notice and Opportunity to be heard, Adequate Record of Review and Substantive Findings of Frivolousness and Harassment pursuant to *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, No. 11-57231 (9th Cir. 2014), before the Executive Committee entered orders against the Plaintiff.
11. Further, the 7th Circuit remained silent on *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, No. 11-57231 (9th Cir. 2014) when it affirmed the Executive Committees Orders against the Plaintiff.
12. Further, most of the cases filed by Plaintiff in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (hereinafter District Court) cannot be taken into account when entering restricting orders against Plaintiff pursuant to *Goolsby v Gonzalez*, Case # 11-cv-00494-LJO-GSA-PC, (E.D.Cal).
13. Further many of the cases filed in the District Court in which the Plaintiff is involved were removed by the Defendants to the District Court from State courts and such cases can also be not taken into account when entering restricting orders against the Plaintiff pursuant to *Goolsby v Gonzalez*, Case # 11-cv-00494-LJO-GSA-PC, (E.D.Cal).
14. Further, when Plaintiff appealed the dismissal of Case # 18-cv-8393, the 7th Circuit in concert with the judges and members of the Executive Committee named above unlawfully affirmed J.Feinerman's judgment which dismissed the case as a sanction without answering Plaintiff's questions.
15. Further, Case # 20-cv-50133 was dismissed under Rule 8 without allowing the Plaintiff to amend his complaint after the court invoked Rule 8 violation in violation of various decisions of the 7th Circuit court and other Circuits, by J.Johnston in concert with the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above in retaliation for his lawsuit against J.Johnston and several other judges of this court and the 7th Circuit.
16. Further, when Plaintiff unknowingly appealed an order from NLRB, the 7th Circuit entered sanctions against Plaintiff in concert with the judges and members of the Executive Committee named above despite Plaintiff's representation to the 7th Circuit that he did not know that NLRB's Order cannot be appealed.
17. Litigiousness alone is not enough, either: "The plaintiff's claims must not only be numerous but also be patently without merit." *Molski*, 500 F.3d at 1059 (quoting *Moy*, 906 F.2d at 470).
18. Already a judge (J.Tharpe) of the District Court has refused to follow Executive Committee's illegal orders against the Plaintiff.
19. Judge Tharpe has not sent *Mohammed v T-Mobile USA Inc*, Case # 21-cv-2706 to the Executive Committee for review as he does not feel that cases removed by the Defendants from the State Courts to District Court can be reviewed by the Executive Committee.
20. Plaintiff has informed Judge Tharpe about the existence of the Executive Committee Orders against him, and Judge Tharpe has acknowledged that he is aware of the Executive Committee Orders against Plaintiff.
21. Further denial of this Motion will also be considered another count of retaliation against Plaintiff by the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named in the pending complaint with USDOJ and will be reported to USDOJ.
22. Further denial of this Motion will be considered another violation of 18 U.S.C. Sections 1512 and 1513.

23. The actions of the judges and the members of the Executive Committee named above were intentionally committed to cause a physical and mental injury to Plaintiff and his three minor children and such actions have caused extreme physical and mental injury to Plaintiff and his three minor children.

24. Plaintiff's minor children live in constant fear of early morning raids by Federal Agents and the Naperville Police.

25. Based on the arguments made above all the judges of the 7th Circuit are disqualified to hear any matter involving the Plaintiff or his three minor children.

26. *Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp.*, 486 U.S. 800, 819 (1988), the court explained that "if a transferee court can find the transfer decision 'plausible,' it should accept jurisdiction."

27. Pursuant to *Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp.*, 486 U.S. 800, 819 (1988) this case can be transferred to another circuit.

Wherefore, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff prays to this court.

- a) Enter an order transferring this case to another circuit that shares a border with the 7th circuit;
- b) Enter an order staying the payment of the docketing fees until this case is transferred to another circuit or until April 18, 2022, whichever date comes later;
- c) Enter an Order for any such other relief as the court may deem just and proper.

Dated:- 09/13/2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Abdul Mohammed,
Pro Se Plaintiff,
258 East Bailey Rd, Apt C,
Naperville, IL 60565

ABDUL MOHAMMED,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
vs.
PRAIRIE STATE LEGAL SERVICES INC ET.AL
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES,

CASE # 20-2419

MOTION FOR EXPLANATION

NOW COMES, the Plaintiff-Appellant Abdul Mohammed, appearing for himself as Pro Se, with his Motion for Explanation and states as follows:-

1. On September 17, 2021, Plaintiff-Appellant's Amended Motion for Transfer was denied without any explanation from the court.
2. Plaintiff-Appellant is requesting this court to explain why his Amended Motion for Transfer was denied because the Plaintiff-Appellant needs that information to file his Petition for Writ of Mandamus in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Dated:- 09/17/2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Abdul Mohammed,
Pro Se Plaintiff,
258 East Bailey Rd, Apt C,
Naperville, IL 60565

ABDUL MOHAMMED,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT
vs.
DAN BRIDGES ET.AL
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES,

CASE # 21-1591

MOTION FOR EXPLANATION

NOW COMES, the Plaintiff-Appellant Abdul Mohammed, appearing for himself as Pro Se, with his Motion for Explanation and states as follows:-

1. On September 17, 2021, Plaintiff-Appellant's Amended Motion for Transfer was denied without any explanation from the court.
2. Plaintiff-Appellant is requesting this court to explain why his Amended Motion for Transfer was denied because the Plaintiff-Appellant needs that information to file his Petition for Writ of Mandamus in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Dated:- 09/17/2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Abdul Mohammed,
Pro Se Plaintiff,
258 East Bailey Rd, Apt C,
Naperville, IL 60565

ABDUL MOHAMMED,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT

vs.

DAN BRIDGES ET.AL
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES,

CASE # 21-1591

MOTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF

NOW COMES, the Plaintiff-Appellant Abdul Mohammed, appearing for himself as Pro Se, with his Motion for Miscellaneous Relief and states as follows:-

1. The clerk of this court is refusing to file the Motion as shown in Exhibit-A for no reason whatsoever.
2. Please direct the clerk of the court to file the Motion as shown in Exhibit-A in this case or in Case # 20-3178.
3. Plaintiff-Appellant needs relief as requested in the Motion as shown in Exhibit-A to file his Application for In Forma Pauperis in the instant case.

Dated:- 09/20/2021

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/Abdul Mohammed,
Pro Se Plaintiff,
258 East Bailey Rd, Apt C,
Naperville, IL 60565

EXHIBIT-A

Case # 20-3178

Abdul Mohammed <aamohammed@hotmail.com>

Sun 9/19/2021 3:13 PM

To: CA07_pro_se_filings <CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov>

 1 attachments (15 MB)

Motion to Vacate.pdf;

Dear Clerk,

Please find attached the Motion that needs to be filed in the above-captioned case.

Sincerely,

Abdul Mohammed



Virus-free. www.avg.com

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

September 17, 2021

By the Court:

No. 20-2419	ABDUL AZEEM MOHAMMED, Plaintiff - Appellant v. PRAIRIE STATE LEGAL SERVICES, INC., et al., Defendants - Appellees
Originating Case Information:	
District Court No: 3:20-cv-50133 Northern District of Illinois, Western Division District Judge John Robert Blakey	

The following are before the court:

1. **MOTION FOR TRANSFER**, filed on September 13, 2021, by the pro se appellant.
2. **AMENDED MOTION FOR TRANSFER**, filed on September 13, 2021, by the pro se appellant.

IT IS ORDERED that the motions are **DENIED**.

form name: c7_Order_BTC (form ID: 178)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

September 17, 2021

By the Court:

No. 21-1591	ABDUL AZEEM MOHAMMED, Plaintiff - Appellant v. NAPERVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 203 and RACHEL WEISS, Defendants - Appellees
-------------	--

Originating Case Information:

District Court No: 1:19-cv-06525
Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division
District Judge Gary Feinerman

The following are before the court:

1. **MOTION FOR TRANSFER**, filed on September 13, 2021, by pro se appellant.
2. **AMENDED MOTION FOR TRANSFER**, filed on September 13, 2021, by pro se appellant.

IT IS ORDERED that the motions are **DENIED**.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

September 24, 2021

By the Court:

	ABDUL AZEEM MOHAMMED, Plaintiff - Appellant
No. 20-2419	v.
	PRAIRIE STATE LEGAL SERVICES, INC., et al., Defendants - Appellees
Originating Case Information:	
District Court No: 3:20-cv-50133	
Northern District of Illinois, Western Division	
District Judge John Robert Blakey	

Upon consideration of the **MOTION FOR EXPLANATION**, filed on September 17, 2021, by the pro se appellant,

IT IS ORDERED that the appellant's motion for explanation is **DENIED**.

form name: **c7_Order_BT** (form ID: 178)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

September 24, 2021

By the Court:

No. 21-1591	ABDUL AZEEM MOHAMMED, Plaintiff - Appellant v. NAPERVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 203 and RACHEL WEISS, Defendants - Appellees
Originating Case Information:	
District Court No: 1:19-cv-06525	
Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division	
District Judge Gary Feinerman	

Upon consideration of the **MOTION FOR EXPLANATION**, filed on September 20, 2021, by Pro Se Appellant Abdul Mohammed,

IT IS ORDERED that appellant's motion for explanation is **DENIED**.

form name: **c7_Order_BTC** (form ID: 178)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

ORDER

September 24, 2021

By the Court:

No. 21-1591	ABDUL AZEEM MOHAMMED, Plaintiff - Appellant v. NAPERVILLE COMMUNITY UNIT SCHOOL DISTRICT 203 and RACHEL WEISS, Defendants - Appellees
Originating Case Information:	
District Court No: 1:19-cv-06525 Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division District Judge Gary Feinerman	

Upon consideration of the **MOTION FOR MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF**, filed on September 20, 2021, by the pro se appellant,

IT IS ORDERED that the appellant Abdul Mohammed's motion for miscellaneous relief is **DENIED**.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

In the Matter of)
Abdul Mohammed) Civil Action No. 20 C 3479
)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ORDER

Since February 22, 2016, *pro se* litigant Abdul Mohammed has filed at least 14 cases in the Northern District of Illinois. The cases have been terminated for reasons such as defendants' motion for summary judgment, case stayed pending arbitration, plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss, failure to state a claim, lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and frivolous complaint.

It is the judgment of the Executive Committee* that reasonable and necessary restraints must be imposed upon Mr. Mohammed's ability to file new civil cases in this District *pro se*. Cases in existence prior to the entry of this order are not affected by this order and shall proceed as usual.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE in its capacity as the supervisor of the assignment of cases, that -----

- 1) Mr. Abdul Mohammed, or anyone, other than an attorney acting on his behalf, is enjoined from filing any new civil action or proceeding in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois without first obtaining leave by way of the following procedures:
 - a) Any materials Mr. Mohammed, or anyone, other than an attorney acting on his behalf, wishes to submit for filing shall be delivered to Room 2050, Office of the Clerk at the Courthouse in Chicago. Only the Clerk or deputies specifically designated by the Clerk may accept such documents.
 - b) Where the document submitted is a complaint, it shall be accompanied by a motion captioned "Motion Seeking Leave to File Pursuant to Order of Executive Committee." That motion shall, in addition to requesting leave to file the complaint, include a sworn statement certifying that the claims raised by or on behalf of Mr. Mohammed in the complaint are new claims never before raised in any federal court.
 - c) Whenever Mr. Mohammed submits a document for filing, the clerk or designated deputy shall accept the papers, stamp them received, docket them on Mr. Mohammed's Executive Committee case number, and forward them to the Executive Committee.
- 2) The Executive Committee will examine any complaints submitted by or on behalf of Mr. Mohammed to determine whether they should be filed.
- 3) If Mr. Mohammed seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the Committee will also determine if such leave should be granted. The Committee will deny leave to file any complaints if they are legally frivolous or are merely duplicative of matters already litigated. The Committee may deny leave to file any complaints not filed in conformity with this order.
- 4) If the Executive Committee enters an order denying leave to file the materials, the clerk shall retain the order on a miscellaneous docket with the title "In Re: Abdul

Mohammed" and cause a copy of the order to be mailed to Mr. Mohammed.

- 5) If the Executive Committee enters an order granting leave to file the materials, the clerk will cause the materials to be stamped filed as of the date received and shall cause the case to be assigned to a judge in accordance with the rules. The clerk shall also cause a copy of the order to be mailed to Mr. Mohammed.
- 6) Mr. Mohammed's failure to comply with this order may, within the discretion of the Executive Committee, result in his being held in contempt of court and punished accordingly.
- 7) Nothing in this order shall be construed -----
 - a) to affect Mr. Mohammed's ability to defend himself in any criminal action,
 - b) to deny Mr. Mohammed access to the federal courts through the filing of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus or other extraordinary writ, or
 - c) to deny Mr. Mohammed access to the United States Court of Appeals or the United States Supreme Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That any password issued to Abdul Mohammed for access to the electronic filing system shall be disabled.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That any new complaints filed by Mr. Mohammed and transferred to this Court from another jurisdiction shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee to determine whether they should be filed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Clerk shall cause to be created and maintained a miscellaneous docket with the title "In Re: Abdul Mohammed" and case number 20 CV 3479. The miscellaneous docket shall serve as the repository of this order and any order or minute order entered pursuant to this order. All orders will be entered on the docket following standard docketing procedures. A brief entry will be made on the docket indicating the receipt of any materials from Mr. Mohammed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Clerk shall cause a copy of this order to be mailed to Mr. Mohammed at 258 East Bailey Rd., Apt. C, Naperville, Illinois 60565, the address given by Mr. Mohammed in documents filed on May 29, 2020. Such mailing shall be by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested.

ENTER:

FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE



Dated at Chicago, Illinois this 17th day of June, 2020

*Judges before whom Mr. Mohammed has active cases have recused themselves in this matter.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

In the Matter of)
,) Civil Action No.
Abdul Mohammed) 20 C 3479
)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ORDER

On June 3, 2020, the Law Firm of Robbins Schwartz submitted its Notice to the Executive Committee on behalf of Defendants in case number 20 C 50133, *Abdul Mohammed v. The State of Illinois, et al*, before the Honorable John Robert Blakey. Enclosed was Defendants' motion to have *pro se* plaintiff Abdul Mohammed declared a vexatious litigant.

On June 4, 2020, Mr. Mohammed submitted his Response to the motion of June 3, 2020.

On June 17, 2020, after consideration of the above-described documents in addition to Mr. Mohammed's many filings in this District, an Executive Committee order was entered, restricting the filings of *pro se* plaintiff Abdul Mohammed and directing that any documents he submits shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee to determine whether they should be filed.

The June 17, 2020 order noted that since February 22, 2016, *pro se* litigant Abdul Mohammed had filed at least 14 cases in the Northern District of Illinois. The cases were terminated for reasons such as defendants' motion for summary judgment, case stayed pending arbitration, plaintiff's motion to voluntarily dismiss, failure to state a claim, lack of subject matter jurisdiction, and frivolous complaint.

On June 18, 2020, Mr. Mohammed submitted his Response to the Executive Committee's Order of June 17, 2020. Also on June 18, 2020, Mr. Mohammed submitted his Notice of Appeal regarding the same Order.

On June 19, 2020, Prairie State Legal Services, Inc., on behalf of its Defendant client, submitted its Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Motion to Declare Abdul Mohammed as a Vexatious Litigant.

On June 26, 2020, Mr. Mohammed submitted his Affidavit and *in forma pauperis* application in Executive Committee case number 20 C 3479.

On June 29, 2020, the Honorable Manish S. Shah entered an order terminating case number 20 C 3481, *Abdul Mohammed v. Judge Jorge Alonso, et al*, which was filed in the Central District of Illinois and transferred to this District. The complaint accused Northern District of Illinois judges of improper rulings and bias in Mr. Mohammed's cases and requested disqualification and vacatur of the judgments in his dismissed lawsuits.

At its meeting on July 6, 2020, the Executive Committee considered the above-listed submissions and facts, and determined that Abdul Mohammed's efforts in this District have become burdensome to the Committee, straining the resources of the Court and the Clerk's Office, therefore

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Mr. Mohammed is granted leave to file his June 26, 2020 Affidavit and *in forma pauperis* application in case number 20 C 3479.

Case: 20-2090 Document: 8 Filed: 08/13/2020 Pages: 2
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that for a period of 12 months from the date of this order, any complaints, motions, or presentments received from Abdul Mohammed shall be discarded unfiled, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no sooner than 12 months from the date of this order, Mr. Mohammed may submit to the Executive Committee a motion to modify or rescind the restrictions against him, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that nothing in this order shall be construed -----

- a) to affect Mr. Mohammed's ability to defend himself in any criminal action,
- b) to deny Mr. Mohammed access to the federal courts through the filing of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus or other extraordinary writ, or
- c) to deny Mr. Mohammed access to the United States Court of Appeals or the United States Supreme Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That any new complaints filed by Mr. Mohammed and transferred to this Court from another jurisdiction shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee to determine whether they should be filed, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Clerk shall cause a copy of this order to be mailed to Mr. Mohammed at 258 East Bailey Rd., Apt. C, Naperville, Illinois 60565, the address given by Mr. Mohammed in documents filed on June 30, 2020. Such mailing shall be by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested.

ENTER:
FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE



Chief Judge

Dated at Chicago, Illinois this 13th day of August, 2020

UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT
OF ILLINOIS

In the Matter of)	Civil Action Nos.
)	20 C 03479 and
Abdul Mohammed)	21 C 04697

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ORDER

On August 13, 2020, an Executive Committee order was entered directing any new complaints filed by Abdul Mohammed and transferred to this Court from another jurisdiction shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee to determine whether they should be filed. On January 11, 2021, the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit sanctioned Mr. Mohammed (No. 20-3178, *Abdul Mohammed v. National Labor Relations Board*). The sanction ordered stated, "Abdul Azeem Mohammed has forfeited the privilege of proceeding in any new or pending case in the district court or court of appeals, until he has paid, in full, all outstanding fees and costs for all of his lawsuits." The sanction order continued, "In any application to proceed in forma pauperis or motion to lift this restriction, Mohammed must provide (under oath) a complete list of all of his federal suits and proof that all of his financial obligations with respect to these suits have been met."

On August 30, 2021, Mr. Mohammed submitted an action in the Central District of Illinois (21cv01243 CDIL). On September 2, 2021, the Honorable Michael M. Mihm of the Central District of Illinois transferred the case to the Northern District of Illinois, where it was assigned as case number 21 C 04697, *Mohammed v. Prairie State Legal Services, Inc et al*, before the Honorable John J. Tharp.

At its meeting on September 9, 2021, the Executive Committee reviewed the submission from Mr. Mohammed, now therefore

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED That Mr. Mohammed. is denied leave to file case number 21 c 04697, *Mohammed v. Prairie State Legal Services, Inc et al*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the order entered on August 13, 2020 remains in force, and any documents submitted by Mr. Mohammed shall be discarded for a period of 12 months, after which he may submit a motion to modify or rescind the restrictions against him, unless he demonstrates to the Executive Committee in writing that he is in imminent danger of great bodily harm, and any new complaints filed by Mr. Mohammed and transferred to this Court from another jurisdiction shall be reviewed by the Executive Committee to determine whether they should be filed, and,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT any future submission from Mr. Mohammed must be in accordance with the January 11, 2021 sanction order from the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals or the Executive Committee will not consider the submission and additional sanctions may be imposed such as contempt, monetary or further filing restrictions because Mr. Mohammed failed to follow the directives of the sanction order when he filed these documents, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED That the Clerk shall cause a copy of this order to be docketed in both 20 C 03479 and 21 C 04697, and,

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT the Clerk is to close 21 C 04697, *Mohammed v. Prairie State Legal Services, Inc et al*, and terminate any pending motion as moot, and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT the Clerk shall cause a copy of this order to be mailed to Mr. Mohammed at 258 East Bailey Rd Apt. C, Naperville, IL 60565; the address given by Mr. Mohammed in documents filed in this matter. Such mailing shall be by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested.

ENTER:
FOR THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE



Rebecca R. Pallmeyer
Hon. Rebecca R. Pallmeyer, Chief Judge

Dated at Chicago, Illinois this 16th day of September 2021

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

FILED

ABDUL MOHAMMED,
PLAINTIFF

vs.

THOMAS BRUTON, MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT COURT, J. JORGE
ALONSO, J. GARY FEINERMAN, CHIEF JUDGE
REBECCA PALLMEYER, J. RONALD GUZMAN, J.
ROBERT GETTLEMAN, J. JOHN BLAKELY, J. IAIN
JOHNSTON, J. FRANK EASTERBROOK, J. MICHAEL
KANNE, J. DIANE WOOD, J. MICHAEL BRENNAN,
J. AMY ST. EVE, J. ILANA ROVER, J. MICHAEL
SCUDDER, J. DAVID HAMILTON, AND CHIEF
JUDGE DIANE SYKES,
DEFENDANTS,

21 SEP 22 AM 9:19

IRIS J. 57
CLERK OF THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF COOK COUNTY

More than \$100,000.00
damaged sought.

2021-063085
CIVIL 2021
\$100,000.00
Court - Intentional

21L 0063085

VERIFIED COMPLAINT AT LAW

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff brings this *Bivens* action for numerous violations of his constitutional rights, commission of crimes and torts against the Plaintiff, and for various violations of Federal and State Laws and Statutes by the individual Defendants.
2. Pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1442 this case can be filed in this court.
3. The Plaintiff is a protected person within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504, the Illinois Adult Protective Services Act, and the Federal Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014.
4. Defendants other than Thomas Bruton (hereinafter Bruton) are the judges of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (hereinafter District Court) and the 7th Circuit and Defendant Bruton is the Clerk of the District Court.
5. Members of the Executive Committee of the District Court consist of unknown judges and Bruton.

BIVENS V. SIX UNKNOWN FED. NARCOTICS AGENTS, 403 U.S. 388 (1971)

6. A Plaintiff alleging a constitutional violation by a federal actor has a right of action under *Bivens*, 403 U.S. at 397. Pursuant to *Bivens*, a Plaintiff may sue a federal officer in his or her individual capacity for damages for violation of the plaintiff's constitutional rights.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

7. Since the entering of the illegal orders by the Executive Committee of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (hereinafter Executive Committee), the members of the Executive Committee, J.Jorge Alonso, J. Gary Feinerman, Chief Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer, J.Ronald Guzman, J.Robert Gettleman, J. John Blakey, J.Iain Johnston, Thomas Bruton, J.Frank Easterbrook, J.Michael Kanne, J.Diane Wood, J.Michael Brennan, J.Amy St.Eve, J. Ilana Rover, J.Michael Scudder, J.David Hamilton, and Chief Judge Diane Sykes has harassed the Plaintiff and his three minor children and retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children as follows:

- 1) J.Feinerman ruled in *Mohammed v Bridges et.al*, Case # 19-cv-6525 (N.D.Ill) that the Plaintiff's 8-year-old son's school can deprive Plaintiff's son of his lunch and the one or more of the 7th Circuit judges mentioned above affirmed J.Feinerman's ruling that Plaintiff's 8-year-old son's school can deprive Plaintiff's son of his lunch;
- 2) Further J.Feinerman dismissed *Mohammed v Bridges et.al*, Case # 19-cv-6525 (N.D.Ill) when Plaintiff asked a question as follows:

"Ms. Deanes,

I have the following question for Judge Feinerman:

How come it is OK to only ban me from dropping Lunch for my son whereas other parents can drop Lunch for their children? Please answer the above question via email either to me or to my attorney, Marco Rodriguez. Sincerely, Abdul Mohammed";

- 3) Further Plaintiff's 8-year-old son has been unlawfully deprived of his lunch by his school, by J.Feinerman by members of the Executive Committee and the other judges named above;
- 4) Further, all the judges named above, and the members of the Executive Committee retaliated against Plaintiff and his three minor children by threatening sanctions for filing a complaint with USDOJ as described in Exhibit-1 and there is a complaint pending against the above-named judges and members of the Executive Committee as described in Exhibit-1;
- 5) Further, all the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children by threatening sanctions, contempt of court, jail time, and a fine of \$1000.00 for filing a complaint with Chief Judge of 7th Circuit Diane Sykes against several judges of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois (hereinafter District Court), the 7th Circuit and members of the Executive Committee and forced the Plaintiff to withdraw his complaint as described in Exhibit-1;
- 6) Finally, all the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee, retaliated against the Plaintiff and his three minor children by having Plaintiff's home raided at 6:30 AM by Naperville Police and several Federal Agents and the Plaintiff was threatened by the Federal Agents for filing complaints against the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee;
- 7) Further Plaintiff was threatened by Federal Agents upon orders of the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee, to watch out what he files against the judges;
- 8) Further Federal Agents threatened the Plaintiff during the raid to not make them come back again to his home and do this in front of his children;

- 9) Further judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee, used Plaintiff's three minor children as "human shields" to protect themselves from Plaintiff's complaints against them when they caused the Federal Agents to threaten the Plaintiff "to not make them come back again and to do this in front of his children";
- 10) Further, the judges named above, and the members of the Executive Committee caused the raid of Federal Agents and Naperville Police upon Plaintiff's home to threaten the Plaintiff with false arrest and false imprisonment if the Plaintiff files any complaint against the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee named above;
- 11) Further, the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee after committing actions as described above, represent that they are impartial when they heard matters related to the Plaintiff and his three minor children which is nothing but preposterous;
- 12) Further, the judges named above, and the members of the Executive Committee entered orders against the Plaintiff with prejudice towards his race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, ethnicity, disabilities, etc. and committed actions in retaliation to the Plaintiff's Federal Complaints against the judges named above including but not limited to Federal Lawsuits and complaint with USDOJ;
- 13) Further, the members of the Executive Committee enforced a non-existing order of the 7th Circuit against Plaintiff on September 16, 2021 (Exhibit-2).
- 14) Further, when Plaintiff filed Motion to Vacate the illegal orders of the Executive Committee (Exhibit-3), members of the Executive Committee has refused to rule on the Motion to Vacate the illegal orders of the Executive Committee.
- 15) The adverse rulings against the Plaintiff by judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee are "derived from an extrajudicial source" or "reveal such a high degree of favoritism or antagonism as to make fair judgment impossible." *Liteky*, 510 U.S. at 555.
- 16) "Findings by a trial judge unsupported by the record are evidence that the judge has relied on extrajudicial sources in making such determinations indicating personal bias and prejudice." *Peacock Records, Inc. v. Checker Records, Inc.*, 430 F.2d 85, 89 (7th Circuit. 1970).
- 17) All the rulings against the Plaintiff by judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee are treason, violation of oath of office, judicial trespass, and fraud upon the court because the judges named above were disqualified from hearing any matter involving the Plaintiff due to their hatred and prejudice against the Plaintiff as described in Exhibit-4.
- 18) Further, when Plaintiff appealed the Executive Committee's Orders, the 7th Circuit in concert with the judges named above and members of the Executive Committee unlawfully affirmed the Executive Committee's Orders without answering the questions asked by Plaintiff in his Appellant's Brief.
- 19) Further, Plaintiff was not provided Notice and Opportunity to be heard, Adequate Record of Review and Substantive Findings of Frivolousness and Harassment pursuant to *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, No. 11-57231 (9th Cir. 2014), before the Executive Committee entered orders against the Plaintiff.
- 20) Further, the 7th Circuit remained silent on *Ringgold-Lockhart v. County of Los Angeles*, No. 11-57231 (9th Cir. 2014) when it affirmed the Executive Committee's Orders against the Plaintiff.

21) Further, most of the cases filed by Plaintiff in the District Court cannot be taken into account when entering restricting orders against Plaintiff pursuant to *Goolsby v Gonzalez*, Case # 11-cv-00494-LJO-GSA-PC, (E.D.Cal).

22) Further many of the cases filed in the District Court in which the Plaintiff is involved were removed by the Defendants to the District Court from State courts and such cases can also be not taken into account when entering restricting orders against the Plaintiff pursuant to *Goolsby v Gonzalez*, Case # 11-cv-00494-LJO-GSA-PC, (E.D.Cal).

23) Further, when Plaintiff appealed the dismissal of Case # 18-cv-8393, the 7th Circuit in concert with the judges named above and members of the Executive Committee unlawfully affirmed J.Feinerman's judgment which dismissed the case as a sanction without answering Plaintiff's questions.

24) Further, Case # 20-cv-50133 was dismissed under Rule 8 without allowing the Plaintiff to amend his complaint even once after the court invoked Rule 8 violation in violation of various decisions of the 7th Circuit court and other Circuits, by J.Johnston in concert with the judges named above and the members of the Executive Committee in retaliation for his lawsuit against J.Johnston and several other judges of this court and the 7th Circuit.

25) Further, when Plaintiff unknowingly appealed an order from NLRB in the instant case, the 7th Circuit entered sanctions against the Plaintiff in concert with the judges named above and members of the Executive Committee despite Plaintiff's representation to the 7th Circuit that he did not know that NLRB's Order cannot be appealed.

26) Litigiousness alone is not enough, either: "The plaintiff's claims must not only be numerous but also be patently without merit." *Molski*, 500 F.3d at 1059 (quoting *Moy*, 906 F.2d at 470).

27) Already a judge (J.Tharpe) of the District Court has refused to follow Executive Committee's illegal orders against the Plaintiff. Judge Tharpe has not sent *Mohammed v T-Mobile USA Inc*, Case # 21-cv-2706 (N.D.Ill) to the Executive Committee for review as he does not feel that cases were removed by the Defendants from the State Courts to the District Court can be reviewed by the Executive Committee. Plaintiff has informed Judge Tharpe about the existence of the Executive Committee Orders against him, and Judge Tharpe has acknowledged that he is aware of the Executive Committee Orders against Plaintiff.

28) Further, when J.Tharpe refused to forward *Mohammed v T-Mobile USA Inc*, Case # 21-cv-2706 (N.D.Ill) and *Mohammed v Prairie State Legal Services Inc et.al*, Case # 21-cv-4697 (N.D.Ill) to the Executive Committee, members of the Executive Committee usurped those matters from J.Tharpe.

8. Defendants were disqualified from hearing matters involving the Plaintiff due to their hatred and prejudice against the Plaintiff based on his race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, ethnicity, disabilities, etc, hence the Defendants does not have either judicial or qualified immunity as further described in a similar case where the Plaintiff is a party (See paragraphs 36-43 of Exhibits-5).

COUNT-1

VIOLATION OF REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973, SECTION 504

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
10. Defendants violated section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 by retaliating against the Plaintiff for his protected activity including but not limited to claims arising from his disabilities and claims arising under 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 when they committed actions as described from paragraphs 1-8.
11. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-2

**VIOLATION OF FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION THE GOVERNMENT PURSUANT
PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397
(ALL DEFENDANTS)**

12. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
13. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 deprived the Plaintiff of his constitutional right to petition the government pursuant to the 1st Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
14. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-3

**VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO AN IMPARTIAL JUDGE
PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397
(ALL DEFENDANTS)**

15. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
16. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 make it crystal clear that they were not impartial judges and by not being impartial judges the Defendants deprived the Plaintiff of his constitutional right to an impartial judge pursuant to the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
17. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-4

**VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL
PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397
(ALL DEFENDANTS)**

18. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
19. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 makes it crystal clear that the judges who are Defendants in this case and by not being impartial judges the Defendants deprived the Plaintiff of his constitutional right to an impartial judge pursuant to the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
20. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-5

**VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT FOR MALICIOUS PROSECUTION
PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397**

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

21. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
22. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 was malicious prosecution pursuant to the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
23. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-6

VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT FOR DEPRIVATION OF ACCESS OF COURTS PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
25. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 deprived the Plaintiff of his constitutional right of access to the courts pursuant to the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
26. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-7

VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT FOR SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS (SHOCK THE CONSCIENCE)

PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

27. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
28. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 were committed to cause harm to Plaintiff in a manner shocking to the conscience.
29. Substantive Due Process Violation claim under Fourteenth Amendment pursuant to *Bivens*, 403 U.S. at 397 is recognized when any person acting under color of any statute, ordinance or regulation, deprives any citizen of the United States of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution and laws.
30. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 are violations of the rights, privileges, and immunities of the Plaintiff, secured by the constitution and laws as described in this complaint and as described under this count. Defendants deprived the Plaintiff of his rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the constitution and laws under the color of various laws and statutes.
31. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-8

VIOLATION OF FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT FOR SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS

PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

32. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
33. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 are Substantive Due Process violations.

34. Substantive Due Process Violation claim under Fourteenth Amendment pursuant to *Bivens*, 403 U.S. at 397 is recognized when any person acting under color of any statute, ordinance or regulation, deprives any citizen of the United States of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution and laws.
35. Defendants' illegal actions as described above in paragraphs 1-8 are violations of the rights, privileges, and immunities of the Plaintiff, secured by the constitution and laws as described in this complaint and as described under this count. Defendants deprived the Plaintiff of his rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the constitution and laws under the color of various laws and statutes.
36. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-9

**CLASS-OF-ONE CLAIM EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S.
AT 397**

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
38. Defendants' actions as described above and specifically described in paragraphs 1-8 also constitute a class-of-one action asserted under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.
39. A class-of-one action asserted under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is recognized where a plaintiff alleges that (s)he has been intentionally treated differently from others similarly situated and that there is no rational basis for the difference in treatment. *Village of Willowbrook v. Olech*, 528 U.S. 562, 564 (2000).
40. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-10

(CONSPIRACY PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397)

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
42. In a manner more fully set forth above, Defendants together reached an understanding, engaged in a course of conduct, and otherwise jointly acted and/or conspired among and between themselves for the purpose of depriving Plaintiff of his constitutional rights and to accomplish an unlawful purpose by unlawful means as described in this complaint and as described in every individual count.
43. In furtherance of this conspiracy or conspiracies, Defendants, acting in concert with each other, committed the overt acts as described in this complaint.
44. Said conspiracy or conspiracies and overt acts continue to the present date.
45. The misconduct described in this count was undertaken with malice, willfulness, and reckless indifference to the rights of Plaintiff.
46. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

CONSPIRACY (ILLINOIS STATE LAW)

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

47. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
48. In a manner more fully set forth above, Defendants together reached an understanding, engaged in a course of conduct, and otherwise jointly acted and/or conspired among and between themselves for the purpose of depriving Plaintiff of his Constitutional rights, to commit other violations as described in this complaint and to accomplish an unlawful purpose by unlawful means as described in this complaint and as described in every individual count.
49. In furtherance of this conspiracy or conspiracies, Defendants, acting in concert with each other, committed the overt acts as described in this complaint.
50. Said conspiracy or conspiracies and overt acts were continues from on or about November of 2018, through to the present date.
51. The misconduct described in this Count was undertaken with malice, willfulness, and reckless indifference to the rights of Plaintiff.
52. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-12

INTENTIONAL INFILCTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS (ILLINOIS STATE LAW)

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

53. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
54. In a manner more fully set forth above, the acts and conduct of Defendants were extreme and outrageous. Defendants intended to cause extreme intentional emotional distress to Plaintiff or were in reckless disregard of the probability that their conduct would cause severe emotional distress to Plaintiff.
55. Said actions were undertaken with malice, willfulness, and with reckless indifference to the rights of Plaintiff.
56. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' wrongful acts, Plaintiff suffered damages, physical and mental injuries including but not limited to severe emotional distress and anguish.

COUNT-13

RETALIATION PURSUANT TO BIVENS, 403 U.S. AT 397

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

57. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
58. All actions by Defendants as described under this complaint were also in retaliation against the Plaintiff for his protected activity including but not limited to the Federal Lawsuit against some of the Defendants and complaint with USDOJ against all the Defendants.
59. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

COUNT-14

VIOLATION OF HATE CRIMES ACT OF ILLINOIS

(ALL DEFENDANTS)

60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference herein all preceding and ^{and 32} succeeding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

31. Defendants' actions as described above and specifically described in paragraphs 1-8 were due to their prejudice towards Plaintiff's race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, ethnicity, disabilities, and when the Defendants threatened the Plaintiff with false arrest, false criminal charges, false imprisonment, monetary fine, contempt and further restrictions in his ability to access courts in retaliation to the Plaintiff's protected activity as described above, the Defendants committed intimidation and disorderly conduct against the Plaintiff due to their prejudice towards Plaintiff's race, color, religion, national origin, ancestry, ethnicity, disabilities which is a violation of Illinois Hate Crimes Act because intimidation is a predicate of the Hate Crimes Act of Illinois.
32. Defendants' actions as described under this count have caused irreparable physical and mental injuries to Plaintiff, Defendants' actions as described above will proximately cause immediate and further irreparable harm to Plaintiff.

RELIEF REQUESTED

PLAINTIFF requests that:

- A. The court enter an order declaring that Defendants violated Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 1st 5th, and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution as alleged above;
- B. The court enter an order declaring that Defendants committed threats of false criminal charges, false arrest, false imprisonment, and committed disorderly conduct upon the Plaintiff as alleged above;
- C. The court enter an order declaring that Defendants committed hate crimes upon the Plaintiff;
- D. The court award Plaintiff compensatory damages in excess of \$1000,000.00 for each count;
- E. The court award Plaintiff punitive damages in excess of \$1000,000.00 for each count;
- F. The court enter an order that the Defendants immediately cease all the violations against the Plaintiff as alleged above;
- G. The court award Plaintiff his attorney fees and costs; and
- H. The court enter an order granting any other relief as it deems equitable and just.

Dated:- September 22, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,
/s/ Abdul Mohammed

VERIFICATION

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters the undersigned certifies as aforesaid that he verily believes the same to be true.

/s/ Abdul Mohammed,
258 East Bailey Rd., Apt. C
Naperville, IL 60565
Ph.630-854-5345

20-3178 Abdul Mohammed v. NLRB "Sanction order filed" (13-CA-16362)

CA07_CMECFMail@ca7.uscourts.gov <CA07_CMECFMail@ca7.uscourts.gov>

Mon 1/11/2021 9:17 AM

To: aamohammed@hotmail.com <aamohammed@hotmail.com>

*****NOTE TO PUBLIC ACCESS USERS*** Judicial Conference of the United States policy permits attorneys of record and parties in a case (including pro se litigants) to receive one free electronic copy of all documents filed electronically, if receipt is required by law or directed by the filer. PACER access fees apply to all other users. To avoid later charges, download a copy of each document during this first viewing.**

Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals

Notice of Docket Activity

The following transaction was entered on 01/11/2021 at 9:00:51 AM CST and filed on 01/11/2021

Case Name: Abdul Mohammed v. NLRB

Case Number: 20-3178

Document(s): Document(s)

Docket Text:

ORDER re: 1) Response to Court's Order to Show Cause. 2) Supplemental Response to Court's Order to Show Cause. On December 29, 2020, this court dismissed this case for lack of jurisdiction and ordered the appellant to show cause why he should not be sanctioned for continuing to file frivolous appeals. The appellant has filed a response to this court's show cause order, but the response does not offer any justification for his persistence in pursuing frivolous claims. Accordingly, Abdul Azeem Mohammed has forfeited the privilege of proceeding in forma pauperis in any new or pending case, in the district court or court of appeals, until he had paid, in full, all outstanding fees and costs for all of his lawsuits. See *In re City of Chicago*, 500 F.3d 582, 583 (7th Cir. 2007); *Campbell v. Clarke*, 481 F.3d 967 (7th Cir. 2007). In any application to proceed in forma pauperis or motion to lift this restriction, Mohammed must provide (under oath) a complete list of all of his federal suits and proof that all of his financial obligations with respect to these suits have been met. See *In re City of Chicago*, 500 F.3d at 583. In accordance with our decision in *Mack*, exceptions to this filing bar are made for criminal cases and for applications for writs of habeas corpus. See *Mack*, 45 F.3d at 186-87. This order will be lifted immediately once Mohammed makes full payment. See *In re City of Chicago*, 500 F.3d at 585-86. Further, if Mohammed, despite his best efforts, is unable to pay in full all outstanding filing fees, he is authorized to submit to this court a motion to modify or rescind this order no earlier than two years from the date of this order. See *id.*; *Mack*, 45 F.3d at 186. MWR [11] [7133492] [20-3178] (AD)

Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Mr. Kevin Patrick Flanagan, Attorney

Mr. Abdul Azeem Mohammed

National Labor Relations Board

The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:

Document Description: Sanction Order

Original Filename: /opt/ACECF/live/forms/203178_c7_Order_Sanction_7133492_AmyDycus.pdf

Electronic Document Stamp:

[STAMR acecfStamp_ID=1105395651 [Date=01/11/2021] [FileNumber=7133492-0]

[71ea797794ba4cc255956bb4fde712acde9ea3c47eed723b5c7f349f3705831ccca790bbc5cbcedea0db
d98210d77887722bb88c4b62e8efdb220fac4c2beff]]

Recipients:

- Mr. Kevin Patrick Flanagan, Attorney
- Mr. Abdul Azeem Mohammed
- National Labor Relations Board