

NO. 21A692
IN THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

CRAIG MRAZEK

v.


PETITIONER,

PEOPLE OF STATE OF ILLINOIS

RESPONDENT,

ORIGINAL

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF



ON PETITION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
TO FILE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TO ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF

CRAIG MRAZEK (PRO SE)

*M 20689

GRAHAM C.C.

12078 RT. #185

HILLSBORO, IL; 62049

¶1. PETITIONER (MRAZEK) IS VERY GRATEFUL FOR HON. CLERK BARNES' RECENT INQUIRY / APPRISAL OF (HIS) NON-COMPLIANCE, IN ABSENCE OF LOWER COURT OPINION (NOT) APPENDED TO HIS REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE HIS WRIT OF CERTIORARI. SUCH VOID POTENTIALLY JEOPARDIZES A COMPLETE REVIEW OF REQUEST. HOWEVER, PETITIONER WAS UNABLE TO ENJOIN SAID OPINION WITH 2-16-'22 REQUEST FOR EXTENSION SOLELY DUE TO DENIAL OF ACCESS TO HIS PRISON'S COPY SERVICES DESK AT YET ANOTHER C-19 LOCKDOWN OF INDETERMINATE TIME WHICH BEGAN 1-6-'22 UNTIL SHORTLY FOLLOWING HIS FILING INTO THIS HON. COURT.

¶2. PETITIONER WANTED TO PRESERVE "THE CLOCK" IN SEEKING INSTANT REQUEST FOR EXTENSION EVEN UPON ABSENCE OF CRITICAL ELEMENT [OPINION.] PETITIONER BOTH PRAYS FOR GRACE IN THIS HOBSON'S CHOICE, * HE SEEKS FORGIVENESS FOR THE OVERSIGHT IN NOT PROACTIVELY SUPPLEMENTING THAT REQUEST FOR EXTENSION WITH SAID OPINION ONCE COPYING SERVICES RESUMED. (PLEASE AND THANK YOU.)

¶3. THE PRIMARY IMPETUS FOR SAID REQUEST TO EXTEND 90-DAY LIMITATIONS WINDOW IN FILING PETITIONER'S WRIT OF CERTIORARI WAS AT ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT'S 2-10-22 DIRECTIVE AS PRESENTED AT APX. #2-10 OF:

"YOU WILL NEED TO CONTACT THEIR OFFICE FOR INFORMATION REGARDING THEIR FILING REQUIREMENTS."

PETITIONER'S VOID TO TIMELY SUPPLEMENT HIS REQUEST FOR EXTENSION HAS TO DATE CREATED AN ADDITIONAL 50-DAY DELAY IN OBTAINING THIS HON. COURT'S "FILING REQUIREMENTS", FURTHER EXACERBATING HIS NEED FOR EXTENSION TO TIMELY FILE HIS WRIT OF CERT.; ONLY NOW, HIS INITIAL 6-10-22 FILING DATE, HE PRAYS WILL BE RESET TO: 7-30-'22.

• PAGE ONE •

114. PETITIONER ANNEXES THE FOLLOWING CITED DOCUMENTS OF COURT RECORD HOPING TO SATISFY HON. CLERK BARNES' [COURT'S] MINIMUM GROUNDS FOR GRANT OF HIS REQUEST FOR EXTENSION "TO DETERMINE THE TIMELINESS OF (YOUR) APPLICATION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME..."; [APX. #3-31.]

APX. #3-31 ALSO STATES:

"THE LOWER COURT OPINION MUST BE APPENDED FROM THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT DATED JANUARY 25, 2022. RULE 13.5."

••APX. #3-31 IS HON. CLERK BARNES' NOTIFICATION OF MISSING "LOWER COURT OPINION".

••EXH. #A IS A COPY OF [S.C.O.T.U.S. 2-22-22/3-1-22 FILE STAMPS] AT THEIR/ YOUR/ ITS TEMPORARY WITHHOLDING CITATION REFERENCE OF "21 A 556" TO ATTACH PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME'S COVER PAGE.

••APX. #2-10 IS IL. SUP. COURT'S NOTIFICATION TO PETITIONER "ON JANUARY 25, 2022, THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT DENIED YOUR MOTION BY PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF THIS COURT'S ORDER ENTERED SEPT. 28, 2021, DENYING THE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A PETITION FOR AN ORIGINAL WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS."

••APX. #12-14 (a) IS A COPY OF IL. SUP. COURT'S DENYING PETITIONER'S FIRST PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION.

12-14 (b) IS COVER PAGE OF "

••APX. #9-28 IS IL. SUP. CT. ORDER FILED 9-28-21 DENYING HABEAS CORPUS.

• PAGE TWO •

cc

RS. PETITIONER EXPRESSLY CHOSE TO CIRCUMVENT ANY REVIEW OF HIS ORIGINAL MANDAMUS BY HIS SENTENCING COURTHOUSE, DISTRICT #5, BRIDGEVIEW, ILLINOIS. THE FOLLOWING SECTION IS A PORTION OF THE REASONS PETITIONER FILED HIS ORIGINAL WRIT OF MANDAMUS STRAIGHT INTO ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT AS PROVIDED FOR AT IL SUP. CT. RULE #381(a) TO "SEEK APPROPRIATE RELIEF," FROM OLDEST TO MOST RECENT:

•• EXH. # 5-2 MANIFEST AFTER SUBPOENAED COURT RECORDS WERE SENT TO PETITIONER, THIS EXHIBIT PRESENTS A BAD FAITH COURT PRACTICE; ADHERING TO A COURT ORDER TO NOTIFY DEFENDANT OF AN ORDER/RULING; WHILE PROACTIVELY WITHHOLDING PETITIONER'S INMATE ID. # FROM SNAIL MAIL ADDRESS, SO AS TO GUARANTEE SAID NOTIFICATION'S RETURN TO COURTHOUSE AS "UNABLE TO FORWARD"; WHEN SAID "VOID" WAS NOT MERELY CORRECTED BY ADDING ID. # + RE-MAILING, JUDICIAL MISCONDUCT BECOMES INDEFENSIBLE.

•• APX. # D, 1+3 PRESENT AS PETITIONER'S DENIAL ORDER OF HIS P.C.P., 7-18-14, AS SIGNED BY HON. C. HYLAND, PETITIONER'S SENTENCING JUDGE. 725 ILCS. 5/122-8 EXPRESSLY FORBIDS SAID JUSTICE FROM ANY INVOLVEMENT ADJUDICATING ANY REVIEW, STATING:

"ALL PROCEEDINGS UNDER THIS ACT SHALL BE CONDUCTED + ALL PETITIONS SHALL BE CONSIDERED BY A JUDGE WHO WAS NOT INVOLVED IN THE ORIGINAL PROCEEDING WHICH RESULTED IN CONVICTION."

AS PETITIONER WAS REPRESENTING HIMSELF DURING SECOND STAGE PROCEEDINGS OF HIS P.C.P., AT AN ORAL ARGUMENT IN 2018, HE CONFRONTED HIS SENTENCING JUDGE, HON. C. HYLAND, OF

• PAGE THREE.

cc

HER AT THE JURISDICTIONAL BAR SHE WAS CREATING / VIOLATING STATUTORY PROCEDURE, EVEN CITING IN OPEN COURT THE PRECEDENT RULE, MANDATING A VOID OF PROCESS, TRUSLY PRODUCING AN (ILLEGAL) ABUSE OF DISCRETION; HER DISREGARD ESTABLISHED A WILLFUL MISCONDUCT.

.. EXH. # P.V. IS A PHOTOCOPY OF TWO POSTAL VOUCHERS DATED 5-15-20 + 6-24-20 FROM WHICH PETITIONER FILED A NUNC PRO TUNC ORDER AND A STATE HABEUS CORPUS INTO DISTRICT #5; NO EXPLICIT RESPONSE EVER MANIFEST, SUGGESTING NEITHER ACTION WAS ADDRESSED, EVEN UPON MOTIONS BOTH FOR STATUS AND TO COMPEL.

.. EXH. # 10-1 IS A DIST. #5 COURT DOCKET DATED 10-1-21 NOTIFYING A CLERK TO "MAIL COPY OF RULING TO D", WHICH DENIAL OF STATUS ON SOME UNCERTAIN ACTION AMONG ~8] ACTIONS FILED IN PRIOR YEAR WAS NEVER RECEIVED BY PETITIONER.

.. EXH. # 25-28 IS A COURT DOCKET DISCLOSING THAT AN UNIDENTIFIED MOTION WAS HEARD 12-11-20 AND AN ORDER MADE 1-22-21. PETITIONER ATTEMPTED TO PARTICIPATE VIA ZOOM; SUBSEQUENT SILENCE PLUS ZERO NOTIFICATION ON ISSUES DECIDED EQUALS AN ABUSE OF BOTH PROCESS + DISCRETION AT THIS FACTUAL FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT.

.. APX. # 05, 8-13 IS EXEMPLAR OF DIST. #5'S EVASIVE COURTROOM TACTICS. FIRST ENTRY OF 8-13-21 DOCKET PRESENTS:

"2-1901 RULED ON PREVIOUSLY." PETITIONER HAS FILED MORE THAN ONE ACTION WHICH COULD BE CHARACTERIZED AS A "2-1901"; TWO NO ACTION WAS CAPTIONED AS SUCH. ENTRY #2 IS A FACTUAL CONTINUED INVOLVEMENT BY SENTENCING JUDGE, ADN. C. AYLAND, POTENTIALLY DEMONSTRATING A PROVERBIAL FOX GUARDING HER HEN-

HOUSE OF MISDEEDS. WITHIN TWO WEEKS OF TAKING RECEIPT OF 8-13-21 DOCKET, PETITIONER FILED A NOTICE OF APPEAL 8-30-21 TO THIS OBSCURE RULING; FOLLOWED BY A R. 77 MOTION TO REOPEN THE TIME TO FILE AN APPEAL, 9-16-21. PETITIONER TWICE INQUIRED INTO HIS EXECUTIVE CLERK OF COURT OPERATIONS TO DETERMINE THE APPEAL NO. ASSIGNED TO SAID ACTIONS... SILENCE.

EXH. # MYS IS PETITIONER'S 10-25-21 MOTION FOR STATUS REGARDING HIS MOTION TO RE-OPEN, TO WHICH DISTRICT #5 HAS ALSO IGNORED.

EXH. # 10-1 IS COURT DOCKET OF 10-1-21 DENYING SOME UNCERTAIN MOTION FILED BY PETITIONER + ACKNOWLEDGING A MOTION FOR STATUS; BUT, PETITIONER HAS FILED ~ A DOZEN ACTIONS WITH THIS CAPTION, BUT, LACK OF REFERENCE OVER THE PAST YEAR'S FILINGS IS SUSPECT.

6. THESE EXAMPLES DEMONSTRATE THAT PETITIONER HAS NOT HAD ANY CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AVAILABLE TO HIM, FURTHER DEEMING THIS HON. COURT'S INTERVENTION, ALL IN THE INTEREST OF TRUTH, JUSTICE, + FAIRNESS AT A TRIBUNAL INTENDED TO MAINTAIN DATA OF NEUTRALITY, BUT PRAGMATICALLY WANTING, AS DISCLOSED ABOVE.

7. CONCLUSION:

WHEREFORE, PETITIONER PRAYS THIS HON. COURT REVIEW COURT RECORDS AFFIXED TO SATISFY TIMELINESS OF HIS REQUEST FOR EXTENSION TO FILE HIS WRIT OF CERT. FROM ILLINOIS SUP. CT.'S 1-25-22 OPINION. SAID REQUEST WAS INITIATED BY ILL. S. CT.'S DIRECTIVE TO OBTAIN THIS HON. COURT'S "FILING REQUIREMENTS"; WHICH HE URGENTLY SEEKS TO MAINTAIN COMPLIANCE ON CERT.. LASTLY, PETITIONER PRAYS FOR SAID EXTENSION TO BE RESET TO 7-30-22.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED;