

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

EDWARD "COACH" WEINHAUS,
Petitioner,

v.

REGINA A. SCANNICCHIO, AND
ILLINOIS JUDGES ASSOCIATION,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

APPENDIX

Edward "Coach" Weinhaus
11500 Olive Blvd Ste 133
Creve Coeur, MO 63141
314-580-9580
eaweinhaus@gmail.com

Pro Se Petitioner

Thirteenth day of December, MMXXV

App-i

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A

Order [not precedential], United States
Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,
*Edward Weinhaus v. Regina A.
Scannicchio and Illinois Judges
Association*,
No. 24-2473 (Jun. 18, 2025) App-1

Appendix B

Final Judgment, United States Court of
Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,
*Edward Weinhaus v. Regina A.
Scannicchio and Illinois Judges
Association*,
No. 24-2473 (Jun. 18, 2025) App-5

Appendix C

Order [rehearing denied], United States
Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit,
*Edward Weinhaus v. Regina A.
Scannicchio and Illinois Judges
Association*,
No. 24-2473 (Sep. 15, 2025) App-7

App-ii

Appendix D

Minute Entry [amended complaint dismissed], United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, *Edward Weinhaus v. Regina A. Scannicchio and Illinois Judges Association*,
No. 1:24-cv-03061 (Jul. 24, 2025) App-9

Appendix E

Judgment [amended complaint dismissed], United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, *Edward Weinhaus v. Regina A. Scannicchio and Illinois Judges Association*,
No. 1:24-cv-03061 (Jul. 24, 2025) App-12

Appendix F

Minute Entry [amended complaint dismissed], United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, *Edward Weinhaus v. Regina A. Scannicchio and Illinois Judges Association*,
No. 1:24-cv-03061 (Jun. 28, 2025) App-13

App-iii

Appendix G

First Amended Complaint, United
States District Court for the Northern
District of Illinois, *Edward Weinhaus v.
Regina A. Scannicchio and Illinois
Judges Association*,
No. 1:24-cv-03061 (Jul. 22, 2025) App-17

App-iv

(This page is intentionally left blank.)

App-1

Appendix A

[Filed: Jun. 18, 2025]

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P.
32.1

**United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Argued June 4, 2025
Decided June 18, 2025

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*
MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*
THOMAS L. KIRSCH, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2473

EDWARD WEINHAUS, Appeal from the United
Plaintiff-Appellant, States District Court for
the Northern District of
v. Illinois, Eastern Division

REGINA A. No. 1:24-cv-03061
SCANNICCHIO and
ILLINOIS JUDGES John Robert Blakey,
ASSOCIATION, *Judge*.
Defendants-Appellees.

App-2

ORDER

Edward Weinhaus was ordered to pay attorney's fees and costs to his ex-wife following the conclusion of their divorce proceedings. After an unsuccessful appeal in state court, Weinhaus brought this federal suit against the judge who entered the order and the Illinois Judges Association (a professional development organization), alleging violations of his constitutional rights to due process and equal protection. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

The following facts are drawn from Weinhaus's amended complaint, taken as true, and from state-court filings, of which this court may take judicial notice. *See Fosnight v. Jones*, 41 F.4th 916, 922 (7th Cir. 2022). Weinhaus initiated divorce proceedings in the Circuit Court of Cook County. After a decree of divorce was issued, various post-decree matters were resolved by Judge Regina Scannicchio.

Weinhaus's ex-wife then petitioned for attorney's fees and costs based on Weinhaus's litigiousness during the proceedings. Judge Scannicchio granted the petition and ordered Weinhaus to pay \$25,000. Weinhaus appealed, but the Illinois Appellate Court dismissed the appeal. Weinhaus sought leave to appeal to the Illinois Supreme Court, but his petition was denied.

Weinhaus then filed suit in federal court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that the defendants violated his equal protection and due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment by interfering with his right to an impartial appeal. According to Weinhaus, Judge Scannicchio conspired with fellow judges in the Illinois Judges Association to convince the appellate

App-3

court to dismiss his appeal. He sought damages for the “financial injury” caused by litigation costs and the order to pay attorney’s fees.

The district court later dismissed the complaint as barred under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *See D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983); *Rooker v. Fid. Tr. Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923). The court explained that the substantive allegations in Weinhaus’s complaint necessarily questioned the validity of a state-court judgment. The court gave Weinhaus a chance to amend his complaint but found that the amended complaint still implicated the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine and dismissed the case.

On appeal, Weinhaus challenges the district court’s *Rooker-Feldman* analysis, but Weinhaus’s amended complaint is subject to dismissal regardless because it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6). Weinhaus broadly alleges conspiracy and interference but fails to support these claims of wrongdoing with any factual conduct within his personal knowledge. Conclusory labels are insufficient to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2). *See Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678–79 (2009). His complaint includes no factual allegations that would support a reasonable inference that the defendants are responsible for the state court dismissing his appeal. *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 557 (2007) (declining to take as true the conclusory allegation “upon information and belief” that companies had entered a conspiracy without enough facts to make that statement plausible); *see also Airborne Beepers & Video, Inc. v. AT & T Mobility LLC*, 499 F.3d 663, 667 (7th Cir. 2007). Without more, Weinhaus’s

App-4

“allegation[s] of parallel conduct and bare assertion[s] of conspiracy” are insufficient. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 551, 556.

AFFIRMED

App-5

Appendix B

[Filed: Jun. 18, 2025]

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT**

Everett McKinley Dirksen	Office of the Clerk
United States Courthouse	Phone: (312) 435-5850
Room 2722 - 219 S.	www.ca7.uscourts.gov
Dearborn Street Chicago,	
Illinois 60604	

FINAL JUDGMENT

June 18, 2025

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*
MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*
THOMAS L. KIRSCH, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2473 EDWARD WEINHAUS,
Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

REGINA A. SCANNICCHIO and
ILLINOIS JUDGES
ASSOCIATION,
Defendants - Appellees

App-6

The judgment of the District Court is **AFFIRMED**,
with costs, in accordance with the decision of this
court entered on this date.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher Conway". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Clerk of Court

App-7

Appendix C

[Filed: Sep. 15, 2025]

**United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*
MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*
THOMAS L. KIRSCH, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2473

EDWARD WEINHAUS, Appeal from the United
Plaintiff-Appellant, States District Court for
the Northern District of
v. Illinois, Eastern Division

REGINA A. No. 1:24-cv-03061
SCANNICCHIO and
ILLINOIS JUDGES John Robert Blakey,
ASSOCIATION, *Judge.*
Defendants-Appellees.

O R D E R

Appellant filed a petition for rehearing and rehearing *en banc* on July 2, 2025. No judge in regular active service has requested a vote on the petition for rehearing *en banc*, and all judges on the original panel have voted to deny the petition for rehearing.

App-8

Accordingly, the petition for rehearing and rehearing *en banc* is **DENIED**.

App-9

Appendix D

[Filed: Jul. 24, 2024]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois –
CM/ECF NextGen 1.7.1.1
Eastern Division**

Edward “Coach” Weinhaus

Plaintiff,

Case No.:

v.

1:24-cv-03061

Regina A Scannicchio, et al.

Honorable John

Robert Blakey

Defendant.

NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on
Wednesday, July 24, 2024:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable John Robert Blakey: Plaintiff has filed an amended complaint, [16], seeking to cure the deficiencies noted in the Court's 6/28/24 order, [15]. But the amended complaint, like the prior complaint, still implicates Rooker–Feldman. Indeed, Plaintiff's amended allegations still detail the handling of his domestic relations case, including his appeal and the dismissal thereof, [16] 14–32, and still challenge the impartiality of the judges who dismissed his appeal, id. 32–33, as well as the judge who presided over the underlying matter. As before, the Court remains unable to consider the reasons for the dismissal without re-evaluating the appropriateness of the

dismissal, as well as the underlying orders appealed. Plaintiff claims he is not seeking relief against any Judge or Justice involved in his case. Yet he names as Defendants the Judge who presided over his domestic relations case and the Illinois Judges Association (comprised, among other members, of the judges who dismissed his appeal), for "knowingly interfering with his constitutionally protected rights"namely, the right to an impartial appeal, see [16] 33, 35. His attempts to draft around Rooker–Feldman do not change the fundamental character of his claims, which necessarily require the Court to delve into the validity, and impugn (if Plaintiff were to win), the state court decisions resolving his domestic relations matter. Awarding damages for a defective decision still necessarily requires a finding that the decision was wrong as a matter of law, which Rooker–Feldman precludes. In *Maple Lanes, Inc. v. Messer*, 186 F.3d 823 (7th Cir. 1999), a restaurant sued the Sheriff's Department for damages after the Sheriff implied that the restaurant had been supplementing its legitimate income with drug sales, causing the City to revoke the restaurant's liquor license. The Seventh Circuit determined that Rooker–Feldman barred the restaurant's claims; more specifically, the court held that the restaurant's "effort to portray its injury as a federal civil rights violation" was "insufficient to overcome the Rooker–Feldman doctrine. A plaintiff may not circumvent the effect of the RookerFeldman doctrine simply by casting his complaint in the form of a federal civil rights action." *Id.* at 825. The Court held that, because the restaurant claimed damages arising from the constitutional violation leading to the revocation of its liquor license, Rooker–Feldman

App-11

barred the claim: "If a federal court were to award the relief Maple Lanes seeks in the form of monetary damages equal to the value of the liquor license, this result would effectively reverse the state court judgment upholding the revocation of the liquor license." Id. at 826. So too here. Awarding Plaintiff monetary damages for the claimed constitutional violation he suffered by having unfavorable orders entered in a state court domestic relations matter effectively reverses those orders. The Court thus dismisses Plaintiff's amended complaint [16], and dismisses this case, for lack of jurisdiction. Civil case terminated. Mailed notice(gel,)

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at www.ilnd.uscourts.gov.

App-12

Appendix E

[Filed: Jul. 24, 2024]

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

Edward "Coach" Weinhaus,
Plaintiff(s),
v.
Regina A Scannicchio et al,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 24 CV
3061
Judge John
Robert Blakey

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

Judgment is hereby entered (check appropriate box):

[moot sections omitted]

☐ other: This case is dismissed for lack of
jurisdiction.

This action was [omitted] decided by Judge John
Robert Blakey.

Date: 7/24/2024 Thomas G. Bruton, Clerk of Court
G. Lewis, Deputy Clerk

App-13

Appendix F

[Filed: Jun. 28, 2024]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois –
CM/ECF NextGen 1.7.1.1
Eastern Division**

Edward “Coach” Weinhaus

Plaintiff,

v.

Regina A Scannicchio, et al.

Case No.:

1:24-cv-03061

Honorable John

Robert Blakey

Defendant.

NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Friday,
June 28, 2024:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable John Robert Blakey: This case has been reassigned to the calendar of the Honorable John Robert Blakey. The litigants are ordered to review and fully comply with all of this Court’s standing orders, which are available on Judge Blakey’s information page on the Court’s official website: <http://www.ilnd.uscourts.gov/>. During the litigation, the attorneys must also appear at all hearing dates set by the Court or noticed by the parties. If an attorney has a conflict with a set court date, the attorney must notify Judge Blakey’s Courtroom Deputy, Gloria Lewis, at Gloria_Lewis@ilnd.uscourts.gov. If appropriate, the Court will then reset the matter. Advising opposing counsel of a scheduling conflict is not a substitute for

App-14

communicating directly with the Court. On its initial review of the docket, the Court notes that Plaintiff has appeared via counsel whose appearance form indicates that he is not a member of this Court's general bar or trial bar. Local Rule 83.12 provides that, "except as provided in LR 83.14 and as otherwise provided in this rule, only members in good standing of the general bar of this Court may enter an appearance on behalf of a party; file pleadings, motions or other documents; sign stipulations; or receive payments upon judgments, decrees or orders." Moreover, a review of Plaintiff's complaint shows that this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider his claim as pled. The Rooker–Feldman doctrine "precludes lower federal court jurisdiction over claims seeking review of state court judgments... no matter how erroneous or unconstitutional the state court judgment may be." *Swartz v. Heartland Equine Rescue*, 940 F.3d 387, 390 (7th Cir. 2019), cert. denied, 140 S. Ct. 2510 (2020). "The doctrine applies not only to claims that were actually raised before the state court, but also to claims that are inextricably intertwined with state court determinations." *Id.* Moreover, "the Rooker–Feldman bar is jurisdictional; violations of it cannot be waived and thus preclude a court from considering the merits of the claim." *Id.* Here, Plaintiff alleges that "nothing in this action requests or demands the undoing of any state court action. Instead, it seeks damages caused by non-judicial actions and prevention of future rights-depriving behavior by the Defendants. Most importantly, it seeks preventing members of the Illinois Judges Association from conspiring against the public and to transform it into a "Good" Business League of Judges

if that's possible." [1] 9. But Plaintiff's substantive allegations undermine his representations: he alleges in count I that the state court trial and appellate judges lacked impartiality in their handling of litigation involving Plaintiff, and any assessment of that claim necessarily implicates the validity of the state courts' determinations. To the extent Plaintiff claims to be seeking prospective relief for future litigants, he lacks standing to do so. See, e.g., *O'Shea v. Littleton*, 414 U.S. 488, 495-96, 94 S. Ct. 669, 676, 38 L. Ed. 2d 674 (1974) ("Past exposure to illegal conduct does not in itself show a present case or controversy regarding injunctive relief, however, if unaccompanied by any continuing, present adverse effects."); *City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 105 (1983) ("speculation is insufficient to establish the existence of a present, live controversy"); *Schirmer v. Nagode*, 621 F.3d 581, 585 (7th Cir. 2010) (to establish standing to seek prospective relief, a plaintiff must show, inter alia, that he is under threat of an actual and imminent injury in fact). For these reasons, the Court dismisses Plaintiff's complaint [1] for lack of jurisdiction and denies as moot Defendant's motion to dismiss [13]. If Plaintiff can, consistent with his obligations under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, amend his complaint to allege a viable federal claim against a proper defendant, he may amend his complaint by 7/22/24. To pursue this matter through counsel, however, he must be represented by an attorney who can demonstrate compliance with this Court's rules and standing orders. If Plaintiff fails to comply, the Court will dismiss this case. Mailed notice(gel,)

App-16

ATTENTION: This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at *www.ilnd.uscourts.gov*.

App-17

Appendix G

[Filed: Jul. 22, 2024]

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

**Edward “Coach”
Weinhaus,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**Regina A. Scannicchio,
and
Illinois Judges
Association,**

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:24-cv-
03061

Judge: John Robert
Blakey

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Edward “Coach” Weinhaus (“Plaintiff”), for violations of his Due Process rights by Defendants Regina A. Scannicchio (“Scannicchio”) and the Illinois Judges Association (“IJA”). In support of his claim, Plaintiff states as follows:

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Edward “Coach” Weinhaus is a citizen of Missouri, resident of St Louis, and member of the Illinois, Missouri, and California Bars.

2. Defendant Regina A. Scannicchio is a citizen of the state of Illinois and resident of Cook County, Illinois.

App-18

3. Defendant Regina A. Scannicchio is the Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois and has served on the Board of Directors of the IJA since at least 2021 and through the current time where she fulfills her duties.

4. Defendant Illinois Judges Association is an Illinois-based business league, as defined pursuant to 26 CFR § 1.501(c)(6)-1, and is located in Chicago, Illinois.

5. The Illinois Judges Association is a quasi-governmental body that oversees the appointment of judicial ethics members and, upon information and belief, approves various appointments throughout the state's unified court system.

6. Five of seven of the current Illinois Supreme Court are affiliated with the Illinois Judges Association. The Illinois Judges Association is empowered by the Illinois Supreme Court. Half of the committee the Illinois Supreme Court relies on for ethics must be appointed by the Illinois Judge's Association (the Illinois Judicial Ethics Committee). These rules are then adopted by the Illinois Supreme Court. The state of Illinois markets its affiliation with the Illinois Judges Association on its website. Upon information and belief, the state of Illinois reimburses members for their dues to the Illinois Judge's Association.

7. The Illinois Judges Association provides any number of benefits to its members including, *inter alia*, coordinated actions by its members to mitigate the threat or harm ethical complaints would have on

its members and makes a coordinated effort to quash negative sentiments about its members.

8. The Illinois Judges Association benefits its members by ensuring they defend each other in ethical matters and encourages its members to act cooperatively to defend one another.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because Plaintiff alleges violations of a constitutionally protected right and brings this lawsuit pursuant to a federal statute 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

10. The Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because each of the Defendants resides and currently does business within the Northern District of Illinois and importantly, each of the acts giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in the Northern District of Illinois.

11. Further, the Court has jurisdiction because here, like in *Kowalski v. Boliker*, 893 F.3d 987, 995 (7th Cir. 2018), the Plaintiff is seeking redress for damages done by Defendants for the interference with his state court proceedings and rights attendant thereof.

12. Further, nothing requested herein seeks to overturn or re-litigate the underlying state court matters in violation of the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine.

13. Venue is proper in the Northern District of Illinois pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because all of the acts giving rise to Plaintiff's claim occurred in this District.

PLAINTIFF'S ALLEGATIONS

14. Plaintiff resided in Illinois for less than a year in 2012 - 2013 and during that time he instituted the Illinois Dissolution Action which gave cause for him to appear as a litigant in the Cook County Circuit Court's Domestic Relations Division.

15. His dissolution proceeding resulted in a decree of divorce in 2015, but his case remained pending in the Cook County Circuit Court's Domestic Relations Division for various post-decree issues.

16. Scannicchio assumed her role as the judge in Plaintiff's case after judgment was entered in 2015 and which was terminated in 2023.

17. On August 21, 2020, Plaintiff won full-time primary residential custody of the second of his children by Scannicchio's order of court.

18. Post-decree issues concluded by Scannicchio's order of court on September 8, 2020 which included her affirmation of sanctions she issued for Plaintiff having sought interventions which led to the successful winning of primary residential custody.

19. Scannicchio described her basis for sanctions in 2019 ("Scannicchio's Opinion") after Plaintiff voluntarily dismissed his pending motions for one of his requested remedies – an intervention for the children.

20. Thereafter, on October 8, 2020, Plaintiff timely filed a Notice of Appeal of the final order, *inter alia*, (the "Appeal").

21. Plaintiff timely filed his appellate brief which included his appeal of Scannicchio's Opinion and called into question her inability to fulfill her judicial duties as a result of ethical concerns raised by multiple other attorneys, including Stephen Ross,

before the requisite state appellate court and ripe for adjudication as there were then no matters then before the trial court.

22. Here, the Justices empaneled to adjudicate the Appeal were all leaders and affiliated with the Illinois Judges Association (the “Justices”) as members.

23. The majority of the Justices marketed their affiliation with the Illinois Judges Association and benefited from the organization and Scannicchio’s acts.

24. The Justices all had a financial incentive to refuse to consider hearing Plaintiff’s Appeal due to its impact on Scannicchio and the IJA.

25. The Justices never disclosed their relationship to Scannicchio nor their financial and professional incentives to ignore her ethical lapses or improper judgment, such as Scannicchio’s Opinion or temporary visitation suspension without hearing (ongoing) from 2018, which she had to completely reverse for two of the five children.

26. During the pendency of the Appeal, Plaintiff filed an unrelated matter in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri related to, *inter alia*, a third-party media company and an investigation into Scannicchio’s in-court conduct and her relationship with former Alderman Ed Burke (the “Media Suit”). See Edward “Coach” Weinhaus v. ALABSeries.com, et al., Case No.: 4:22-cv-00115 (Jan. 31, 2022, E.D. MO.).

27. Shortly thereafter, upon information and belief, Scannicchio became aware of the Media Suit from another attorney appearing in her courtroom.

App-22

28. Thereafter, Scannicchio began contacting other judges within the circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois to discuss Plaintiff, his cases, and her opinion of him.

29. Shortly thereafter, upon information and belief, Scannicchio began to discuss Plaintiff, the Appeal, and the impact the Appeal would have on her and by extension the Illinois Judges Association if it were to proceed because, it relates to her reputation and conduct while acting under color of law.

30. Defendant Regina A. Scannicchio provides a benefit of services as a Director of the Illinois Judges Association and to all its members through her fulfilling of her duties to it.

31. Scannicchio and the Illinois Judges Association communicated their displeasure with Plaintiff and the risk he posed to them and the members to the Justices, through no less than Scannicchio's Order and, upon information and belief, through direct contact with the Justices prior to considering the Appeal.

32. As a result of Scannicchio's influence, the Illinois Judges Association's influence, and the Justices' financial incentives related to their membership in the Illinois Judges Association and Scannicchio's Board position therein, Plaintiff's Appeal was dismissed *sua sponte* without any concern for Plaintiff's equal protection of due process rights.

33. Plaintiff, like all litigants had a right to have an appeal impartially reviewed. Justices, based on consideration paid via the Illinois Justices Association and from Scannicchio, instead decided that Scannicchio's Order itself was enough to refuse Plaintiff's right to have an appeal.

App-23

34. Thereafter, Plaintiff attempted to exhaust his state court rights but, his Petition for Leave to Appeal was met with further interference by the IJA and Scannicchio's reach as a Board Member.

35. Plaintiff's rights were violated by Scannicchio and the IJA because they knowingly and intentionally interfered with his constitutionally protected rights to equal protection and due process to safeguard their own pecuniary interests.

36. As a result of Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff was forced to expound tens of thousands of dollars in fees and costs and suffer emotional stress, distress, and trauma.

37. No litigant in the underlying matter is named herein.

38. No justice who removed Plaintiff's appellate rights is named herein.

39. No judge in any active matter before which Plaintiff is a litigant is named in this Complaint.

40. This matter cannot be intertwined with any case as there is no participant in any case named herein.¹

41. This complaint does not seek damages against any judge for any judicial act.

1. This statement is important to help the Court address the Court's stated concern with the *Rooker Feldman* from ECF #15. In such manner as the Court determines *Rooker-Feldman* is implicated, Plaintiff seeks to challenge the current interpretation of *Rooker-Feldman* that would allow it to be applied to only strangers to an underlying case in a case for damages.

App-24

COUNT I

**Violation of Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment
Right to Due Process
Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

42. Plaintiff incorporates and restates his proceeding allegations as if they were fully set forth herein.

43. At all times the Illinois Judges Association was acting under the color of state law in its capacity performing public functions such as selecting members of judicial panels and writing state ethics rules as an arm of the state. The Illinois Judges Association also acted under the color of state law under the state compulsion to follow the rules and rely upon the Illinois Judges Association-dominated ethics commission while marketing the Illinois Judges Association on its website. The Illinois Judges Association's and leadership are so intertwined with the Illinois Supreme Court are intertwined in such a manner as to make the Illinois Judges Association indistinguishable from the state.

44. At all times Defendant Regina Scannicchio was acting under the color of state law as a Director of the Illinois Judges Association while serving as a judge.

45. Plaintiff had a Constitutionally protected right to Equal Protection Under the Law and Due Process before an impartial judiciary.

46. Defendants intentionally interfered with Plaintiff's rights without any legal right to do so.

47. As a result of Defendants' interference with Plaintiff's rights, he has suffered considerable damage in the form of emotional stress and distress,

App-25

and considerable financial expense including attorney's fees prior to this action and for it.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff Edward "Coach" Weinhaus, respectfully requests that the Court find:

a) Defendants violated his rights to Equal Protection of the Law and Due Process under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution;

b) Any damages proximately caused by Defendant's deprivation of Plaintiff's rights; and

c) For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Pursuant to the United States Constitution and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38, Plaintiff Edward "Coach" Weinhaus hereby demands a trial by jury on all claims herein.

App-26

Dated: July 22, 2024 Respectfully Submitted:

s/ Antonio Valiente

Antonio Ernesto Valiente-
Rivera

Antonio Ernesto Valiente-
Rivera

N.D. Ill. Gen. Bar No.: 12326²

Torre de La Reina - Suite 203

450 Avenida de La

Constitucion

San Juan, PR 00901

Tel: +1 787 782-9544

Email:

lcdoavaliente@live.com

2. Attorney Valiente apologizes for not updating the Court upon his admission on or about April 30, 2023, 12 days after initial filing of which the Court was unaware in its order of June 28, 2024. (ECF #15).