

**DOCKETED**  
FEB 28 2002

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

**JEFFERY HARGETT; KIM A. OVERLIN;  
JIMMIE SMITH; LOREN K. WALKER; on  
behalf of themselves and all others  
similarly situated,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**LINDA R. BAKER, Secretary of the  
Illinois Department of Human Services,  
MARY BASS, Head Facility  
Administrator for the Illinois  
Department of Human Services,  
TIMOTHY BUDZ, Facility Director of  
the Sexually Violent Persons Unit at  
the Joliet Correctional Center,  
RAYMOND WOODS, Clinical Director,  
and TRAVIS HINZE, Associate Clinical  
Director,**

**Defendants.**

**JUDGE KENNELLY**

**02C 1456**

**No.**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
GERALDINE SOAT BROWN**

FILED-ED4  
02 FEB 27 PM 4:10  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiffs, JEFFERY HARGETT, KIM A. OVERLIN, JIMMIE SMITH and LOREN K. WALKER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, by their undersigned counsel, state as follows for their Class Action Complaint:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This complaint asserts a civil rights action pursuant to Title 42 of the United States Code, § 1983 for declaratory and injunctive relief to redress violations of the United States Constitution in connection with the complete and utter failure of the Defendants or those acting under their control or direction to provide adequate and meaningful mental health treatment to the named Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated that have been involuntarily detained by the Illinois

1-1

Department of Human Services ("DHS") pursuant to the Sexually Violent Persons Commitment Act, 725 ILCS 207/1 et al. (the "SVP Act"). The avowed purposed of the SVP Act is to provide mental health treatment and care to individuals in the custody of DHS in the least restrictive manner consistent with the person's needs and in accordance with the court's commitment order. The treatment and care provided by the Defendants to the Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated is punitive and Constitutionally inadequate.

### **JURISDICTION**

2. The Court has jurisdiction over this action under Title 28 of the United States Code, § 1331 and § 1343.

### **PARTIES**

3. Plaintiff Jeffery Hargett was involuntarily civilly committed pursuant to the Act in or about March, 2000 by the Circuit Court of Iroquois County, Illinois. Mr. Hargett has consented to participate in any and all mental health treatment programs provided by DHS. Mr. Hargett has never refused treatment or to participate in any test administered by the Defendants. Nevertheless, due to the systemic deficiencies in the SVP program described below, Mr. Hargett has never received adequate treatment or treatment that might yield a realistic chance for his release.

4. Plaintiff Kim A. Overlin ("Overlin") was involuntarily civilly committed pursuant to the Act in or about June, 1998 by the Circuit Court of Macon County, Illinois. Mr. Overlin has consented to participate in any and all mental health treatment programs provided by DHS. Mr. Overlin has never refused treatment or to participate in any test administered by the Defendants. Nevertheless, due to the systemic deficiencies in the SVP program described below, Mr. Overlin has never

received adequate treatment or treatment that would lead to a realistic chance for his release.

5. Plaintiff Jimmie Smith ("Smith") was involuntarily civilly committed pursuant to the Act in or about October, 2000 by the Circuit Court of Macoupin County, Illinois. Mr. Smith has consented to participate in any and all mental health treatment programs provided by DHS. Mr. Smith has never refused treatment or to participate in any test administered by the Defendants. Nevertheless, due to the systematic deficiencies in the SVP program described below, Mr. Smith has been denied adequate treatment or treatment that would lead to a realistic chance for his release.

6. Plaintiff Loren K. Walker ("Walker") was involuntarily civilly committed pursuant to the Act in or about September, 1998 by the Circuit Court of Madison County, Illinois. Mr. Walker has consented to participate in any and all mental health treatment programs provided by DHS. Mr. Walker has never refused treatment or to participate in any test administered by the Defendants. Nonetheless, due to the systemic deficiencies in the SVP program described below, Mr. Walker has been denied adequate treatment or treatment that would lead to a realistic chance for his release.

7. Defendant Linda R. Baker ("Baker"), is the Secretary of the Illinois Department of Human Services ("DHS") and the chief administrative officer of the DHS. Defendant Baker is sued herein in her official capacity. At all relevant times, she was acting under the color of state law.

8. Defendant Mary Bass ("Bass") is the Head Facility Administrator of DHS. She is sued herein in her official capacity. At all relevant times, she was acting under the color of state law.

9. Defendant Timothy Budz ("Budz") is the Facility Director of the DHS Sexually Violent Persons Unit at Joliet. He is sued herein in his official capacity. At all relevant times, he was acting under the color of state law.

10. Defendant Raymond Woods ("Woods") is the Clinical Director of the DHS Sexually Violent Persons Unit at Joliet. He is sued herein in his official capacity. At all relevant times, he was acting under the color of state law.

11. Defendant Travis Hinze ("Hinze") is the Associate Clinical Director of the DHS Sexually Violent Persons Unit at Joliet. He is sued herein in his official capacity. At all relevant times, he was acting under the color of state law.

12. Baker, Bass, Budz, Woods and Hinze (the "Defendants"), pursuant to authority vested in them by the State of Illinois (the "State"), are the individuals primarily responsible for the care, custody, treatment and control of the Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated. The Defendants knowingly and with deliberate indifference established and maintained the treatment policies, procedures and regime that are challenged in this action.

#### **BACKGROUND**

13. The SVP Act provides for the civil commitment into the custody of DHS of persons that: (a) have been convicted, or acquitted by reason of insanity, of certain sexual offenses; and (b) have been found to have a mental disorder that creates a substantial possibility that they will engage in future acts of sexual violence. Persons may be detained by DHS pursuant to the SVP Act prior to a civil commitment proceeding if there is probable cause to believe that conditions (a) and (b) above are met.

14. Although the SVP Act's stated purpose is not to punish, but instead is to provide for the segregation and treatment of persons with a dangerous

mental disorder, Plaintiffs in fact have not received adequate treatment and have been confined in punitive conditions that are not rationally related to the purposes of the SVP Act.

15. This action challenges under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment the punitive conditions and the inadequate treatment received by the Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated. Specifically, this action challenges the decision of the Defendants to warehouse and put out of sight the Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated in an attempt to hold them indefinitely and to punish, rather than treat their perceived mental disabilities.

#### **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

16. This case is brought on behalf of a class that consists of all persons who have been, are or will be committed under the SVP Act and placed in the custody of DHS.

17. The class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. The population in the custody of DHS exceeds 150 individuals and is constantly growing larger as new persons are detained and civilly committed under the SVP Act.

18. There are questions of law and fact common to the members of the class, and these questions predominate over those affecting only individual class members. The predominate common question is whether the mental health treatment and care provided by the Defendants or those acting under their control or direction comports with the requirements of the Due Process Clause of the United States Constitution.

19. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the class members. All are based on the same factual and legal theories in that they have all suffered as a result of the unconstitutional practices alleged in this Complaint.

20. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent the members of the class. They have no interests antagonistic to the class, and they are represented by counsel who are competent and experienced in civil rights litigation.

21. A class action is superior for the fair and efficient adjudication of this matter, in that the Defendants, by creating and maintaining the practices alleged in this complaint, have acted on grounds generally applicable to the class, and, as a result, declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to the entire class is appropriate.

#### **DUE PROCESS VIOLATIONS**

22. Defendants, in their official capacities, are collectively responsible for the policies and procedures controlling the manner and method of Plaintiffs' confinement and manner and method of their mental health treatment.

23. The Fourteenth Amendment Due Process Clause requires states to provide civilly committed persons with access to mental health treatment that is at least minimally adequate and gives them a realistic opportunity for their conditions to improve so that they can be released. Further, because the Plaintiffs and others similarly situated are not prisoners, they are entitled to more considerate treatment and conditions of confinement than criminals whose conditions of confinement are designed to punish.

24. The Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are being denied meaningful mental health care treatment that gives them a realistic opportunity for their conditions materially to improve because, among other things, the Defendants have failed:

- (a) To properly train staff regarding the treatment of sexual deviance;
- (b) To provide a coherent and meaningful individualized treatment program for each detainee with understandable goals and a road map showing steps necessary for improvement and release;
- (c) To make adequate provisions for the participation of detainees' family members in rehabilitation efforts, including permitting family visits with reasonable frequency and allowing prompt telephone access to detainees in cases of family emergency;
- (d) To draft and implement fair and reasonable grievance procedures and behavior management plans;
- (e) To afford reasonable opportunities to all residents for educational, religious, vocational and recreational activities;
- (f) To cease requiring, as a precondition to participation in all but the most basic treatment offered by DHS, and therefore, as a predicate to release, that the Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated detainees to admit to a laundry list of real and imagined crimes for which they were not convicted, and thereby place themselves in jeopardy of future criminal prosecution for other crimes in violation of the Plaintiffs' Fifth right against self-incrimination applied to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment; and
- (g) To institute a procedure to guarantee appropriate therapist/patient confidentiality.

25. The aforesaid failure to provide constitutionally adequate treatment is a substantial departure from accepted professional judgment, practice or standards and demonstrates that the Defendants did not base their decisions on such professional judgment.

26. Instead of providing treatment and conditions that are rationally related to the purposes of Plaintiffs' confinement, Defendants are using the SVP program as a means of warehousing and punishing those in the SVP program. Since this program was initiated over four years ago, no more than a handful of detainees have been permitted to successfully complete the Defendants' treatment program to

the point where the Defendants recommended their discharge to the courts. Defendants erect one arbitrary barrier after another to prevent Plaintiffs from progressing to the point where the SVP program will recommend their release, including requiring participants in the program to confess to crimes which they did not commit.

27. The Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are being held in conditions that are more restrictive than the conditions under which the Plaintiffs were confined when they were incarcerated as criminals prior to their civil commitment under the Act. These conditions are unrelated to the security or treatment needs of the SVP population and are purely punitive in nature. Further, the Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated are arbitrarily confined in conditions that are more restrictive than the conditions under which most convicted felons are confined by the Illinois Department of Corrections in that, among other things, the Plaintiffs:

- (a) Are routinely stripped searched before and after every visit, including visits with attorneys;
- (b) Are routinely shackled with restraints normally used for the transportation of prisoners housed in "super-max" facilities;
- (c) Are subjected to intrusive cell searches, often with little or no justification, with greater frequency than those of prisoners;
- (d) Have their freedom of movement restricted in a variety of arbitrary ways; for example, they are not allowed to go to the commissary by themselves;
- (e) Are not allowed to purchase their own razor, stapler, nail clippers, aspirins or other similar over-the-counter medication, vitamins or eye drops; and
- (f) Are constantly surveilled by DHS as a result of the installation of intercom systems in the Plaintiffs' cells.



**CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

28. The aforesaid conditions are not rationally connected to furthering the constitutionally legitimate purpose of the Act, which is to provide for the segregation and treatment of the Plaintiffs because of their alleged mental disorder, and are excessive in relation to that purpose, in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

29. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of the Defendants, the Plaintiffs have suffered and continue to suffer distress, humiliation, pain and a loss of liberty. The Defendants' practices and policies described above violate Plaintiffs' rights to reasonable mental health care and constitute punishment in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Plaintiffs have been and continue to be irreparably harmed by these injuries and they have no adequate remedy at law for the Defendants' unlawful conduct.


WHEREFORE, JEFFERY HARGETT, KIM A. OVERLIN, JIMMIE SMITH and LOREN K. WALKER, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, respectfully request that this Court:

- (1) Issue a Declaratory Judgment that the conduct, conditions and mental health treatment described in this complaint violates the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;
- (2) Issue a Permanent Injunction against the Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees and attorneys, and upon all those persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of the Injunction by personal service or otherwise requiring them to submit and implement a plan correcting the constitutional deficiencies alleged in this complaint;
- (3) Award Plaintiffs their costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;

- (4) Expressly reserve the right of all class members to bring subsequent lawsuits for damages; and
- (5) Enter such other and further relief as this Court deems just and equitable.

DATED: February 27, 2002

JEFFERY HARGETT, KIM A. OVERLIN,  
JIMMIE SMITH and LOREN K.  
WALKER, on behalf of themselves and  
all others similarly situated

By:   
One of Their Attorneys

Everett J. Cygal  
Schiff Hardin & Waite  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 258-5783

Benjamin S. Wolf  
Roger Baldwin Foundation  
of the ACLU, Inc.  
180 North Michigan Avenue  
Suite 2300  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
(312) 201-9740

**DOCKETED**

FEB 28 2002

JS 44  
(Rev. 3/99)

*(Handwritten initials)*

**CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

**I. (a) PLAINTIFFS**

Jeffery Hargett; Kim A. Overlin; Jimmie Smith; Loren K. Walker; on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated

**DEFENDANTS**

Linda R. Baker, Secretary of the Illinois Department of Human Services, Mary Ba Head Facility Administrator for the Illinois Department of Human Services

(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF Will

COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

MAGISTRATE JUDGE JUDGE KENNELLY

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)

Everett J. Cygal 312-258-5783  
Schiff Hardin & Waite  
6600 Sears Tower, Chicago, IL 60606

**020** **1450**  
FILED - E  
FEB 27 10 10 AM '02

**II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION** (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item II)

**III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES** (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)

- |   |                            |                            |   |                            |                            |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State                   | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State     | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State                | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation  | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

**IV. NATURE OF SUIT** (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	<b>PERSONAL INJURY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury	<input type="checkbox"/> 302 Personal Injury — Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury — Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 575 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 591 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 592 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 593 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 594 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 595 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes <input type="checkbox"/> 990 Other Statutory Actions
<b>REAL PROPERTY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	<b>CIVIL RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	<b>PRISONER PETITIONS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <b>HABEAS CORPUS:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	<b>PROPERTY RIGHTS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark	
		<b>LABOR</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Rags. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<b>SOCIAL SECURITY</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 661 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 662 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 663 DMW/DRWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 664 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 665 RSI (405(g))	
		<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	<b>FEDERAL TAX SUITS</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS — Third Party 26 USC 7609	

**V. ORIGIN**

- (PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)
- 1 Original Proceeding
  - 2 Removed from State Court
  - 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
  - 4 Reinstated or Reopened
  - 5 Transferred from another district (specify)
  - 6 Multidistrict Litigation
  - 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

**VI. CAUSE OF ACTION**

(CITE THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER WHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE BRIEF STATEMENT OF CAUSE. DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES UNLESS DIVERSITY)  
 Title 42 of the United States Code, Section 1983, Class Action on behalf of civil detainees for due process violations.

**VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:**

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23  DEMAND \$ \_\_\_\_\_ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND:  YES  NO

**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY**

(See instructions): JUDGE Harry D. Leinenweber DOCKET NUMBER 99 C 2861

DATE 2/27/02 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD *(Handwritten Signature)*

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # \_\_\_\_\_ AMOUNT \_\_\_\_\_ APPLYING IFF \_\_\_\_\_ JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_ MAG. JUDGE \_\_\_\_\_

*(Handwritten mark)*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

JUDGE KENNELLY

In the Matter of

Eastern Division

Jeffery Hargett; Kim A. Overlin; Jimmie Smith; Loren K. Walker; on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs,

v.  
Linda R. Baker, et al., Defendants.

DOCKETED


FEB 28 2002

MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
GERALDINE SOAT BROWN  
Case Number:

02C 1456

APPEARANCES ARE HEREBY FILED BY THE UNDERSIGNED AS ATTORNEY(S) FOR:

Plaintiffs

(A)		(B)	
SIGNATURE 		SIGNATURE	
NAME Everett J. Cygal		NAME	
FIRM Schiff Hardi & Waite		FIRM	
STREET ADDRESS 6600 Sears Tower		STREET ADDRESS	
CITY/STATE/ZIP Chicago, IL 60606		CITY/STATE/ZIP	
TELEPHONE NUMBER (312) 258-5783		TELEPHONE NUMBER	
IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE) 6215930		IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)	
MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
TRIAL ATTORNEY? YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		TRIAL ATTORNEY? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		DESIGNATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
(C)		(D)	
SIGNATURE		SIGNATURE	
NAME		NAME	
FIRM		FIRM	
STREET ADDRESS		STREET ADDRESS	
CITY/STATE/ZIP		CITY/STATE/ZIP	
TELEPHONE NUMBER		TELEPHONE NUMBER	
IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)		IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)	
MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
TRIAL ATTORNEY? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		TRIAL ATTORNEY? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESIGNATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>		DESIGNATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	

FILED  
 02 FEB 27 PM 4:10  
 U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
 CHICAGO  
