IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF _	COUNTY		
JUDICIAL CIRCUIT			
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS Plaintiff-Appellee,	S, ) )		
-vs-	) No		
Defendant-Appellant.	)		
NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM ORDER U	NDER PRETRIAL FAIRNESS		
ACT PURSUANT TO ILLINOIS SUPP	•		
(Defendant as Ap	pellant)		
Court from which appeal is taken:			
Circuit Court of Count			
The Judge(s) who entered the order(s) be	eing appealed:		
Date(s) of Order(s) Appealed:  Date(s) of Hearing(s) Regarding Pretrial			
Court to which appeal is taken:			
Appellate Court of Illinois,	Judicial District		
Name of Defendant and address to which	ch notices shall be sent (if		
Defendant has no attorney):			
Defendant's Address:			
Defendant's E-mail:			
Defendant's Phone:			

appointed? (If Cook Cou appointed, in all other C	- '	-	
_ 105	110		
Name of Defendant's a	ttorney on a	ppeal (if any):	
Attorney's Name:			
Attorney's Address:			
Attorney's E-mail:			
Attorney's Phone:			
Name of Defendant's ti	rial attorney	(if any):	
Attorney's Name:			
Attorney's Address:			
Attorney's E-mail:			
Attorney's Phone:			
Is the trial attorney	a public defend	der? □ Yes	$\square$ No
Nature of Order Appeal	l <b>ed</b> (check all	that apply):	
☐ Denying pretrial re		11 0	
☐ Revoking pretrial r			
☐ Imposing condition		ease	
Are there currently pen	ding any oth	er appeals in th	is matter under the
Pretrial Fairness Act?	□ Yes*	□ No	
*If Yes, list appeal	number(s):		<del> </del>
Rule 328 Supporting Re	<b>cord*</b> (check ε	all that are attach	ed):
☐ Copy of the order a			,
☐ Supporting docume		of record (please l	ist)
-			
☐ Affidavit of attorne	y or party (in li	ieu of clerk certific	ate of authentication)

If Defendant is indigent and has no attorney, do they want one

\*You may attach a supporting record to this notice of appeal. A full supporting record must be filed with the appellate court within 30 days after filing this notice of appeal.

The State failed to meet its burden of presumption great that defendant enmitted the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing ridence that the proof is evident or the presumption great that defendant enmitted the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing ridence that defendant on the presumption great that defendant on the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	Relief Requested:		
Denial or Revocation of Pretrial Release  Defendant was not charged with an offense qualifying for denial or evocation of pretrial release or with a violation of a protective order that the process of pretrial release.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the proof is evident or the presumption great that defendant committed the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that the offense of proving by clear and convincing evidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any person or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	Grounds for Relief (check all that apply and describe in detail):		
Defendant was not charged with an offense qualifying for denial or evocation of pretrial release or with a violation of a protective order dealifying for revocation of pretrial release.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that the proof is evident or the presumption great that defendant demitted the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant demitted the offense of the state failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any derson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	Grounds for Herier (check air that appry and describe in detail).		
The State failed to meet its burden of presumption great that defendant enmitted the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that the proof is evident or the presumption great that defendant enmitted the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant on the presumption great that defendant on the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	<b>Denial or Revocation of Pretrial Release</b>		
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that the proof is evident or the presumption great that defendant committed the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant or the presumption great that defendant committed the offense(s) charged.	□ Defendant was not charged with an offense qualifying for denial or		
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that the proof is evident or the presumption great that defendant ommitted the offense(s) charged.  The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	revocation of pretrial release or with a violation of a protective order		
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	qualifying for revocation of pretrial release.		
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of	committed the offense(s) charged.		
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
vidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any erson or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of			
	☐ The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that defendant poses a real and present threat to the safety of any person or persons or the community, based on the specific, articulable facts of the case.		

evidence tha and present	failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing at no condition or combination of conditions can mitigate the real threat to the safety of any person or persons or the community, e specific, articulable facts of the case, or defendant's willful flight
conditions w	erred in its determination that no condition or combination of could reasonably ensure the appearance of defendant for later prevent defendant from being charged with a subsequent felony or demeanor.
	t was denied an opportunity for a fair hearing prior to the entry of nying or revoking pretrial release.

$\Box$ Other (explain).
Imposing Conditions of Pretrial Release
The State failed to meet its burden of proving by clear and convincing
evidence that conditions of pretrial release are necessary.
In determining the conditions of pretrial release, the court failed to take into account the factors set forth in 725 ILCS 5/110-5(a). Specifically, the courfailed to consider the following factors (list all that apply):

	the defendant does not commit any criminal			
offense, ensure that defendant complies with all conditions of pretrial releasement defendant's unlawful interference with the orderly administration				
justice, or ensure compliance with	n the rules and procedures of problem-solving			
courts.				
$\square$ Other (explain).				
I certify that everything in this	NOTICE OF APPEAL FROM ORDER			
UNDER PRETRIAL FAIRNESS	ACT PURSUANT TO ILLINOIS			
	n) is true and correct. I understand that			
	s form is perjury and has penalties			
provided by law under <u>735 ILCs</u>	<del>5                                    </del>			
Your Signature				
Printed Name	Attorney # (if any)			