

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

Monday, March 17, 2025

THE COURT MADE THE FOLLOWING ANNOUNCEMENTS:

MANDATE PENDING

131611

Max Solomon, petitioner, v. Isaac R. Wiseman, etc., et al., respondents. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, First District.

Emergency motion by Petitioner to accelerate docket pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 311(b).

IT IS ORDERED that the emergency motion to accelerate docket is treated as an emergency motion for expedited consideration of the petition for leave to appeal. The motion for expedited consideration of the petition for leave to appeal is allowed. The petition for leave to appeal is denied.

Order entered by the Court

Rochford, J., took no part.

MISCELLANEOUS RECORD

M.R.031888

In re: Conducting Hearings Pursuant to SAFE-T Act

The Court's order of August 30, 2023, as amended on March 18, 2024 and *nunc pro tunc* to September 18, 2024, and as further amended September 27, 2024, regarding Conducting Hearings Pursuant to the SAFE-T Act is further amended as follows (deleted material is struck through and added material is underlined):

On September 18, 2023, the pretrial release provisions of Public Acts 101- 652 and 102-1104, commonly known as the Safety, Accountability, Fairness and Equity-Today Act (SAFE-T Act), went into effect. *See Rowe v. Raoul*, 2023 IL 129248.

The pretrial release provisions establish a default rule that all persons charged with an offense shall be eligible for pretrial release on personal recognizance subject to conditions of release that a court finds to be appropriate. 725 ILCS 5/110-2

(West 2022). The SAFE-T Act sets out extensive factors that a court must consider in determining the conditions of release, and the Pretrial Services Act requires that pretrial services agencies investigate and submit written reports to assist the court in determining the appropriate terms and conditions of pretrial release, if any. 725 ILCS 5/110-5 (West 2022); 725 ILCS 185/7 (West 2022).

The SAFE-T Act requires Illinois circuit courts to conduct in-person hearings, under certain circumstances or at certain stages of a case and within statutorily specified timeframes, to determine whether a defendant should be detained or continue in detention and, if not, what conditions of pretrial release should apply (if any). See *generally* 725 ILCS 5/106D-1, 109-1, 109-2, 110-5, 110-5.2, 110-6, 110-6.1 (West 2022). Defendants have a right to counsel at these hearings. See 725 ILCS 5/110-5 (West 2022) (including a public defender or a licensed attorney appointed by the court). Accordingly, attorneys for the state and defendants must prepare for these hearings, and courts must have the necessary information to proceed with these hearings. See, e.g., 725 ILCS 5/110-5 (West 2022); 725 ILCS 185/7 (West 2022).

The SAFE-T Act permits these hearings to be conducted by two-way audio-visual communication systems if, among other exceptions, the chief judge of the circuit orders the use of those systems due to operational challenges in conducting the hearings in person.

Obtaining the necessary information and conducting any hearings on questions of pretrial detention or conditions of pretrial release within the statutorily specified timeframes requires increased judicial, pretrial, court staff, attorney, law enforcement, and other justice partner resources. The courts have conducted a great number of hearings for newly arrested individuals and for individuals who were in pretrial detention before September 18, 2023. Courts have been taking reasonable steps to address the operational challenges including, but not limited to, adding staff, training existing staff to conduct the investigations and hearings, adjusting court schedules, reconfiguring courtrooms, addressing transportation, logistical, and security issues, and planning for disbursement of the fund established by 55 ILCS 5/3-104 (West 2022) to enhance public defender services. The courts will continue to take reasonable steps to address

remaining and any developing operational challenges.

Due to the high volume of investigations and hearings on pretrial detention or conditions of pretrial release and the continued still limited resources of circuit courts, state's attorneys, public defenders, law enforcement, and other justice partners, statewide compliance with the SAFE-T Act will only be possible with the use of two-way audio-visual communication systems. Conducting these hearings by two-way audio-visual communication systems is consistent with the Court's belief that remote appearances can be used effectively and appropriately in both civil and criminal proceedings. Under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 45 (eff. Jan. 1, 2023), the courts of this state have been undertaking remote proceedings in criminal cases consistent with constitutional protections.

FOR THESE REASONS, the Court finds there are still statewide operational challenges to conducting all hearings relating to pretrial detention or conditions of pretrial release pursuant to the SAFE-T Act in-person ~~for the six (6) months following September 18, 2024~~, particularly those hearings that must be done within condensed timeframes.

Therefore, in the exercise of the general administrative and supervisory authority over the courts of Illinois conferred on this Court pursuant to Article VI, Section 16, of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 (Ill. Const. 1970, art. VI, §16),

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Due to the current statewide operational challenges documented in this Order, there is a basis for circuit courts to use two-way audio-visual communication systems to conduct any hearings relating to pretrial detention and conditions of pretrial release where necessary.
2. A chief judge who seeks to permit use of two-way audio-visual communication systems to conduct any hearings relating to pretrial detention or conditions of pretrial release shall enter a local order approving the operational challenges documented in this Order and ordering the use of two-way audio-visual communication systems in their circuit where

necessary.

The chief judge shall submit these local orders to the Court, through its Administrative Office, and make them available to the public, case participants, and other justice system partners in the same manner as local rules adopted pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 45(b)(7).

3. Because the Court finds that statewide operational challenges exist and are being reasonably addressed, circuits need not submit a plan to the Administrative Office to address these challenges while this Order remains in effect.
4. Nothing in this Order impacts the provisions of the SAFE-T Act that govern the way in which hearings conducted by two-way audio-visual communication systems shall occur, including, but not limited to, the availability of a secure line over which the person in custody and his or her counsel may confer and communicate, the availability of a recording for purposes of an appeal, and the fact that confidential communications between the defendant and defense counsel shall not be recorded and shall be undertaken consistent with constitutional protections. See, e.g., 725 ILCS 5/106D-1(b), 110-6.6(b), and 109-1(g) (West 2022).
5. This Order shall remain in effect until ~~March 18, 2025~~ further order of the Court.

Order entered by the Court.

THE FOLLOWING MOTIONS WERE PRESENTED AND ORDERS WERE ENTERED AS INDICATED:

CLOSED

129439 People State of Illinois, respondent, v. Andrew L. Hall, petitioner. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, Fourth District.

Motion by Petitioner for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the order denying petition for leave to appeal.

129715 People State of Illinois, respondent, v. Amy J. Mallery, petitioner. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, Fourth District.

Motion by Petitioner for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the order denying petition for leave to appeal.

MANDATE PENDING

131014 Rashun Singleton, petitioner, v. Illinois Human Rights Commission et al., respondents. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, First District.

Motion by Petitioner, *pro se*, for reconsideration of the denial of extension of time to file a Petition for Leave to Appeal. Denied

Order entered by Justice Cunningham

PEOPLE'S DOCKET

130110 People State of Illinois, Appellee, v. Ocheil D. Keys, Appellant. Appeal, Appellate Court, Fourth District.

Unopposed motion by Appellant for an extension of time for filing reply brief to and including April 11, 2025. Allowed

Order entered by Justice Holder White

- 130779 People State of Illinois, Appellee, v. Isaiah J. Williams, Appellant. Appeal, Appellate Court, Second District.
- Unopposed motion by Appellee for an extension of time for filing appellee's brief to and including April 10, 2025. Allowed
- Order entered by Justice Rochford
- 131187 People State of Illinois, Appellee, v. Gregory Dobbins (Katrina Dobbins, etc., Appellant). Appeal, Appellate Court, First District.
- Motion by Appellee for leave to review any secured volumes of record. Allowed
- Order entered by Justice Cunningham
- 131365
131506
cons. Aimee Stewart, Petitioner-Appellant, v. Hon. Steven J. Rosenblum, Associate Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County, et al., Respondents-Appellees. Habeas Corpus and Circuit Court (Cook).
- Unopposed motion by Respondent Hon. Steven Jay Rosenblum to supplement supporting record Instanter. Allowed
- Order entered by Justice Cunningham
- 131601 Adam Lujano, movant, v. Justices of the Appellate Court, First District, respondents. Supervisory Order.
- Motion by Movant for a supervisory order.
- 131603 Charles Hill, movant, v. Justices of the Appellate Court, First District, respondents. Supervisory Order.
- Motion by Movant for a supervisory order.

CIVIL DOCKET

131604 Cynthia Logan, movant, v. Appellate Court, Third District, et al., respondents. Supervisory Order.

Motion by Movant for a supervisory order.

131614 Alvin D. Carr, movant, v. Appellate Court, First District, respondent. Supervisory Order.

Application by Movant, *pro se*, for waiver of court fees. Allowed

Order entered by Justice Cunningham

LEAVE TO APPEAL DOCKET

131597 People State of Illinois, respondent, v. Christopher L. Thompson, petitioner. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, Third District.

Motion by Petitioner for an extension of time for filing a Petition for Leave to Appeal to and including April 14, 2025. Allowed

Order entered by Justice Rochford

131598 Bank of America, NA, respondent, v. Muralidhar Narayana, petitioner. Leave to appeal, Appellate Court, First District.

Motion by Petitioner, *pro se*, for an extension of time for filing a Petition for Leave to Appeal to and including March 31, 2025. Allowed

Order entered by Justice Cunningham

MISCELLANEOUS RECORD

M.R.032610 In re: Strauss Borrelli PLLC

Motion by movant for leave to renew registration retroactively for the year 2025 pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 721. Allowed

Order entered by Justice Cunningham

M.R.032611

In Re: David M. Zinder, Ltd.

Motion by movant for leave to renew registration retroactively for the year 2025 pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 721.

Allowed

Order entered by Justice Cunningham