

The Chicago Council of Lawyers Evaluation Report:

Judges Seeking Retention in the November 2012 General Election and Judicial Candidates Seeking to Fill Judicial Vacancies

September 14, 2012

The Chicago Council of Lawyers, in this report, releases its evaluation of the judges seeking retention in the November 6th general election. We also include in this report our evaluation of the candidates who won their primary election held in March 2012 and who are on the November ballot.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR RETENTION CANDIDATES

The criteria for the Council's evaluations are whether the retention candidate has demonstrated the ability to serve on the relevant court in the following categories:

- fairness, including sensitivity to diversity and bias
- legal knowledge and skills (competence)
- integrity
- experience
- diligence
- impartiality
- judicial temperament
- respect for the rule of law
- independence from political and institutional influences
- professional conduct
- character
- community service

If a candidate has demonstrated the ability to perform the work required of a judge in all of these areas, the Council assigns a rating of "qualified." If a candidate has demonstrated excellence in most of these areas, the Council assigns a rating of "well qualified." If a candidate has demonstrated excellence in all of these areas, the Council assigns a rating of "highly qualified." If a candidate has not demonstrated that he or she meets all of the criteria evaluated by the Council, the Council assigns a rating of "not qualified."

As part of the evaluation process, we require candidates to provide us with detailed information about their backgrounds, including any complaints filed against them with the Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission ("ARDC") or the Judicial Inquiry Board ("JIB").

In conducting these evaluations, the Council has participated in a joint investigation and interview process with the Alliance of Bar Associations for Judicial Screening ("Alliance"). The Alliance includes the following bar associations: Asian American Bar Association, Black Women Lawyers Association, Chicago Council of Lawyers, Cook County Bar Association, Decalogue Society of Lawyers, Hellenic Bar

Association, Hispanic Lawyers' Association of Illinois, Illinois State Bar Association, Lesbian and Gay Bar Association of Chicago, Puerto Rican Bar Association, and the Women's Bar Association of Illinois.

The Council, in addition to participating in the evaluation process with the Alliance, also utilized the research conducted by the Judicial Performance Commission of Cook County (JPC). The JPC does not evaluate judges for the purpose of voter education. Rather, the JPC is a group of lawyers and non-lawyers who utilize electronic surveys and phone interviews with lawyers who have filed appearance forms in the courtrooms of those judges being evaluated within the past three years. There are additional interviews with judges, litigants, and others with professional experience with the judges seeking retention. The JPC utilizes its research results to prepare a research summary for each judge, containing strengths and weaknesses of the judge, and if appropriate a judicial performance improvement plan consisting of such suggestions as peer mentoring, court watching, and continuing education. The JPC reports are shared with the judges being evaluated, their presiding judges, and with the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court. The JPC will oversee a court watching program for these judges and will re-evaluate the judges within three years. The JPC shares its research results and findings with bar groups and others doing evaluations for the retention elections.

The Council's evaluation process includes:

- (1) a review of a written informational questionnaire provided to the Alliance by the candidate, including details of the candidate's career and professional development and information on any complaints filed against the candidate with the JIB or the ARDC;
- (2) a review of the candidate's written responses to the supplemental essay questionnaire;
- (3) interviews of judges, attorneys, and others with personal knowledge about the candidate, including those who have and those who have not been referred to the Alliance by the candidate, and not restricted to Council members;
- (4) a review of the candidate's professional written work, where available;
- (5) an interview of the candidate done jointly with the Alliance;
- (6) review of any information concerning the candidate provided by the ARDC or the JIB;
- (7) a review of any other information available from public records, such as the Board of Election Commissioners and prosecutorial agencies; and
- (8) an evaluation of all the above materials by the Council's Judicial Evaluation Committee;
- (9) submission of the proposed evaluation and write-up to the candidate prior to its public release, to provide an opportunity for comment, correction, or reconsideration.

The Council places special importance on interviews with attorneys who practice before the judge, particularly those who were not referred to the Council by the candidate. Most evaluations are based on information gathered and interviews held during the past few months.

In evaluating candidates, the Council expresses written reasons for its conclusions. Without knowing the reason for a recommendation concerning a candidate, the public cannot use the bar's evaluations intelligently to draw its own conclusions.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RETENTION ELECTIONS

The retention elections provide the voter with an opportunity to remove those judges whose judicial performance has been, in some respect, unsatisfactory. Retention elections provide the only practical opportunity for the voters as a whole to focus on the performance of judges, with a realistic opportunity to defeat those candidates who deserve to be defeated.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR JUDICIAL CANDIDATES IN CONTESTED ELECTIONS

Judicial candidates seeking election must run for specific vacancies. Candidates seeking election to the Circuit Court – which is the County’s trial-level court for both civil and criminal matters – may run in either a countywide or a subcircuit race. Legislation creating the subcircuits provides that approximately one-third of the judges are elected by voters of the entire County, and each of the remaining judges elected by voters runs in one of fifteen geographical districts into which the County has been arbitrarily divided. Once elected, there is no distinction between a “countywide” judge and a “subcircuit” judge. Either kind can be assigned to any judicial post in the County.

The Council rates candidates as “*highly qualified*,” “*well qualified*,” “*qualified*,” or “*not qualified*.” If a candidate refuses to submit his or her credentials to the Council, that candidate is rated “*not recommended*” unless the Council is aware of credible information that would justify a “not qualified” rating. Because we believe a willingness to participate in bar association and other public evaluations is a key indicator of fitness for public office, no candidate who refuses to be screened can be found “qualified.”

We apply higher standards to candidates for the Supreme Court and the Appellate Court. Because these Courts establish legal precedents that bind the lower courts, their work has a broad impact on the justice system. Moreover, qualities of scholarship and writing ability are more important to the work of the Supreme and Appellate Court justices than they are to satisfactory performance as a trial judge.

The Council does *not* evaluate candidates based on their substantive views of political or social issues. Nor do we take into account the particular race in which a candidate is running or the candidates against whom a candidate is running. We apply a uniform standard for all countywide and subcircuit elections because judges elected through either method can be assigned to any judicial position in the Circuit Court.

It should be noted that a lawyer might be performing well or even very well without being qualified to be a judge. A good lawyer may be unqualified to be a judge, for instance, because of a narrow range of prior experience, limited trial experience, or limited work doing legal research and writing. A lawyer may have the temperament and intelligence to be a judge without yet having worked in a position that would allow the candidate to demonstrate that capacity. Accordingly, it should be recognized and expected that we will rate some good lawyers “not qualified.”

Judges Seeking Retention in the November 2012

General Election

Martin S. Agran – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Martin S. Agran served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney and was in private practice. He was also a panel attorney with the Federal Defender's Office for 14 years. He was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1994 and elected to the bench the same year. Judge Agran was initially assigned to the First Municipal District, then to the Child Protection Division. He served in the Juvenile Justice Division and the Trial Section of the Law Division. Since 2004, Judge Agran has been in the Chancery Division.

Attorneys surveyed and interviewed indicated Judge Agran is well-respected. He is seen as a "thoughtful" jurist who takes time to do his own research and come to the right conclusion. He has the ability to "move his cases" and he does this while still taking time to ensure everyone's cases are litigated thoroughly. Respondents noted his "judicial and cordial" demeanor and describe him as "very fair." He is known for giving "well-reasoned decisions based on the law." Consistently, interviewees stated that Judge Agran was "very knowledgeable" and "bright."

This judge was also consistently praised for courtroom management skills. While he "keeps his call moving" and is "very organized," Judge Agran is also said to be "very accommodating" and grants continuances when necessary. One interviewee pointed out that Judge Agran "always made sure everyone knew the status." The attorneys interviewed uniformly stated that he "reads everything," and is always "very prepared" for court proceedings. Many respondents also mentioned that he had an excellent memory and could often recall many details of the matters before him.

Judge Agran's temperament also received praise from the attorneys surveyed. Many of the interviewees stated that he was "not excitable" and "even keeled." A number of respondents also stated that while Judge Agran could be firm at times, he always remained "professional" and "respectful."

Judge Agran is also highly regarded for his integrity and fairness. Many of the attorneys interviewed stated that his integrity was "beyond reproach." Attorneys also uniformly felt they "got a fair shake" from Judge Agran. This was even said by attorneys who received unfavorable decisions from the judge. Many interviewees also made special note of Judge Agran's treatment of *pro se* litigants, stating that he always treated *pro se* litigants fairly and listened to their arguments. One attorney stated that "you're always on a level playing field in his courtroom whether or not you're represented by a lawyer."

The Council finds Judge Agran Well Qualified for retention.

Patricia S. Banks – Qualified

Prior to becoming a Judge, Patricia Banks was in private practice for her entire career. Judge Banks also served as a Trustee for the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in the Northern District of Illinois and as an arbitrator for the Cook County Mandatory Arbitration program. She was elected to the bench in 1994. Judge Banks was initially assigned to the Domestic Relations Division and to the Law Division in 2001. She is presently Presiding Judge in the Elder Law and Miscellaneous Remedies Division.

Judge Banks' temperament and demeanor appear to be an asset. She is considered both accommodating and engaging of attorneys in her courtroom. Judge Banks is diligent in conducting research on issues in the cases before her. She has also praised for her work since 2010 to create the new Elder Law Division, which, among other things, hears cases formerly heard in the Probate Division. Respondents believed Judge Banks' integrity is sound and that she displays no bias or favoritism.

In her previous assignment, some respondents complained about the speed with which she resolved cases and many respondents commented that Judge Banks could be better prepared. But the reports regarding her current assignment have been positive. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Ronald Bartkowicz – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Ronald Bartkowicz was an attorney for the Chicago Transit Authority for 20 years. Judge Bartkowicz was appointed in 1985 as an Associate Judge and appointed as a Circuit Court judge in 1997. He was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. Judge Bartkowicz presently sits in the Law Division, Individual Commercial Calendar Section. Previously, he was in the Law Division, jury trial section, and the First Municipal District trial section.

Respondents indicated that Judge Bartkowicz has excellent courtroom management skills, with the praise extending to his courtroom staff. Generally, interviewees noted that it is a very busy courtroom with a crowded docket, but most noted that he is "punctual" and moves cases. Interviewees say that he is professional, attentive, and has always behaved appropriately even when his patience was clearly tested. Judge Bartkowicz appears particularly good at communicating displeasure while remaining calm and courteous.

His courtroom was consistently described as a "level playing field" with few exceptions. He is described as "effective" in his use of pretrial time. Nonetheless, a minority of respondents felt he could be more persuasive in encouraging settlements. He is considered hard-working and very diligent, with more than one respondent commenting on his long hours in a typical day.

Judge Bartkowicz is knowledgeable about substantive and procedural law on more routine cases, although some respondents commented on his occasional indecisiveness in more complex matters.

Overall, Judge Bartkowicz is well-respected as a diligent and capable judge. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Carole Bellows -- Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Carole Bellows spent the entirety of her career in private practice. Judge Bellows was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1986 and elected in 1988. She presently serves in the Domestic Relations Division.

Respondents most often described Judge Bellows as patient and prepared. Her calm demeanor is considered an asset, and she is known for courtesy to *pro se* litigants. She is considered honest and knowledgeable in her area of law, sometimes doing independent research where necessary. Attorneys report that she appears to favor settlement over judicial ruling, which generally earns compliments from attorneys, but a minority of respondents find this frustrating. She is considered to be compassionate and considerate of litigants. She is praised for her pretrial memoranda and for her courtroom management.

Most respondents also agreed that her courtroom functions well. One interviewee praised her informal manner of resolving cases and another felt her willingness to accept agreed orders without a hearing helped move her call expeditiously. Most respondents described her as on time, prepared and attentive to proceedings.

Judge Bellows is considered to be a very good judge and is praised for her diligence, temperament, and knowledge of the law. The Council finds Judge Bellows Qualified for retention.

Judge Maura Slattery Boyle – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Maura Slattery Boyle spent six years as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney and also worked at the City of Chicago's Department of Law. Judge Boyle was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. She was assigned to the First Municipal District until she was transferred to the Criminal Division in 2009.

Attorneys praise Judge Boyle for her improved knowledge of the law, preparedness and diligence, integrity and fairness on the bench. Many practitioners noted that Judge Boyle "has progressed" as a judge over the last few years – she is good at recognizing issues, explaining her rulings, and has gotten up to speed on the case law. She received high marks for her preparedness and judicial diligence, with many interviewees noting that she is "always prepared" and "works hard." She is considered "cognizant of ethical issues" and "has a reputation of someone beyond reproach, and honorable." Attorneys on both sides of the aisle appear to think that she is fair. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Daniel Patrick Brennan – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Daniel Patrick Brennan was counsel to the Cook County Sheriff. Judge Brennan was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. He was initially assigned to the First

Municipal District and then to the Sixth Municipal District. He is presently assigned to the Mortgage Foreclosure/Mechanics Lien call at the Daley Center.

Judge Brennan has been on the Mortgage Foreclosure/Mechanics Lien call in the Chancery Division for less than a year. Respondents were generally positive, giving particular praise to his handling of *pro se* litigants and the overall fairness of his courtroom. He is called fair, rational, thorough and calm. Attorneys report that Judge Brennan will often telegraph his inclination prior to argument, but does not cut off argument and appears to consider what is presented to him. He is described as not inclined to rush cases through his courtroom.

Overall, Judge Brennan received good ratings from the respondents. Most attorneys interviewed stated that they believed he was diligent. One attorney mentioned that Judge Brennan always had notes on the cases before trial and that he “gives a preview that allows you to better manage your case.” Judge Brennan was also highly praised for his judicial temperament.

This judge was also praised for his fairness and integrity. One attorney stated that “lawyers hear a lot of scuttlebutt, but I’ve never heard a negative word about Brennan.” Repeatedly, the interviewees stated they felt that they were always on a “level playing field” and that he “ruled on the matters before him.” He was consistently praised for his fairness and integrity and seen as a well-informed judge who has the ability to keep an even temper even when dealing with a high-volume courtroom. The Council finds Judge Brennan Qualified for retention.

Judge Cynthia Brim – Not Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Cynthia Brim was an Assistant Illinois Attorney General. Judge Brim was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994 and initially assigned to the First Municipal District. Judge Brim is presently assigned to the Fifth Municipal District but has been suspended from duty since March 12, 2012. Judge Brim was arrested on March 10, 2012 on misdemeanor charges related to an altercation with a Cook County Sheriff’s Deputy at the Daley Center.

Most respondents indicated a lack of confidence in her legal abilities. Even though the judge hears generally non-complex matters, her rulings are often described as unpredictable and delayed. Respondents indicate that they regularly file motions for substitution of judge, despite the cost and inconvenience to their clients.

Additionally, there are many complaints that Judge Brim is late to take the bench. Attorneys report repeated continuances because court starts late and because the call is handled inefficiently. Attorneys feel that Judge Brim is particularly rude and unaccommodating of counsel who are on call in multiple courtrooms. Many attorneys described her as “consistently late” and there is some concern that her case management delays resolution of cases.

The consistently negative reports about Judge Brim’s judicial performance and her arrest at the courthouse at the Daley Center in downtown Chicago raise serious questions about whether she can remain effective on the bench. The Council finds her Not Qualified for retention.

Judge Rodney Brooks – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Rodney Brooks worked as a solo practitioner maintaining a diverse general practice. Judge Brooks was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994 and assigned to the First Municipal District Traffic Center. In 1996, he was transferred to the Juvenile Justice Division, where he is presently assigned as a floater or coverage judge.

Judge Brooks received high marks from attorneys on both sides of the aisle. His legal ability and knowledge of the law is considered one of his most obvious strengths. Attorneys commented that he “reads statutes literally and follows them” to the letter of the law, that he is “extremely well versed in the law” and does research when he is uncertain about a particular issue. Judge Brooks garnered praise for his courtroom management, with respondents noting that he does a “great job moving through his cases” and the call is “very smooth” in his courtroom. Our research shows that he is prepared for court.

As a trial judge in the past, the Council heard negative reports about Judge Brooks’ temperament and ability to control a courtroom. As a floater judge with a more limited call in this evaluation, the reports have been more positive. On balance, the Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Mary Margaret Brosnahan – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Mary Margaret Brosnahan was a career prosecutor in the Cook County State’s Attorney’s Office. From 1997, Judge Brosnahan was a Supervisor in the Felony Trial Division where she supervised eighteen Assistant State’s Attorneys in the Felony Trial Courts. Judge Brosnahan was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. Judge Brosnahan was initially assigned to Traffic Court and later served in the First Municipal District in central bond court, narcotics preliminary hearing court, and the homicide – sex preliminary hearing court. Since 2005, Judge Brosnahan has been assigned to the Criminal Division.

Judge Brosnahan received consistently high marks in all areas surveyed. Interviewees described her as having “outstanding ability”, saying it was always “clear she read the law and used logic to arrive at her decisions.” She was also highly praised for her courtroom management. Several respondents stated that Judge Brosnahan was “extremely well prepared,” “prompt,” and efficient. One respondent commented that she “always explained to the courtroom why private lawyers’ cases were called first.” While she keeps her call moving, Judge Brosnahan was also praised for her ability to allow “parties to complete what they need to do” and “give extra court dates when needed.”

Respondents gave Judge Brosnahan high marks for diligence and attention to detail. She was frequently referred to as “extremely prepared” and “very well organized.” One respondent stated that Judge Brosnahan “has a handle on all of the cases that come before her. “

Overall, Judge Brosnahan received high marks from the respondents interviewed in all areas. She was consistently praised for her knowledge and application of the law and her courtroom management skills. She is also seen as a very diligent and well informed judge who has the

ability to keep her call moving while giving appropriate attention to all matters before her. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Jill Cerone-Marisie -- Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Jill Cerone-Marisie worked as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney as well as in private practice. Judge Cerone-Marisie was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal Division, and transferred to the Third Municipal District in 2007.

Judge Jill Cerone-Marisie received high marks in all categories. With regard to her legal ability, attorneys stated that she is "an excellent judge," with "a very knowledgeable grasp of the case law and the courtroom procedures;" and, "the best... she knew the law well and was able to apply it correctly." She was also praised for her ability to move through her cases in an efficient manner despite having a heavy call: she is "always on time" and her "call runs smoothly" and "moves efficiently."

Attorneys on both sides of the aisle gave Judge Cerone-Marisie positive marks for her diligence, preparedness, integrity and temperament – attorneys were roundly impressed by her judicial tone, demeanor, and personable disposition: "she treats everyone the same" and is "authoritative, but not condescending." Finally, attorneys praised her fairness and independence. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Gloria Chevere – Not Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Gloria Chevere was a partner at the general practice firm of Ogden & Chevere. From 1987 to 1991, Judge Chevere was Senior Executive Deputy Director for the Chicago Transit Authority. Then from 1991 until 2006, she was a prosecutor and hearing officer for the Secretary of State, as well as a hearing officer for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District. She was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006, and was assigned to the First Municipal District.

In May 2010, Fox Chicago News in conjunction with the Better Government Association, investigated whether Cook County Judges were leaving work early. The article mentioned Judge Chevere as a judge who often left the courthouse early. Judge Chevere was reassigned shortly after the story was made public.

Judge Chevere generally received good scores from most attorneys for being able to "move her call." One respondent stated that he had "seen hundreds in her courtroom" and that Judge Chevere was "still able to keep on top of things." Many interviewees also believed they were treated fairly in her courtroom.

Her legal ability is generally considered adequate for her call and attorneys believe she runs her courtroom efficiently. However, she is reported to be sometimes "dismissive and rude" on the bench. She reportedly is often unprepared -- many respondents believe she has not read pleadings sufficiently before ruling. She has the reputation of unilaterally cancelling her 2:30

pm call, saying that it is not necessary. There were many negative comments about her performance as a judge, primarily related to temperament and diligence.

Several respondents believe the judge unnecessarily issues arrests warrants for defendants who are late to court, which wastes resources. About half of the respondents also complained that her rulings are erratic, which some attributed to her being too often unprepared. The Council finds her Not Qualified for retention.

Judge Matthew Coghlan – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Matthew Coghlan was an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney. Judge Coghlan was elected in 2000. He was initially assigned to the Domestic Violence Court and Traffic Court. He is presently assigned to the Criminal Division, where he has been since 2006.

Judge Coghlan is characterized by respondents as intelligent, and many remarked that he has a strong foundational understanding of the law. Respondents report that his courtroom management is good, saying that the Judge is punctual and moves cases. His temperament also drew particular praise from respondents. Judge Coghlan was called “compassionate” and was noted for his professionalism. He is calm and fair, with most respondents believing his demeanor is a considerable asset. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Maureen Connors – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Maureen Connors was in private practice, and also served as an assistant general attorney at the Chicago Park District. Judge Connors was appointed to the Illinois Appellate Court in 2010. She became an Associate Judge in 1988 and was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. She served in the Traffic Division, Domestic Violence Division, the Probate Division, and the Fifth Municipal District of the Circuit Court.

Judge Connors is considered an excellent, hardworking judge. She is considered to have very good legal ability and temperament. She is praised for her knowledge of the law. Attorneys report that she is “exemplary in terms of dealing with people” and “courteous and respectful to all equally.” The Council finds her Well Qualified for retention.

Judge Grace Dickler – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Grace Dickler a legal aid attorney and was in private practice as a solo practitioner. Judge Dickler was appointed as an Associate Judge in 1988 and elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. She served in the Second Municipal District. In 2010, she became Presiding Judge in the Domestic Violence Division, and transferred to the position of Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division in 2011.

Respondents were largely positive with regard to Judge Dickler. They describe her as decisive with good temperament. She is considered to have very good legal ability. Judge Dickler is reported to be both a good judge and a good administrator. In her current role as the Presiding

Judge of the Domestic Relations Division, she has assembled a series of task forces to advise her on reform efforts. For example, she spearheaded a reportedly successful program through which lawyers volunteer to do emergency orders of protection for indigent persons. She is engaged and serious in her duties both as a judge on the bench and as a presiding judge interested in reform. Judge Dickler is considered an asset to the court system. The Council finds her Well Qualified.

Judge Christopher Donnelly – Not Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Christopher Donnelly spent one year in private practice before working as an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney. Judge Donnelly was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. He served in the Juvenile Justice Division prior to being transferred to the Sixth Municipal District in Markham, where he currently sits.

Most attorneys agree that Judge Donnelly has the aptitude to understand the law and apply it. Attorneys reported that Judge Donnelly is “a smart man,” “intelligent,” and has “an excellent grasp of what’s going on in his courtroom.” Regarding his courtroom management, interviewees repeatedly praised his efficiency, describing him as running a tight ship and being capable of moving the call along. His judicial diligence and preparedness were not generally questioned.

While many attorneys complimented his intelligence and legal aptitude, a substantial number raised concerns about Judge Donnelly’s temperament and his professionalism. Interview respondents roundly criticized his tone and demeanor while on the bench. Some respondents referred to him as a “bully,” stating that “he goes out of his way to demean people unnecessarily,” he is “mean spirited” and “sometimes can just explode over the insignificant,” and that he “is unprofessional, rude and disrespectful.”

Many respondents had negative responses about Judge Donnelly’s judicial fairness, with most attorneys reporting that he has an unabashedly pro-prosecution perspective. Another attorney suggested that Judge Donnelly’s experience as a former prosecutor weighs heavily on his current role as a judge. One interviewee who summed up many concerns in moderate terms hoped that the evaluation process would inspire the Judge to consider the impression his demeanor makes. The Council finds him Not Qualified for retention.

Judge Loretta Eadie-Daniels – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Loretta Eadie-Daniels was an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney and, before that, an attorney for the Chicago Transit Authority. Judge Eadie-Daniels was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000 and was assigned to a misdemeanor call in the Sixth Municipal District. She remains in the Sixth District, but now handles traffic and ordinance violations. Attorneys report that Judge Eadie-Daniels takes her responsibility toward *pro se* litigants seriously, although some attorneys believe this slows down her call. She is generally described as having a good temperament. While some attorneys report that she could do a better job of managing her courtroom, she is well regarded by most attorneys in her current assignment. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

James Egan – Not Recommended

Judge Egan failed to submit materials to the Council for evaluation, indicating that he would be retiring. However, his name appears on the November retention ballot and thus we are required to rate him as Not Recommended in light of his failure to submit evaluation materials. Nonetheless, given the unique circumstances here – Judge Egan has submitted his materials in the past and it appears he did not do so this time because he plans to retire – the Council has decided to include the following evaluation of Judge Egan based on the work of the Judicial Performance Commission of Cook County:

Evaluation of Judge Egan based on research conducted by the Judicial Performance Commission of Cook County:

Prior to becoming a judge, James Egan was both an Assistant Cook County Public Defender and an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney. Judge Egan was appointed as an Associate Judge in 1989 and became a Circuit Court judge in 1995. He was first elected in 2000. He was initially assigned to the First Municipal Traffic Court and subsequently transferred to the Second Municipal District Criminal Court and the Criminal Division. He currently hears a motion calendar in the Law Division.

Respondents had a high opinion of Judge Egan’s legal ability, his diligence and his fairness. Comments with regard to the Judge’s diligence are good, calling him “prompt and alert,” “very diligent,” and “cordial, prompt and familiar with matters he must address.” Likewise, he is described as “well versed in the law and . . . very fair in his application of the law.” Respondents also felt Judge Egan’s courtroom management is excellent, noting that he never wastes time and maintains a courteous professional manner while moving cases through his courtroom. Attorneys seem comfortable in his courtroom, considering Judge Egan to be calm and even tempered.

Kathy Flanagan – Not Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Kathy Flanagan was in private practice. Judge Flanagan was elected to the Circuit Court in 1988. She was initially assigned to the Domestic Relations Division as a trial judge. Judge Flanagan currently sits in the Law Division on a motion call.

With regard to fairness and legal ability, Judge Flanagan is generally considered intelligent, with a good grasp of the law, and appropriate diligence. Respondents believe her to be very engaged in the courtroom, giving full attention to the details. With regard to rulings, she is described as “consistent, predictable and follows the law.” Many interviewees characterize her as “very fair” and “always prepared.”

However, a substantial number of respondents had a negative impression of Judge Flanagan’s judicial temperament. She was called “hostile,” “imperious,” “rude” and “discourteous.” She was frequently described as impatient or inflexible. A number of attorneys believe these qualities negatively affected her ability to manage her courtroom efficiently. However, even some

respondents who were highly critical of her temper noted that she is “bright” and “truly cares” about the outcomes in her courtroom.

Responses indicate that Judge Flanagan is clearly diligent and capable on the bench. She is prepared for court, punctual and engaged in the proceedings with a reputation for intelligence and general fairness. However, responses show that Judge Flanagan displays inappropriate temper and has created a courtroom atmosphere that is readily described as hostile or unpleasant. In 2006 the Council found Judge Flanagan Not Qualified for retention for these same reasons. There reportedly has been no significant improvement. The Council finds her Not Qualified for retention.

Judge Ellen L. Flannigan – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Ellen L. Flannigan worked as an attorney in private practice. Judge Flannigan was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. She is assigned to the Domestic Violence Division.

Most respondents say that Judge Flannigan is performing adequately. She is reported to have a good grasp of the issues and is praised for putting specific findings on the record. Respondents believe she is generally fair, reaching sound decisions, based in law.

However, some respondents have concerns that Judge Flannigan is not always well-prepared. Attorneys report she has not always read the case materials, but these lawyers add that she usually comes to the right decision. Some attorneys also say that Judge Flannigan can be insensitive when questioning victims of domestic violence. On balance, the Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Peter Flynn – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Peter Flynn was in private practice, focusing on complex business litigation. Judge Flynn was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1999 and elected in 2000. Judge Flynn was initially assigned to the First Municipal District and then to the Law Division, Individual Commercial Calendar. He currently sits in the Chancery Division.

Judge Flynn’s intelligence and engagement with the issues before him are reported as obvious strengths by respondents. Many respondents remarked on how familiar with the cases on his docket the judge is, noting that he is prepared and runs an efficient, professional courtroom. Although respondents indicate that Judge Flynn expects similar rigor from the attorneys practicing in his courtroom, they note he does not lose his temper with unprepared attorneys, but he will pass their cases to another date.

Judge Flynn is considered very smart with an excellent legal ability. Several respondents characterized him as among the smartest or best judges in the county. He is described as having a thorough understanding of both law and procedure, as well as having control of his cases. Additionally, Judge Flynn is noted to be engaged and interested in the proceedings before him and possesses good communication skills.

“Calm” and “fair” are common assessments of his courtroom demeanor. His courtroom is regularly described as a “level playing field.” It appears that attorneys know what to expect in Judge Flynn’s courtroom and that *pro se* litigants are handled respectfully and fairly. Respondents believed that cases move through his docket expeditiously. The Council finds him Well Qualified for retention.

Judge Raymond Funderburk – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Raymond Funderburk worked as an attorney for the Legal Assistance Foundation. He was also in private practice. Judge Funderburk was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1993 and elected in 1994. He was initially assigned to the First Municipal District, Traffic Court and Domestic Violence Court. Currently, he is assigned to a jury call in the Civil Trial Section. In 2000, Judge Funderburk was appointed by the Illinois Supreme Court to a seat on the Illinois Court Commission’s Disciplinary Panel.

Judge Funderburk is seen as a very diligent judge. Many of the interviewees referred to him as “meticulous,” “methodic,” and “fully engaged.” He is described as “deliberate” with good legal ability. Judge Funderburk is also praised for his very high integrity and complete fairness. Consistently, interviewees stated that this judge’s integrity was “unquestionable” and of the “highest degree.” One attorney stated that he “couldn’t imagine anyone with more integrity.” Judge Funderburk’s decisions are also seen as very fair and even handed. Most interviewees made note of feeling as if they were “always on a level playing field.”

However, while most respondents believe Judge Funderburk has a very strong grasp of courtroom procedure, many feel that this procedure often times gets in the way of efficiency. Attorneys say that the judge is overly concerned with protocol and appropriate dress and it can take attention away from the legal issues at hand. In general, Judge Funderburk is considered to be a good jurist. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Catherine Haberkorn – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Catherine Haberkorn was an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney throughout her career, handling both criminal and civil law cases. Judge Haberkorn was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal District and later transferred to the Juvenile Division. She is presently assigned to the Criminal Court in Skokie, where she has been since 1999.

Respondents report that Judge Haberkorn displays a good legal ability and is fair and independent in the courtroom. Her integrity is noted by many and generally her courtroom functions well. Respondents say that Judge Haberkorn is well versed in the rules of procedure and applies them fairly and well. She is described as “honest” and fair, and respondents believe she puts effort into doing the right thing. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Orville E. Hambright – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Orville E. Hambright, Jr. worked for the Chicago Title and Trust Company. In 1981, he became a sole practitioner, concentrating his practice in the areas of probate, divorce, real estate, and juvenile law. Judge Hambright was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2005 and elected in 2006. He has been in the First Municipal District since election.

Interviewees consistently stated that Judge Hambright was a very diligent and thorough judge. Many attorneys mentioned that this judge “read everything,” was “very thoughtful,” and “engaged.” One respondent stated that Judge Hambright “was genuinely interested in doing a good job.”

Judge Hambright was also praised for his judicial temperament. Several respondents stated that he is very “patient,” a good listener, and “never flies off the handle.” One attorney stated that Judge Hambright’s temperament was “refreshing” especially when dealing with the high number of *pro se* litigants that go through his courtroom.

Overall, Judge Hambright received praise from most respondents. He is considered to be a very diligent and patient judge who takes time with each matter before him to ensure he’s getting it right. He is also very highly praised for his judicial temperament and ability to handle *pro se* litigants very well. All the respondents felt that his integrity was beyond reproach and that Judge Hambright was always fair and even handed.

However, while Judge Hambright received generally good remarks, respondents voiced concern about Judge Hambright’s ability to manage his courtroom. Repeatedly, the interviewees stated that his call moved “painfully” and “unnecessarily” slowly. One interviewee mentioned that some 9:30 cases were not heard until after the lunch break. There was concern voiced about the length of time Judge Hambright takes to make a decision and about the pace of his courtroom in general. On balance, the Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Pamela Hill-Veal – Not Recommended

Judge Hill-Veal failed to submit materials for evaluation. The Council finds her Not Recommended for the Circuit Court.

Judge Carol Howard – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Carol Howard worked as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender. Judge Howard was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal District and subsequently was transferred to the Criminal Division.

Respondents were uniformly complementary of Judge Carol Howard’s demeanor and professionalism. Fair, even-tempered, patient and pleasant were common descriptors. Her reputation among respondents is excellent. Her handling of cases is called reasonable and several attorneys noted her practical, real world approach to the lower level offenses before her. Several respondents praised her grasp of procedure and noted her preparedness for court.

Judge Howard is considered to be a solid judge with good legal ability. Both prosecutors and defense counsel call her fair, with a low-key temperament. She is praised for reading all the pleadings and for being prepared. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Garritt E. Howard – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Garritt E. Howard served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney, assigned to the Criminal Division. Judge Howard was appointed to the Circuit Court in July 1994. In November 1994, he was elected to the bench and served in the First Municipal District. In January 1997, he was assigned to the Second Municipal District where he continues to serve.

Judge Howard received consistently high marks in most areas. Several respondents noted that he knew the law, that he was very "consistent," and he was "able to articulate his decisions clearly." There were also a few interviewees that mentioned that they respected the judge's decisions even when he ruled against them. He was consistently praised for his knowledge and application of the law and his courtroom management skills. He is also seen as a very diligent and well-informed judge who has the ability to keep his call moving while giving appropriate attention to all matters before him.

Interviewees stated that Judge Howard "moved the call along." A few attorneys noted that he made good use of pretrial conferences in order to resolve issues and, in many instances, avoid a trial altogether. Nonetheless, respondents note he was "was very fair about giving continuances" and never rushes through matters that warranted more attention.

Interviewees also felt that Judge Howard was highly diligent. Many commented that he was "always prepared" for court and that "he read everything." A few respondents mentioned that Judge Howard had an excellent memory and could recall very detailed facts of a case.

Judge Howard received exceptional praise for his judicial temperament. Many interviewees stated that he "never seemed to get upset" and that he was "very even keeled." This sentiment is echoed by other attorneys who stated that Judge Howard "treats everyone as they should be treated" and has a "perfect temperament." The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Michael Howlett – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Michael Howlett clerked in the Federal District Court in Chicago and in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. He worked for the U.S. Attorney's Office before entering private practice. He also served as counsel to Cook County State's Attorney Richard Devine. Judge Howlett served as an Associate Judge from 1983-86 and was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2005. He was elected to the bench in 2006, spending two years in the Juvenile Justice Division before moving into the Criminal Division. He currently sits in the Second Municipal District, hearing felony cases from the Criminal Division of the Circuit Court.

Attorneys praised Judge Howlett in all categories, including his legal ability, courtroom management skills, preparedness and diligence, integrity, temperament, and fairness. He is "up

to speed” on his cases and “isn’t afraid to ask questions.” He is also reported to “listen and stay focused,” remain “engaged” in the proceedings, and he “mak[es] sure everyone understands what’s going on in his courtroom. Judge Howlett is reported to be hard working and focused on the cases in front of him: he “cares about people and doing a good job.” Respondents noted that he is well-prepared for his call and well-versed in the law, rules and procedure.

Attorneys roundly praised his tone, judicial demeanor, diligence and integrity. Many attorneys focused on his integrity, temperament and fairness, giving him high marks in these areas. Respondents feel he has a good tone and demeanor while on the bench. Judge Howlett is described as “courteous and respectful” and lawyers repeatedly echoed the sentiment that “both sides get a fair shake” in front of him. He was uniformly praised for his fairness, judicial independence, and for being a “professional, a dignified man who is fair and respectful.” The Council finds him Well Qualified for retention.

Judge Moshe Jacobius – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Moshe Jacobius was with the Illinois Attorney General’s Office for his entire career. Judge Jacobius was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1991. He was first assigned to the Domestic Relations Division and then to the Chancery Division. In 2000, he was made Presiding Judge of the Domestic Relations Division, and presently serves as Presiding Judge of the Chancery Division.

Respondents report that Judge Jacobius knows the law and works hard. He is considered diligent by the vast majority of respondents. His courtroom is described as efficient and fair. Judge Jacobius is characterized as generally prepared for court with a good memory for his cases. He is called dignified and professional.

As presiding judge, Judge Jacobius handles the administration of the Chancery Division and hears motions and cases assigned to him. Respondents were complimentary and frequently remarked upon his honesty, integrity and knowledge of rules.

Judge Jacobius is highly regarded by attorneys and judges in both Domestic Relations and Chancery divisions. He is praised as a supervisor and as a mentor. The Council finds him Well Qualified for retention.

Judge Paul Karkula – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Paul Karkula worked as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender and as Corporation Counsel to the Town of Cicero. He was in private practice immediately before joining the bench. Judge Karkula was elected in 2000. He was initially assigned to the First Municipal District Traffic Center and subsequently transferred to the Chancery Division for the foreclosure call. Judge Karkula is presently assigned to the County Division.

Judge Karkula is considered fair and extremely diligent. Attorneys report that he remains even-tempered, even when there are contentious parties before him and also when his call is heavy. Respondents described the judge as very well organized, well prepared for court, and reliable. He

is called fair to all parties. He handles a sometimes emotional call with what is characterized as both good legal skill and temperament.

Much of his call is routine uncontested matters—such as name changes—but he is described as “quiet, efficient, and considerate in these proceedings.” Attorneys with experience before him in Chancery or on more complicated matters in County feel he has a good legal ability and an extensive knowledge of the property tax code. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Joseph Kazmierski – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Joseph Kazmierski served as an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney for his entire legal career and served as a supervisor in the Third Municipal District from 1988-1993. Judge

Kazmierski was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1994 and then elected the same year. He is currently assigned to the Criminal Division where he is a supervising judge.

Judge Kazmierski is generally considered to have very good legal ability, with most respondents reporting that he has a strong knowledge and understanding of the law. He is reported to “have case law at his fingertips” and he is described as an “excellent jurist,” “a credit to the judiciary,” and at “the top of the legal community.” Respondents say he has good courtroom management skills and runs an efficient, “very respectable” court call by all accounts.

He is described as prepared, organized, and willing to do his own research. He issues written opinions and is prompt in his rulings. He reportedly makes a good record. Judge Kazmierski drew praise for his work ethic, and judicial demeanor. Many survey respondents said he is fair and immune from external influences on his decision making. Overall, respondents feel he is an asset to the bench and a model jurist. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Robert Lopez Cepero – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Robert Lopez Cepero worked as a solo practitioner specializing in corporate and business law. Judge Lopez Cepero was appointed to the Cook County Circuit Court in 1994 and elected the same year. He was previously assigned to the First Municipal District, and both Misdemeanor and Felony Preliminary Hearing Courts. Judge Lopez Cepero currently sits in the Law Division.

Judge Lopez Cepero received generally good ratings from the respondents. Most attorneys interviewed believed he had strong legal ability and praised the Judge for giving clear explanations of his rulings.

Judge Lopez Cepero also received high marks for his diligence and his fairness. One attorney stated that diligence was “one of [Judge Lopez Cepero’s] best things.” Several interviewees also mentioned that this judge always “listened to both sides” and “gave everyone a fair shake.”

Attorneys generally find the judge to be knowledgeable and able to come to the right decision. His decisions are viewed as thoughtful and practitioners believe that Judge Lopez Cepero gives them adequate time to make their cases. He is also seen as very even-handed, showing no bias.

Some lawyers report that Judge Lopez Cepero is not always in sufficient command of the courtroom and can be short-tempered. Most say, however, that he is a solid, hard-working jurist. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Start Lubin – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Stuart Lubin was a career Assistant Cook County Public Defender. Judge Lubin was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1991 and elected in 1994. He currently serves in the Juvenile Justice Division.

Judge Lubin is regarded as an extraordinary jurist with excellent legal ability. His courtroom management praised as exceptional. He is efficient in the courtroom, but is praised for taking the time to communicate with the lawyers and litigants before him. Respondents characterize him as very diligent. He is praised for his integrity and fairness. He exhibits a low key demeanor but is reported to always be in control of his courtroom.

Respondents characterize Judge Lubin as a model judge and consider him an asset to the judiciary. The Council finds him Well Qualified for retention.

Judge Marvin Luckman – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Marvin Luckman worked as a Managing Attorney of the Criminal Traffic Division of the Chicago Transit Authority's Law Department. Judge Luckman was appointed in 1992 to the Circuit Court and elected in 2000. He is assigned to the First Municipal District.

Attorneys respect Judge Luckman and seem to enjoy practicing in front of him. He is considered to have excellent legal ability. His courtroom management is described as "on time" and "no nonsense." Respondents were very positive regarding his diligence, integrity and fairness, and were strongly supportive of him. Respondents had a generally favorable impression of his temperament and courtroom demeanor. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Marcia Maras – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Marcia Maras was in private practice. She also served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney and as General Counsel to the Cook County Assessor. Judge Maras was appointed in 1999 and elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal District before transfer to the County Division. She currently sits in the Law Division.

Judge Maras handles a hectic call of both routine case management and complex substantive matters. She is praised her for her courtroom management and manner. Several mentioned that the judge is prompt and keeps good notes on the cases. She is considered professional.

Judge Maras received praise for her courtroom management skills in particular, with one respondent noting “Judge Maras runs an efficient call, but, as is often not the norm, takes time to allow counsel to speak, and make a record if need be. She takes time to learn of the key issues and address them fairly.” Another respondent related an anecdote complimenting how Judge Maras dealt with an unprepared or possibly incompetent attorney, noting she was firm, but professional.

She is considered knowledgeable and up-to-date on black letter law. Judge Maras is characterized as a fair and competent jurist who runs her courtroom in a firm, efficient and attentive manner. She handles a routine, but hectic, call with what is described as professionalism and decorum. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge James McGing – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, James McGing was in private practice. He also served as an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney and as legal counsel to the Sheriff of Cook County. Judge McGing was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. He was initially assigned to Traffic Court in the First Municipal District, but has been transferred to Housing Court.

Judge McGing is in a limited courtroom, but there is a general sense from respondents that he has a good legal ability. He issues written opinions which are well-considered and readable. Comments from all sources describe him as well-prepared and efficient in a high-volume courtroom. Most respondents, as well as our court watchers, noted that he keeps notes on his cases and stays on top of the call, balancing the need to move quickly against the demands of fairness.

Comments from all sources praised him as calm and even-tempered, in a hectic courtroom. Several respondents felt the judge displayed an appropriate consideration of *pro se* litigants. Attorneys indicate that Judge McGing does his work diligently, with an even temper and patience, managing a heavy call with civility and efficiency. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Michael McHale – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Michael McHale served as a career Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney. Judge McHale was elected in 2006. He was initially assigned to the First Municipal District and transferred to the Domestic Violence Division in 2007. He is presently assigned to the Criminal Division as a floater judge, working on the Presiding Judge’s call, handling motions, hearings, expungements, trials on the sexually violent persons call, and other matters.

Judge McHale is often described as having a “full, comprehensive” legal knowledge and well-prepared for court. Some interviewees noted both that the judge has a solid understanding of the

law and that he is constantly improving. He is known to pass cases and do appropriate research the same day in order to understand issues and move cases efficiently. Respondents state he has a calm, respectful demeanor, but remains “quick and effective” at managing his call. Judge McHale is characterized as respectful of attorneys, defendants and court staff.

He is considered “fair” and “honest.” Judge McHale handles many *pro se* cases on the expungement call, and several interviewees noted his patience with the call and his ability to manage the hearings well. Judge McHale is considered to have an outstanding temperament, remarkable patience and an excellent work ethic. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Joyce M. Murphy Gorman – Not Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Joyce M. Murphy Gorman worked with the Office of the Presiding Judge of the Sixth Municipal District in Markham for four years. Judge Murphy Gorman then worked as a sole practitioner for one year immediately before being elected to the bench. Judge Murphy Gorman was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal District’s Traffic Court. In 2002, Judge Murphy Gorman was assigned to the Civil Trial Section, non-jury call where she presently presides.

Judge Murphy Gorman was described by most respondents as knowledgeable about the law. Attorneys say she takes the time to understand the issues and respondents reported that she keeps current on developments in the law relevant to the cases heard in her courtroom. There were several respondents who praised her for using her courtroom mediators effectively. The judge is described as punctual and prepared for court and she issues her rulings in a prompt, timely manner. She is considered fair and independent.

Judge Murphy Gorman’s courtroom management skills were given generally favorable marks. Several interviewees stated that she always started her call on time and did not “dilly dally.” Others mentioned how she worked to accommodate attorneys with multiple cases in order to keep the call moving.

Many interviewees stated that Judge Murphy Gorman was diligent. Most attorneys believed she was “always engaged” and “interested in doing a good job.” She also “allowed each side to make their case.” Judge Murphy Gorman was also repeatedly praised for her handling of *pro se* litigants. Respondents said that she explains things well to *pro se* litigants “while remaining even-handed.”

However, many respondents believed that Judge Murphy Gorman needs to improve her judicial temperament. Comments included: “could be calmer;” “she can be short with people;” “she lets lawyers get under her skin;” “she is short and testy with people in her courtroom.” The Council found Judge Murphy Gorman Not Qualified for retention in 2006 due primarily to reported problems with her temperament. We continue to hear these complaints. On balance, the Council finds her Not Qualified for retention.

Judge James Patrick Murphy – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, James Patrick Murphy served as an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney. Judge Murphy was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. He is assigned to the First Municipal District, Domestic Violence Division.

Judge Murphy received consistently high marks in all areas surveyed. Respondents believe that he knows the law and that his opinions are well-reasoned and “expressed cogently.” He is also seen as very diligent. Respondents stated that he “always reads the pleadings prior to oral arguments,” and “listens to both sides.”

He was also highly praised for his courtroom management. Several of the interviewees stated that Judge Murphy “kept the call moving.” One attorney even stated that this judge was “one of the best I’ve seen in Cook County” when asked about this judge’s courtroom management skills.

Repeatedly, the respondents stated that this judge was always “very respectful” of everyone who appeared before him. He is viewed as “professional” and “patient.” Judge Murphy is also viewed as a very fair judge whose integrity is beyond reproach. Several of the attorneys interviewed described this judge as “fair” and “even.” A few interviewees also mentioned how well this judge handles *pro se* litigants. He is said to treat them respectfully and give them a fair shot.

Judge Murphy is described as smart and respectful in the courtroom. He is reported to have good leadership skills and presently serves as a mentor to other judges. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Thomas W. Murphy – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Thomas W. Murphy was in private practice and a City of Chicago Alderman. Judge Murphy was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. He was first assigned to the First Municipal Division, and transferred to the Fifth Municipal District in 2008.

Judge Murphy is praised for his professional temperament and his fairness. He “knows how to get things done” and is prepared. He is praised for his courtroom management. Judge Murphy appears to have earned the respect of the attorneys surveyed.

Several respondents also noted that Judge Murphy is particularly adept at handling *pro se* litigants and at handling conflicts in his courtroom. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Marya Nega – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Marya Nega was the Principal Assistant Attorney with the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. Judge Nega was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal District. In 1995, Judge

Nega was assigned to the Domestic Relations Division where she is currently a preliminary judge handling Calendar E.

Respondents describe Judge Nega's legal ability as excellent, with many interviewees stating that she has a very "in depth knowledge" of the statutes in Domestic Relations. Several respondents also remarked very favorably regarding Judge Nega's "common sense approach" to applying the law. She is known to describe her rulings logically.

The interviewees also believed she does an excellent job managing her courtroom. Several mentioned that Judge Nega always started on time and had a system in place to ensure that all cases were heard in a timely manner. One interviewee stated that "she will skip lunch if it's a really busy day" in order to get through her call.

Judge Nega was also repeatedly praised for her diligence and attention to detail. Several respondents stated that she always reads everything prior to the hearing and that she is "always fully engaged." One interviewee stated that "she had a memory like a steel trap," and "always knows what is going on." Many attorneys remarked that Judge Nega was also very organized. Judge Nega's temperament and fairness received particularly high praise from almost all of the respondents. The Council finds her Well Qualified for retention.

Judge P. Scott Neville – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, P. Scott Neville was an Administrative Law Judge with the Illinois Department of Income Security, was in private practice, and worked with Chicago Transit Authority. Judge Neville was appointed as a Circuit Court judge in 1999. He served in Traffic Court and Housing Court before being appointed to the Appellate Court in 2004. He was elected to the Appellate Court in 2012.

Judge Neville is regarded as an experienced and intelligent jurist. Before joining the Appellate Court, he had a reputation for being impartial and sensitive to issues of bias. He is considered diligent and hard-working. He is engaged in arguments before the court and prepared with questions for counsel. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Joan Margaret O'Brien – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Joan Margaret O'Brien was a career prosecutor with the Cook County State's Attorney's Office. Judge O'Brien was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. She was initially assigned to the Child Protection Division and presently serves in the Fifth Municipal District.

Respondents describe Judge O'Brien as having a good demeanor and better than average courtroom management skills. She is said to comport herself well and keep her courtroom on schedule and in order. Attorneys report that Judge O'Brien is prepared for court and, for the most part, had no complaints about her overall legal ability. She is called "pleasant and knowledgeable."

Many respondents noted that Judge O'Brien takes care to explain her decisions. Most respondents say she is a solid judge with good temperament and ability to move her call efficiently.

However, Judge O'Brien has a reputation among some lawyers as being inappropriately prosecution-oriented. Some respondents believe that defendants are at a disadvantage in her courtroom. These respondents say she is considered overly harsh in her sentencing and more accommodating to prosecutors' motions than defense motions. In general, though, Judge O'Brien is considered to be a good judge with very good temperament and courtroom management skills. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Patrick W. O'Brien – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Patrick W. O'Brien served both as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney and as an Assistant Illinois Attorney General. Patrick O'Brien was in private practice and served as Hearing Officer for the Mayor's Licensing Commission immediately prior to election. Judge O'Brien was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006 and has been assigned to the First Municipal District.

Judge O'Brien was the lead prosecutor in a case that led to an exoneration lawsuit, *Ollins, et. al v. O'Brien et al*, Case No. 03 C 5795, filed in the Northern District federal court . The case was dismissed as to Judge O'Brien in March 2005 (2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7225).

The defendants were freed in 2002, after being pardoned by then Governor George Ryan, and subsequently filed a civil rights action against the lab technician and the prosecutors involved in the criminal case. The suit alleged malicious prosecution, false imprisonment, and conspiracy, and was ultimately dismissed against all parties.

The Council concludes that this situation does not affect Judge O'Brien's qualifications to be a judge.

Respondents considered Judge O'Brien "knowledgeable" and described his legal ability as "terrific," "satisfactory" and "competent". He is described as "courteous," "in control" and "efficient." Judge O'Brien has what is characterized as a mild, low-key manner that is both professional and respectful. He is reported to be appropriately solicitous of *pro se* litigants. Respondents generally felt the courtroom was a level playing field where everyone is treated the same.

Respondents say that Judge O'Brien is well prepared for court and that he seems to have read filings and analyzed the issues prior to hearing. He is described as "methodical and gets to the point." Respondents say that he displays good ability to control the courtroom in high volume calls. He is especially praised for his ability to communicate with *pro se* litigants and to adequately advise them of their rights. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Ramon Ocasio III – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Ramon Ocasio III served as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender and as a Supervisor in the Cook County Public Defender's Office. He also worked in the Illinois Attorney General's Regional Consumer Fraud Office in Chicago. Judge Ocasio was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006 and assigned to the Bond Court rotation in the First Municipal District, where he currently sits.

The majority of responses indicate that Judge Ocasio has a good grasp of the applicable law. Judge Ocasio is viewed by a number of respondents as having a strong legal ability and as very diligent. Many interviewees mentioned that this judge did his own research and pulled his own cases. Many of the defense attorneys also stated that this judge "took time with every person who appeared before him," in order to make the best possible decision in regards to their bond.

Many respondents also believed Judge Ocasio had high integrity and that he was very fair. They often stated that he was "very professional" and did "nothing improper." One of the attorneys interviewed also stated that this judge "treats all of the defendants the same" and does not show bias. Judge Ocasio is reported to speak in Spanish to some defendants where appropriate to make sure that they understand everything. He is praised for judicial temperament, which is characterized as very low-key but effective.

There seems to be a conflict in respondents' assessment of Judge Ocasio, particularly because many prosecutors believe defendants are at an advantage in Judge Ocasio's courtroom. Some say he improperly sets cash bonds in burglaries and other nondrug felony cases without articulating an appropriate reason for doing so. Defense counsel, however, report that bonds are set correctly and that the judge makes sure the defendants understand their rights and the proceedings. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Stuart Palmer – Well Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Stuart Palmer was an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney and served in the Felony Trial Division. Judge Palmer was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. He was assigned to the Criminal Division until 2005 when he was transferred to the Chancery Division. Judge Palmer was assigned to the Appellate Court of Illinois by the Illinois Supreme Court effective January 6, 2012. He is seeking retention as a Circuit Judge.

Most respondents felt Judge Palmer had a strong legal ability. He "makes firm decisions and knows law" and "he processes [information] quickly and comes to sensible decisions." He is considered courteous. Many remarked that he controls his docket and treats everyone equally and with dignity. He is often described as a "solid and fair jurist." Judge Palmer was very recently elevated to the Appellate Court. His performance as a Circuit Court judge indicates a strong legal ability and a judicial temperament. The Council finds him Well Qualified for retention.

Judge Lee Preston -- Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Lee Preston was primarily in private practice. Judge Preston was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. He was assigned to the Child Protection Division until 1997, when he transferred to the Law Division. He became a Supervising Judge in the Law Division in 2005.

Respondents were generally positive with regard to their experiences practicing before Judge Preston. Judge Preston is often characterized as “smart” with a strong grasp of the law. He is characterized as analytic, courteous and professional. Judge Preston is considered fair and impartial. Judge Preston brings years of experience to the bench and is generally well-regarded as a smart and capable jurist.

However, some respondents raised concerns about the speed with which cases move through Judge Preston’s courtroom and his diligence in managing the cases before him. These respondents complain that he can be slow to rule, and sometimes sets unnecessarily long briefing schedules. The Council found Judge Preston Not Qualified for retention in 2006 due to reports related to problems with courtroom management. The Council notes that there seems to have been improvement in this regard, and that respondents report generally that Judge Preston is a good jurist. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Mary Colleen Roberts – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Mary Colleen Roberts was a social worker and then served as an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney. She has also served as a hearing officer for the Cook County Circuit Court and an Assistant Corporation Counsel for the City of Chicago in the Law Department. Judge Roberts was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. She has served in the Municipal and Juvenile Divisions, and is presently sitting in the Criminal Division.

Judge Mary Colleen Roberts received praise for all aspects of her judicial performance. She is described as “smart” and “hard working,” a judge who tries to do the right thing. She is characterized as “even keeled,” “professional” and “pleasant.” Her court call is considered well-managed. Judge Roberts is well-respected both as a practitioner before becoming a judge and as a jurist – particularly in the Juvenile Justice Division. She is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Thomas Roti – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Thomas David Roti was in private practice, and became General Counsel for Dominick’s Finer Foods, Inc. Judge Roti was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000. He has been assigned to the Third Municipal District since taking the bench and currently hears Municipal and Law Division trials – both jury and bench – and supervises the Mandatory Arbitration Program in the Third District.

Respondents were uniformly positive with regard to their experiences practicing before Judge Roti. Respondents described him as knowledgeable, a “quality judge” and one noted that “what

he does not know, he researches.” He is said to use proffered briefs on legal issues effectively. One respondent said that he is “acutely aware of the law and continues to learn on the job.” His courtroom management is considered effective, swift and organized. He is noted for valuing settlement and working diligently to promote and reach settlement.

Judge Roti is considered fair and even-tempered. More than one respondent said they don’t mind losing in his courtroom because they know Judge Roti is fair. Judge Roti is managing his duties effectively and efficiently. He shows appropriate temperament and diligence in his work. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Lisa Ruble Murphy – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Lisa Ruble Murphy was Deputy Chief Administration Officer for the Chicago City Council’s Committee on Finance. Judge Ruble Murphy was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994. Judge Ruble Murphy was initially assigned to the First Municipal District of the Cook County Circuit Court. In January 1995, she was assigned to the Domestic Relations Division, where she currently serves.

Many respondents praised Judge Ruble Murphy as a judge, but a significant number of respondents report concerns about her performance. For instance, while lawyers reported that Judge Ruble Murphy gives a fair trial, there were complaints that she sometimes pushes too hard to discourage parties from going to trial, even where the parties have clear and irreconcilable difficulties. Some of the attorneys interviewed also reported that she is often late in starting her call. However, Judge Ruble Murphy is considered to be a smart, solid jurist. On balance, the Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Drella Savage – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Drella Savage was in private practice and served as an election law attorney for the City of Chicago. Judge Savage was elected in 1994. She was initially assigned to the Child Support Enforcement Division, and transferred to the Law Division in 2009.

Judge Savage is considered prompt and polite by most respondents. Respondents report that “she runs a tight ship” and both the judge and her staff drew compliments for the management of the courtroom. The majority of respondents believe she has a good legal ability. Judge Savage displays common sense and an even temper, according to most respondents.

Judge Savage is characterized as a competent judge who runs an efficient courtroom. She appears to approach her responsibilities with diligence and an appropriate demeanor. She is relatively new to the Law Division, but respondents indicate that while there was an initial learning curve, she is learning the law and applying it appropriately. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Colleen Sheehan – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Colleen Sheehan served for four years as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender. She also worked as a hearing officer for Chicago’s Administrative Hearing Department, and was in private practice. Judge Sheehan was elected to the Circuit Court in 2000 and was assigned to the First Municipal District, Domestic Violence Division. She currently presides over a Juvenile Court call.

Judge Sheehan is considered to have a good legal ability, with a firm grasp of the law and procedure underlying her present juvenile court practice. She is described as “probing,” “thoughtful” and “smart,” with strong command of the rules of evidence and procedure. Her judicial diligence was applauded as well, with many interviewees stating that she was “prepared,” “detail oriented,” and “up to speed.”

Her integrity, temperament and fairness all received high marks; many practitioners applauded her patience, particularly with parents and juveniles who required more than one advisement. Her temperament “really stands out,” “she treats everyone well, it’s great to see,” and gets “highest marks” for her tone and demeanor. Some practitioners noted a positive improvement over the years in her temperament relating to parents of juvenile defendants. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Diane Shelley – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Diane Shelley was in private practice. She also served as a hearing officer for the City of Chicago Department of Revenue. She was the Head Assistant Attorney for the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Greater Chicago. Judge Shelley was elected to the Circuit Court in 2006. She was initially assigned to the Domestic Violence Division, and transferred to the First Municipal District in January 2010.

Respondents generally had a positive opinion of Judge Shelley, considering her “effective, efficient and professional.” She is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. She appears to be handling her cases in a timely and professional fashion. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge James Smith – Qualified (retention to the Illinois Appellate Court)

Prior to becoming a judge, James Smith as an Assistant Corporation Counsel of Chicago and City Attorney and City Prosecutor of Des Plaines. Judge Smith was appointed to the Circuit Court of Cook County in 1989 and elected in 1994. He was elected to the Appellate Court in 2002.

Judge Smith is well-prepared and mild-mannered on the bench. Attorneys with experience before Judge Smith note that he has a good reputation among appellate attorneys and is known for asking good questions during argument. He is a well-respected appellate justice. His opinions are well reasoned and well written. He is good on oral argument and is well respected within the

appellate circle. He was criticized in the past for his temperament as a trial judge, but has received nothing but praise as an appellate judge.

Judge Smith is praised for his advocacy of the Settlement Committee. He receives praise for settling cases and for the quality of his opinions. The Council finds him Qualified for retention to the Illinois Appellate Court.

Judge James M. Varga – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, James M. Varga was a supervisor in the Medical Litigation Division of the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, as well as a felony prosecutor. Mr. Varga also spent some time in private practice. Judge Varga was elected to the Circuit Court in 1994 and was initially assigned to the First Municipal District. He moved to the Law Division in 1995 and has served there since.

Responses indicate that Judge Varga puts considerable thought and effort into his judicial duties. He is generally regarded as diligent and knowledgeable. Judge Varga reports that he authors articles and lectures on issues of juries and verdicts. He is singled out for praise by respondents for his handling of jury selections. Respondents believe that his manner of organizing issues identified for trial prior to jury selection is helpful to both sides of the case.

Judge Varga is considered hard-working, with good legal ability and a commitment to doing his own research where necessary. Attorneys also noted that Judge Varga appears to consult with other judges in his division where appropriate or necessary. He is known to run a well-functioning courtroom and is known to be diligent and hard-working.

However, some lawyers report that Judge Varga has temperament issues. There is no suggestion that Judge Varga is biased or disfavors particular groups in his courtroom; rather, his temper is characterized as unpredictable and directed at attorneys, witnesses and litigants alike. It is of particular concern that Judge Varga does not limit his outbursts when witnesses and jurors are present. The Council notes that Judge Varga has reported to the Council that he is taking action to remedy his difficulties with temperament. On balance, the Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Carl Anthony Walker – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Carl Anthony Walker was in private practice and worked as an Administrative Hearing Officer for the City of Chicago. Judge Walker was appointed and then elected to the Circuit Court of Cook County in 2006. He initially sat in the First Municipal District and was transferred to the Juvenile Division in 2009.

Interviewees generally had a favorable impression of Judge Walker. His respectful demeanor and investment in the welfare of the juveniles was noted by everyone. He is said to bring good insight to the bench, treating juvenile defendants as individuals. One attorney described him as "honest and conscious of his role in protecting the integrity of the court."

The judge is described as aware of what's going on with the children and concerned about parental involvement. He is "mild-mannered," fair and predictable. "He is good at diffusing situations especially with bad family and parenting issues" and respectful of everyone in his courtroom. All three electronic survey respondents remarked on his patience, compassion, and courtesy to everyone in his courtroom. Judge Walker is considered to be knowledgeable, and respondents believe Judge Walker brings sufficient legal ability and impressive compassion to the Juvenile Division. He is characterized hard-working and very engaged in his cases. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Richard Walsh – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Richard Walsh was a law clerk in the U.S. District Court and a solo practitioner. He has also served as a Staff Attorney in the Federal Defender Program and a Hearing Officer for the Illinois Racing Board. Judge Walsh was elected to the bench in November, 1994. He was initially assigned to the First Municipal Division. Judge Walsh was transferred to the Juvenile Justice Division, where he currently sits.

Judge Walsh was praised for his legal ability. Practitioners noted his strong command of the procedure, evidence, and case law: "it is clear he is keeping up with the law," and "he can analyze a case very quickly and he knows what he is doing." Additionally, some noted with appreciation that he "is clearly up to date on the case law." Judge Walsh reportedly shares recent case law and updates on the status of the law with the practitioners appearing in front of him. He is generally considered a respected jurist. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

Judge Camille Willis – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Camille Willis clerked for the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, and served as an attorney with the Chicago Board of Education from 1986 to 1994. Judge Willis was appointed to the Circuit Court of Cook County in 1995 and elected in 2000. She was initially assigned to the First Municipal District and then to the Child Protection Division. In 1998, Judge Willis was transferred to the Sixth Municipal District, where she currently sits.

Judge Willis is praised for diligently handling a large docket often consisting of a large number of *pro se* litigants and for doing so competently. She is described as taking the time necessary to ensure that individuals in her court understand the proceedings. Practitioners appreciate her demeanor and tone, describing her as "humorous and respectful," "polite and patient," as well as "respectful and professional." Her judicial integrity was unquestioned, and practitioners clearly hold Judge Willis' ethics in high regard. Survey respondents stated that she was ethically beyond reproach, often going to great lengths to avoid the appearance of impropriety. The Council finds her Qualified for retention.

Judge Kenneth Wright – Qualified

Prior to becoming a judge, Kenneth Wright was in private practice as a sole practitioner. He is a former teacher and Associate Dean of the Joliet Junior College. Kenneth Wright was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1994 and elected the same year. He was initially assigned to the Municipal

Division and later was transferred to the Probate Division. He presently serves as presiding judge of the First Municipal District.

Judge Wright received positive marks from practitioners in all categories with very few criticisms of his judicial performance. He is described as a “good lawyer” “who takes an interest in his cases” and “is well-versed in the law.” Respondents believe he moves through his call efficiently and is respectful of the practitioners appearing in front of him. Judge Wright is described as having a good, calm demeanor and purportedly “treats everyone with respect.”

As Presiding Judge of the First Municipal District, Judge Wright is responsible for overseeing the judicial schedule and has worked with the City of Chicago on improvements to the eviction call. Judge Wright has been active in promoting the center for conflict resolution, which has increased the efficiency of the First Municipal District by allowing easier cases to be resolved through mediation. He has also initiated a steering committee on which attorneys, clerks, judges, and the Sheriff worked together to streamline the special process server function. Many respondents praise his leadership.

Respondents say that Judge Wright was well-respected when he had a full-time call in the Probate Division. He was praised for his temperament and courtroom management. The Council finds him Qualified for retention.

**Judicial Candidates Seeking to Fill Judicial Vacancies
in the November 2012 General Election**

Supreme Court – First District, Hon. Thomas R. Fitzgerald Vacancy

Justice Mary Jane Theis – Highly Qualified (Democrat)

Justice Mary Jane Theis was appointed to the Illinois Supreme Court in 2010. She was elected as an Associate Judge in 1983 and was elected to the Circuit Court in 1988. In the Circuit Court of Cook County, Justice Theis was assigned to the Chancery Division in 1993, and from 1988 to 1993 she was assigned to the Criminal Division. From 1983 to 1987, she served in the First Municipal District. Before taking the bench she served as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender. Justice Theis has taught at Loyola University of Chicago School of Law, Northwestern University School of Law, and John Marshall Law School. She was the author of “Recent amendment to Supreme Court Rule 304(b) and its impact on family law cases,” and Editor in Chief of “The Benchbook Project.” Justice Theis has received the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Illinois Judges Association, Catholic Lawyer of the Year from the Catholic Lawyers Guild, Celtic Lawyer of the Year from the Celtic Lawyers Society of Chicago, Mary Heftel Hooton Award from the Women’s Bar Association of Illinois, and the Access to Justice Award from the Illinois State Bar Association.

Judge Theis is considered to have outstanding legal ability and has received accolades from her judicial performance in a variety of trial court arenas, in the Appellate Court, and as an appointed Supreme Court Justice. She is praised as a scholar who both teaches and publishes. Her integrity is unquestioned, and she has an excellent temperament. She was patient as both a trial judge and an appellate judge. She is fair and even-handed to all parties appearing before her. She is also praised for being exceptionally hard-working and for opinions that are well-reasoned and well-written. The Council finds her Highly Qualified for the Illinois Supreme Court.

Judge James G. Riley – Not Qualified (Republican)

Judge James G. Riley was elected to the Circuit Court in 1996 and currently sits in the Probate Division. He has been in this Division for most of his judicial career. He was in private practice before being elected to the bench. He teaches at the John Marshall Law School.

He is regarded as being knowledgeable about the law and a good problem-solver. He listens to all parties before him and is praised for his even-temperament, integrity and decisiveness. The Council, however, is concerned that his judicial experience has been narrow and we are unaware of scholarly works that he has published. He has demonstrated skills that make him a good Circuit Judge but a Supreme Court justice requires a broader understanding of the law. The Council finds him Not Qualified for the Supreme Court.

Appellate Court – First District, Hon. Robert Cahill Vacancy

Judge Mathias Delort – Well Qualified

Judge Mathias Delort was elected as an Associate Judge in 2007. From 1998 to 2007, Judge Delort was an Associate and Shareholder practicing Local Government, Education and Election Law at Robbins Schwartz et al. From 1988 to 1998 he was an Associate and Partner at Odelson & Sterk Ltd., and from 1985 to 1988 he worked as a sole practitioner with a general practice. Judge Delort is currently assigned to the Circuit Court of Cook County, Chancery Division, Mortgage Foreclosure/Mechanics Lien Section, and presides over Calendar 61. He has served in the Section since May 2007. He is a primary author of the benchbook for judges in the foreclosure call. He is also the author of several IICLE chapters for lawyers.

As a practitioner, Judge Delort has extensive experience in municipal and election law at the trial and appellate court levels. He was well-respected as an able and well-prepared practitioner with good legal ability and temperament. As a jurist, he reportedly listens well and responds clearly and decisively. He is respected for his knowledge of the law and for his excellent temperament. He issues written opinions which he posts to Westlaw. He continues to write and lecture extensively. The Council finds Judge Delort Well Qualified for the Appellate Court.

Appellate Court – First District, Hon. Sharon Johnson Coleman Vacancy

Hon. Nathaniel Howse, Jr. – Qualified

Judge Nathaniel Howse, Jr. was appointed to the Illinois Appellate Court in 2009. He was elected to the Circuit Court in 1998. Prior to assuming the bench, he practiced about 22 years in small law firms and as a sole practitioner. He is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. As a trial judge, he was praised for his courtroom management skills and for being knowledgeable about the variety of subjects involved in his court call, including election law, mental health adjudications, and tax deeds. He is considered to be a very good jurist and is praised for the quality of his written opinions. The Council finds him Qualified for the Appellate Court.

Appellate Court – First District, Hon. Michael J. Gallagher Vacancy

Judge P. Scott Neville – Qualified

Judge P. Scott Neville was appointed to the Illinois Appellate Court, First District, by the Illinois Supreme Court on June 11, 2004. He was appointed to the Circuit Court in 1999 and was elected to the bench in 2000. He had extensive litigation experience in both civil and criminal law matters before becoming a judge. He was reported to be a good trial judge before his appointment to the Appellate Court. Judge Neville has taught at the University of Chicago as an Annual Participant as a Judge and Lecturer from 1999 to present. He also was a Lecturer at Loyola School of Law from 2008-2011.

Judge Neville is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. He is reported to always well-prepared and he is praised for his questioning during oral argument and for his written opinions. The Council finds him Qualified for the Appellate Court.

Appellate Court – First District, Hon. Sheila M. O’Brien Vacancy

Judge Jesse G. Reyes – Qualified

Judge Jesse G. Reyes was elected as an Associate Judge in 1997. He currently sits in the Chancery Division hearing mortgage foreclosure matters. From 1995-1997, Judge Reyes worked as an Assistant Attorney at the Chicago Board of Education specializing in Civil Litigation, and from 1985 to 1995 he served as a Senior Supervising Attorney specializing in civil litigation at the City of Chicago Law Department, Torts Division. He was in private practice from 1984 to 1985. Judge Reyes has taught at the John Marshall Law School as a lecturer. He has written a Chapter on Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure Law and articles in the Women’s Bar Association of Illinois Newsletter. Judge Reyes is exceptionally active in community service. Judge Reyes is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. He is praised for his courtroom management skills. He is always well-prepared and his rulings are often described as clear and well-reasoned. The Council finds him Qualified for the Appellate Court.

Appellate Court – First District, Hon. Mary Jane Theis Vacancy

Judge Maureen E. Connors – Well Qualified

Judge Maureen E. Connors was appointed to the Illinois Appellate Court in 2010. She became an Associate Judge in 1988 and was elected to the bench in 1994. She was in private practice before taking the bench. She was an assistant general attorney at the Chicago Park District from 1983 to 1988 and was an attorney with Klafter & Burke from 1979 to 1985.

Judge Connors receives high praise both as an Appellate Court judge and as a trial jurist. She is praised for her knowledge of the law. She asks pointed questions during oral argument and her opinions are praised as well-reasoned and well-written. She was praised for her temperament as a trial judge and her ability to manage her courtroom. She gave ample time for parties before her to argue their cases and then made prompt rulings. The Council finds her Well Qualified for the Appellate Court.

Appellate Court – First District, Hon. John P. Tully Vacancy

Judge Terrence J. Lavin – Qualified

Judge Terrence J. Lavin was appointed to the Illinois Appellate Court by the Illinois Supreme Court in 2010. From 1983 to 2009 Judge Lavin was in private practice. He has substantial litigation experience in medical malpractice and personal injury matters. He has taught trial advocacy as an Adjunct Professor at Chicago-Kent College of Law, and has written several published articles. He is active in community service. Judge Lavin was considered to be a good practitioner with good legal ability and temperament. As an appellate judge, he is

reported to be well-prepared. His opinions are considered well-reasoned. The Council finds him Qualified for the Appellate Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Claudia G. Conlon Vacancy

Karen Lynn O'Malley – Qualified

Karen Lynn O'Malley was admitted to practice in Illinois in 1992. Since 2008, she has been in private practice doing personal injury litigation. From 1992 to 2008, she served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney. Between 2003 and 2008, she served as a deputy supervisor in the Child Advocacy Division of the Cook County State's Attorney's Office. She has taught trial practice at Northwestern University School of Law.

She is considered to have good legal ability with a wide range of litigation experience in civil and criminal law matters. She is reported to have a good temperament and is praised for being hard-working and fair in her professional dealings. Respondents knowing her through both civil and criminal law matters praise her for being able to learn new areas of law quickly and thoroughly. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Daniel E. Jordan Vacancy

Judge Jean Prendergast Rooney – Well Qualified

Judge Jean Prendergast Rooney was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2010. From 1997 to 2009 she was in private practice doing civil litigation and appeals. From 1996 to 1997 she was a law clerk for Illinois Supreme Court Justice Justice Mary Ann McMorrow and from 1994 to 1996, she clerked for then Illinois Appellate Court Judge Mary Jane Theis. Judge Rooney is currently assigned to the Chancery Division of the Circuit Court of Cook County. She has authored six publications published in the ISBA Illinois Lawyer Now Weekly. She is the past president of the Illinois Appellate Lawyers Association.

Judge Rooney, as a lawyer, had substantial litigation experience in complex matters. She is considered to have very good legal ability and was reportedly always well-prepared both as a practitioner and as a judge. She has an excellent temperament and reportedly communicates clearly to all parties before her while doing a good job of managing her call. All respondents reported that Judge Rooney produced well-reasoned opinions and rulings. The Council finds her Well Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Dorothy Kirie Kinnaird Vacancy

Judge Erica L. Reddick – Qualified

Judge Erica L. Reddick was admitted to practice in 1991. She was appointed to the Circuit Court by the Illinois Supreme Court in 2010. Prior to being appointed, Judge Reddick was an Acting Chief Assistant Cook County Public Defender. She has spent her career with the Office of the Cook County Public Defender. As a lawyer, Judge Reddick was considered to have good legal ability. She had a wide range of experience in criminal law matters and was praised

for her litigation skills. She serves as an adjunct professor at Loyola University Chicago School of Law. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. John J. Moran Vacancy

Russell William Hartigan – Qualified

Russell William Hartigan was admitted to practice in 1976. He has been in private practice throughout his career with extensive personal injury litigation experience. He reports acting as lead counsel in 45 civil jury trials and in numerous arbitrations. He has personally handled fifteen cases as principal appellate counsel and argued orally eight of these in the U.S. Court of Appeals, the Illinois Appellate Court, and the Illinois Supreme Court. He is active in bar association activities, and currently is on the Illinois State Bar Association Board of Governors. He has published articles on civil practice matters and is active in community affairs. Mr. Hartigan is reported to have good legal ability and a very good temperament. He is praised as a hard-working, conscientious, and knowledgeable practitioner. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Donald J. O'Brien, Jr. Vacancy

Cynthia Ramirez – Qualified

Cynthia Ramirez has been practicing law since 1990. Following her admission to the bar, Ms. Ramirez served as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender from 1990 to 1995, left the Office for private practice in 1996 to 1997, and returned to the Public Defender's Office from 1997 to 1998. She has served as an administrative law judge with the Illinois Department of Human Services, and is currently an administrative law judge with the Illinois Department of Public Health. Ms. Ramirez is considered to have good legal ability, and is praised as an administrative law judge for her temperament and legal skills. She acquired first-hand litigation and courtroom experience both as an Assistant Public Defender and as a private practitioner. The Council finds her Qualified.

Circuit Court, Hon. Margaret O'Mara Frossard Vacancy

Diann K. Marsalek – Not Qualified

Diann Marsalek was admitted to practice in 1989. She spent 16 years in the Illinois Attorney General's office doing litigation primarily for the Illinois Department of Corrections (DOC). Her initial 13 years in practice were primarily spent defending Section 1983 cases against the DOC in federal court, though she did also have some limited litigation experience in state court during this period. Her final three years in the AG's office were spent as a "facilitator" for litigation involving the DOC and as a policy advisor concerning litigation and legislation. Ms. Marsalek is reported to have good legal ability and temperament. The Council is concerned, however, that most of her litigation experience was earlier in her career and was in federal court. The Council finds her Not Qualified to serve in the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Aurelia Pucinski Vacancy

Judge Lorna Propes – Well Qualified

Judge Lorna Propes was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2010. She was admitted to practice in 1975. Before becoming a judge, she was a partner in the firm of Propes & Kaveny LLC. She served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney between 1975 and 1980. She has been in private practice since 1980, concentrating on medical malpractice, product liability, and personal injury litigation. Judge Propes was considered to be an excellent trial attorney with substantial experience in more complex litigation matters. She brings to the bench a knowledge of both civil and criminal law. She has a good temperament and has been active in community service activities. The Council finds her Well Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Henry R. Simmons, Jr. Vacancy

Jessica Arong O'Brien - Qualified

Jessica Arong O'Brien was admitted to practice in 1998. She received an LLM degree in 2002. She is currently a litigator with the Illinois Department of Revenue where she litigates income and sales tax cases and serves as an arbiter of facts and law for non-hearing cases. From 1998 to 2000 she served as an associate with Schuyler Roche & Crisham. She has been with the Illinois Department of Revenue since 2000. Before becoming a lawyer, Ms. O'Brien had a career in the hotel service industry. She is an active participant in bar association work and has an excellent record in community service.

Ms. O'Brien is considered to be a bright and hard-working lawyer. She has no jury trial experience as part of her employment, but recently volunteered to second chair a jury trial. She has extensive experience in evidentiary hearings before administrative hearing officers in proceedings that are similar to bench trials conducted in the Circuit Court of Cook County. The Council is concerned that Ms. O'Brien's legal experience is narrow and that she has been a lawyer for a relatively short period of time.

She does, however, have substantial litigation experience and enjoys a reputation as a smart lawyer with a professional demeanor. On balance, the Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Victoria A. Stewart Vacancy

Judge Pamela M. Leeming – Qualified

Judge Pamela M. Leeming was appointed to the bench in 2009 by the Illinois Supreme Court. She ran for election in the 2010 primary and was defeated. The Council found her Qualified for recall by the Illinois Supreme Court. Before being appointed to the bench she served an Assistant Cook County Public Defender since her admission to practice in 1990. She concentrated her practice in the areas of paternity, criminal misdemeanor, preliminary hearings, a variety of other pre- and post-trial matters, and appeals. As both a lawyer and as a judge, she is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. The Council was concerned that as a lawyer she lacked breadth and depth in her legal experience, as well as an absence of sufficient

experience in more complex litigation matters. As a judge she receives good marks for her temperament and ability to control a courtroom. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. Paul Stalka Vacancy

Michael Mullen – Well Qualified

Michael Mullen was admitted to practice in Illinois in 1981. He currently works as a partner at Paul B. Episcope LLC specializing in personal injury litigation. From 1991 to 1998, Mr. Mullen was a partner at Mullen & Minella. While in private practice, he concentrated his law practice on personal injury cases and more specifically on cases that involved catastrophic personal injuries caused by medical negligence and product liability. From 1985 to 1991, he served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney where he was the Deputy Chief of the Criminal Division, and from 1982-1985 he worked as an Assistant Illinois Attorney General. Mr. Mullen has personally handled 20 cases as principal counsel on appeal and has orally argued 15 cases. He has authored a number of continuing education articles. From 2006 to present, Mr. Mullen has been a Chairman for the Board of Fire and Police Commission at the Village of Western Springs, and has also participated in CURE, a charitable organization designed to provide medical and dental services to the community.

Mr. Mullen is highly regarded as a very experienced trial lawyer with substantial experience in both civil and criminal law matters. He has experience as an appellate lawyer, as well. He is considered to have very good legal ability and his knowledge of his areas of law is regarded uniformly as excellent. He has a good temperament and is described by respondents generally as low key, effective as an advocate, and fair in his professional dealings. The Council finds him Well Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Hon. John A. Ward Vacancy

Elizabeth Mary Hayes – Not Qualified

Elizabeth Mary Hayes was admitted to practice in 1986. In 2010 she became an Assistant Cook County Public Defender involved in misdemeanor matters. From 1994 to 2007 she was a Hearing Officer in the Child Protection Division. From 2007 to 2010 she worked in the Child Protection Division as a court coordinator. She was a staff attorney with the Illinois Guardianship & Advocacy Commission, Legal Advocacy Services from 1987 to 1993. The Council is concerned that her legal career lacks sufficient experience with litigation matters in more complex cases. Much of her work has been administrative in nature. The Council finds her Not Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Second Subcircuit, Hon. Michael W. Stuttley Vacancy

Carl B. Boyd – Not Qualified

Carl B. Boyd was admitted to practice in Illinois in October 1991. Mr. Boyd has been a general practitioner with the same firm for 19 years doing bankruptcy and torts litigation. He has

participated with the Rainbow Push Legal Clinic and the Chicago South Community Development Organization. Mr. Boyd is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. The Council is concerned, however, that his actual trial work is limited. On balance, the Council finds him Not Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Third Subcircuit, Hon. Patrick E. McGann Vacancy

Maureen Leahy Delahanty – Qualified

Maureen Leahy Delahanty has been a lawyer since 1992. She has served as a Cook County Assistant State’s Attorney throughout her career. Since April 2007 she has been the coordinator of the preliminary hearings room in the Markham courthouse. Lawyers report that Ms. Delahanty is considered to have good legal ability. A few lawyers complained about her temperament, but she is generally considered to be a knowledgeable prosecutor who does her job well. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Third Subcircuit, Hon. Colleen McSweeney Moore Vacancy

Daniel R. Degnan – Not Recommended

Daniel R. Degnan did not submit materials for evaluation. The Council finds him Not Recommended for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Fourth Subcircuit, Hon. Daniel A. Riley Vacancy

John Terrence Gallagher – Qualified (Democrat)

John Terrence Gallagher was admitted to practice in 1988. He has been a sole practitioner since 1996. He tries cases in both state and federal courts. From 1994 to 1996 he worked at the Law Office of Edward R. Vrdolyak where he represented clients in criminal matters, and from 1992 to 1994 he worked at Augustine, Kern, & Levens where he litigated civil matters, mostly contract cases with some injury cases. He worked in the U.S. Navy Judge Advocate General’s Corps between 1988 and 1992. Mr. Gallagher has substantial litigation experience and is considered to be a solid practitioner. He is reported to have a good temperament. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Harry J. Fournier – Not Qualified (Republican)

Harry J. Fournier was admitted to practice in 1997. He is currently a sole practitioner and has been a sole practitioner for most of his legal career. His work experience involves real estate matters and buying/selling businesses. He has little litigation experience. Mr. Fournier is considered to be knowledgeable in his area of practice, and is reported to have good temperament while being a zealous advocate for his clients. He is active in community affairs. The Council is concerned, however, that he does not have sufficient litigation experience of any kind. His career involves transactional matters. On balance, the Council finds him Not Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Fourth Subcircuit, Additional Judgeship A Vacancy

Edward Michael Maloney – Qualified (Democrat)

Edward Michael Maloney was admitted to practice in Illinois in 1978. He is a partner at Ahern Maloney Moran & Block. From 1978 to 1985 he was an associate at Hennessy, Faraci & Tassone. He has published various articles on DUI related issues for the ISBA Traffic Newsletter, and the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin. Mr. Maloney is considered to have good legal ability and is exceptionally knowledgeable about his practice area. He is reported to have good temperament and has substantial litigation experience in more complex matters. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Christine Cook – Qualified (Republican)

Christine Cook was admitted to practice in Illinois in 1990. She is an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney doing appellate work. She worked from 2003 to 2008 as an Assistant State's Attorney at the Cook County State's Attorney's Office in the Complex Narcotics Division, from 1997 to 2008 as an Assistant State's Attorney for the Criminal Appeals Division, and from 1994 to 1997 as an Assistant State's Attorney for the Criminal Prosecutions Bureau in Markham, IL. Ms. Cook is reported to have good legal ability and most respondents praised her temperament. The Council is concerned about her lack of jury trial experience. However, she has substantial complex motion practice experience and frequently appears in court. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Sixth Subcircuit, Hon. David Delgado Vacancy

Beatriz Santiago – Qualified

Beatriz Santiago was admitted to practice in 1996. She is an Assistant Cook County Public Defender defending felony cases in the Juvenile Division. For three years she was in private practice doing personal injury litigation. She is active in community affairs. As an Assistant Public Defender she has tried over 200 bench trials to verdict.

She is considered to have very good legal ability with good litigation skills. She was praised by both judges, colleagues, and prosecutors as being a zealous advocate for her clients while maintaining a professional demeanor. She is praised for her integrity. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Seventh Subcircuit, Hon. Dorothy F. Jones Vacancy

Aicha M. MacCarthy – Not Qualified

Aicha M. MacCarthy was admitted to practice in Illinois in 1997. She is a sole practitioner handling a variety of criminal and civil law matters, with a focus on probate, real estate, and criminal law matters. She serves as a court-appointed guardian ad litem. From 2001 to 2008 she worked for the City of Chicago. From 2004 to 2008 she was an Assistant Commissioner at the Department of Aviation, and from 2001 to 2004 she was Assistant to the

Mayor at the Office of the Mayor. In 2001, she was a Financial Planning Analyst at the Department of Planning and Development and from 1998 to 2001, she worked as a Staff Attorney/Hearing Officer at the Chicago Housing Authority. In 1998, she served as a Traffic Division Prosecutor at the Chicago Department of Law. She provides substantial amounts of time to pro bono programs. Ms. McCarthy is considered to have good legal ability with a substantial commitment to pro bono work. She has a good temperament and is considered diligent and hard-working. The Council is concerned that she does not have substantial experience in a variety of more complex litigation matters. The Council finds her Not Qualified for the Circuit Court at this time.

Circuit Court, Seventh Subcircuit, Hon. Lawrence W. Terrell Vacancy

William Gamboney – Qualified

William Gamboney was admitted to practice in 1977. After spending a few years in private practice, he served as an Assistant Cook County State’s Attorney between 1979 and 1994. He has been a sole practitioner since 1994. He reports acting as lead counsel in one civil jury, 50 criminal jury trials, 10 civil bench trials, and hundreds of criminal bench trials. He has handled 25 cases on appeal. Mr. Gamboney is considered to be a skilled criminal defense lawyer with extensive experience in state courts. He is praised for his demeanor and honesty. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Seventh Subcircuit, Hon. Amanda Toney Vacancy

Kimberly Lewis – Not Recommended

Kimberly Lewis did not submit materials for evaluation. The Council finds her Not Recommended for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Eighth Subcircuit, Hon. Thomas R. Chiola Vacancy

Judge Celia Louise Gamrath – Qualified

Judge Celia Louise Gamrath was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2010. She was admitted to practice in 1994. Before becoming a judge, she was a partner at Schiller DuCanto and Fleck where she handled family law litigation, complex motion practice, and appeals. From 1994 to 1997, she served as a judicial law clerk in the Illinois Appellate Court. The vast majority of her cases settled before trial, but she did substantial numbers of evidentiary and dispositive motions. She reported handling about 50 appeal cases. Judge Gamrath is exceptionally active in bar association activities and has published numerous articles in legal texts. Lawyers report that as a lawyer, Judge Gamrath had good legal ability and was considered to be a zealous, ethical advocate who is hard-working. She has a good temperament and is praised for her community service. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Eighth Subcircuit, Hon. Melvin J. Cole Vacancy

John H. Ehrlich – Well Qualified

John H. Ehrlich was admitted to practice in 1988. He has worked in the City of Chicago Law Department since 1994 and has been Chief Assistant Corporation Counsel in the Torts Division since 1999. Prior to that, he was in private practice handling commercial litigation matters. Mr. Ehrlich has served as an adjunct professor at Northwestern University School of Law since the fall of 2003. Mr. Ehrlich has excellent legal ability and extensive legal experience. He has handled significant, high profile cases on behalf of the City of Chicago, both as plaintiff and defendant. He has a very good temperament. The Council finds him Well Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Eighth Subcircuit, Hon. Maureen Durkin Roy Vacancy

Judge Deborah Gubin – Well Qualified

Deborah Gubin was appointed to the bench by the Illinois Supreme Court in 2010. She served for ten years as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender, both as a trial attorney and as a supervisor. She also was General Counsel for the Illinois Department of Financial Institutions and did administrative and compliance work. She spent nearly 20 years as a sole practitioner. She has also been Deputy General Counsel and Chief Administrative Law Judge for the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services. She has taught trial advocacy at Loyola Law School.

As a lawyer, Judge Gubin had extensive criminal and civil experience and was considered to be an excellent trial attorney. As a judge, she is praised for her ability to handle a high volume court call. Those lawyers appearing before her praise her for her courtroom demeanor, for being especially hard-working, and for the quality of her opinions. The Council finds her Well Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Eighth Subcircuit, Additional Judge A Vacancy

Judge Laura Liu – Qualified

Judge Laura Liu was admitted to practice in 1991. She was appointed to the bench by the Illinois Supreme Court in 2010. Before taking the bench, she was in private practice. She is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. She has substantial litigation-related experience in more complex matters. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Ninth Subcircuit, Hon. Gerald C. Bender Vacancy

Judge Lionel Jean-Baptiste – Qualified

Judge Lionel Jean-Baptiste was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2011. He was admitted to practice in 1991. He is involved in numerous community service pro bono activities, including immigration law work for Haitians to pursue political asylum, Temporary Protective Status, and other relief under immigration law. Before becoming a judge, he had served as the Alderman for the 2nd Ward of Evanston, Illinois since 2001. At the time of his appointment to

the bench, he was a sole practitioner doing administrative law (such as representing clients before the Illinois Department of Human Rights) and litigation. From 1997 to 2001 he practiced law with state Senator Kwame Raoul. He was a sole practitioner between 1993 and 1997 and from 1991 to 1993 he practiced in the firm of Gainer & Dillard.

Mr. Jean-Baptiste is reported to be a hard-working lawyer dedicated to social justice. He is considered to have good legal ability and temperament. He has sufficient litigation experience in more complex matters. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Ninth Subcircuit, Hon. James R. Epstein Vacancy

Judge Larry Axelrood – Well Qualified

Judge Larry Axelrood became an Associate Judge in 2005. He has been assigned to the Second Municipal District since 2008. From 1989 to 2005 Judge Axelrood worked as a sole practitioner specializing in criminal defense. From 1985 to 1989, he served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney.

Judge Axelrood participates in a program "What Teens Need to Know." This program is presented at area high schools to teach teenagers about the legal consequences of certain decisions. In June 2010, Judge Axelrood was given the Honorary Chairperson Award by the Alliance of Illinois Judges. He is the author of three published novels.

Judge Axelrood is considered to be a very good jurist, with a good grasp of the law and an even demeanor. He is considered to be hard-working and is adept at handling the requirements of presiding over two specialty court calls, Veterans Court and Mental Health Court, in addition to hearing felony criminal matters in the Criminal Division. He communicates well with defendants and is praised for his courtroom management. The Council finds him Well Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Tenth Subcircuit, Hon. Daniel M. Locallo Vacancy

Judge Thomas R. Allen – Qualified

Thomas R. Allen was appointed to the bench by the Illinois Supreme Court in 2011. From 1990 to 2010, he was a partner with Chapekis Marcus Allen & Chapekis. From 1986 to 1990, he was a sole practitioner doing criminal defense, real estate, and litigation. From 1987 to 1992 he was a Panel Attorney for the Federal Defender Program and from 1976 to 1986, he served as an Assistant Cook County Public Defender. He served as a Chicago Alderman from 1993 to 2010.

Judge Allen is considered to have very good legal ability with substantial litigation experience in both civil and criminal law matters. As a judge he is praised for his decisiveness his ability to facilitate settlements, his communication with jurors, and his courtroom management skills. He is reported to have an excellent temperament. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Eleventh Subcircuit, Hon. Edward P. O'Brien Vacancy

Judge Michael R. Clancy – Qualified

Judge Michael R. Clancy was appointed to the Circuit Court in 2011. He was admitted to practice in 1989. Before becoming a judge, he served as an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney from 1990 to 2002 where he was a well-respected first chair felony prosecutor. From 2002 to the present he has been in private practice doing criminal defense work. He is reported to have good legal ability and temperament. He has substantial litigation experience in more complex matters. He is praised for his fairness and for being hard-working. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Eleventh Subcircuit, Hon. Joseph P. Urso Vacancy

Lisa Ann Marino – Qualified

Lisa Ann Marino was admitted to practice in 1988. She is currently a sole practitioner focusing on real estate and zoning issues. From 1993 to 1997, she was an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney in the civil division, real estate tax unit. From 1988 to 1993 she was an Assistant Cook County State's Attorney where she conducted more than 200 misdemeanor bench trials and traffic offenses, and handled felony financial crime cases. Ms. Marino is considered to be very knowledgeable about her area of practice and she is reported to be a good lawyer with a good temperament. She has experience in more complex litigation matters. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Twelfth Subcircuit, Hon. Mary K. Rochford Vacancy

Judge Andrea Schleifer – Well Qualified (Democrat)

Andrea Schleifer was appointed to the bench by the Illinois Supreme Court in November 2010. Before taking the bench, she was a solo practitioner concentrating in family law matters for most of her career since being admitted to practice in 1979. From 1986 to 1987, she was a partner in the general practice firm of Kaszak & Schleifer. From 1980 to 1981, she was a partner in the general practice firm of Mullane & Schleifer. Judge Schleifer is reported to have very good legal ability and temperament. As a lawyer she has substantial litigation experience in complex matters and was praised for her community service and for her service to the legal profession. The Council finds her Well Qualified to serve in the Circuit Court.

James Paul Pieczonka – Not Qualified (Republican)

James Paul Pieczonka was admitted to practice in 1983. He has spent most of his career as a sole practitioner doing both transactional work and litigation. In addition to his legal practice, he has been involved in real estate development matters. From 1985 to 1996, he also worked as an Administrative Law Judge for the Illinois Department of Revenue in the Hearings Division. Mr. Pieczonka has limited litigation experience. Some question his litigation skills. Much of his career has been related to transactional work and real estate development. The Council finds him Not Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Thirteenth Subcircuit, Hon. Edward N. Pietrucha Vacancy

Paul S. Pavlus – Qualified

Paul S. Pavlus has been a lawyer since 1991. For most of his career, Mr. Pavlus has served as a Cook County Assistant State’s Attorney, where he currently serves Deputy Supervisor and Suburban Coordinator for domestic violence courtrooms. He is very involved in community service activities. Lawyers report that he has good legal ability and temperament. He is exceptionally knowledgeable about his area of law and enjoys a reputation of being a good advocate who is working to improve the legal system. The Council finds him Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Thirteen Subcircuit, Additional Judge A Vacancy

Martin C. Kelley – Not Qualified

Martin C. Kelley has been in private practice since his admission to the bar in 1992. He has spent his entire career with his family firm and is currently a partner. Mr. Kelley has adequate legal ability and temperament. The Council is concerned, however, that his practice lacks depth. He has little actual trial experience as the primary practitioner. In general, he lacks experience in complex litigation matters. The Council finds him Not Qualified for the Circuit Court.

Circuit Court, Fourteenth Subcircuit, Hon. Lawrence O’Gara Vacancy

Regina Scannicchio – Qualified

Regina Scannicchio has been in private practice since her admission to the bar in 1989. From 1989 to 1992, Ms. Scannicchio was associated with a general litigation firm, but her current practice consists mainly of family law and some real estate matters. Ms. Scannicchio is considered to have good legal ability and she is praised by both lawyers and judges for her professional demeanor. She has substantial litigation experience in more complex matters and enjoys a reputation as a solid practitioner. The Council finds her Qualified for the Circuit Court.