## STATE OF ILLINOIS IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 18TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COUNTY OF DU PAGE

| PE            | OPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,  | )   |
|---------------|---|---|
| s <del></del> | VS<br>DEFENDANT.  | ) ) No ) )  |
|               | ORDE  | R   |
|               | ONDE  |   |
| 14            | This matter is before the Court for the EETITION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGME 01 ET SEQ." The Court has considered d the relevant portions of the Illinois Crim       | NT PURSUANT TO 735 ILCS 5/2-<br>the applicable case and statutory law,          |
|               | The Court hereby finds:   |   |
| 1.            | The Defendant has filed this <u>Petition</u> or   |   |
| 2.            | Section 2–1401 provides that relief from days from the entry thereof, may be had 352 III.App.3d 442, 444 (2004).  |   |
| 3.            | A section 2–1401 petition's purpose is tappearing in the record that, if known a would have prevented the judgment's elll.App.3d at 662, 275 Ill.Dec. 84, 792 N | t the time the court entered judgment, ntry. <i>In re Estate of Barth</i> , 339 |
| 4.            | In criminal proceedings, a petition filed correct all errors of fact occurring in the   |   |

unknown to the petitioner and the court at the time of trial which, if then known, would have prevented the judgment being entered. <u>People v.</u>

Johnson, 352 III.App.3d 442, 444 (2004).

- 5. In a section 2–1401 petition, the petitioner must set forth specific factual allegations that support the following three elements:
  - (1) the existence of a meritorious claim or defense;
  - (2) due diligence in presenting this claim or defense to the trial court in the original action; and
  - (3) due diligence in filing the section 2–1401 petition. <u>Barth</u>, 339 III.App.3d at 662, 275 III.Dec. 84, 792 N.E.2d at 324.
- 6. A section 2–1401 petition is not designed to provide a general review of all trial errors, nor is it designed to substitute for direct appeal.
- 7. A section 2–1401 petition "must be filed not later than 2 years after the entry of the order or judgment." 735 ILCS 5/2–1401(c) (West 2012).
- 8. Exceptions to the time limitation apply where the defendant shows he was under legal disability or duress, or that his alleged ground for relief is fraudulently concealed. <u>People v. Vincent</u>, 226 III.2d 1, 7–8, 871 N.E.2d 17, 22 (2007).
- 9. "The two-year limitations period does not apply to petitions brought on voidness grounds. An order is void where the court that entered the judgment lacked (1) jurisdiction of the (a) parties or (b) subject matter or (2) the inherent power to make or enter the order." People v. Wuebbels, 396 III.App.3d 763, 919 N.E.2d 1122, (2009).
- 10. A section 2–1401 motion cannot be used to relitigate questions already validly adjudicated. *In re J.D.*, 317 III.App.3d 445, 449 (2000).
- 11. The purpose of post-judgment review is not to relitigate matters that were or could have been raised on direct appeal, but rather to resolve arguments that new or additional matters, if they had been known at the time of trial, could have prevented a finding that the defendant was guilty of the crimes charged. People v. Burrows, 172 III.2d 169, 216 III.Dec. 762, 665 N.E.2d 1319 (1996).
- 12. A trial court may dismiss a section 2–1401 petition if the petitioner fails to demonstrate it exercised due diligence in ascertaining and then acting upon its rights. The grounds available to a court for dismissing for lack of due

- diligençe include the mere failure to offer a reasonable excuse for undue delay in filing the petition. *National Underground Construction Co. v. E.A. Cox Co.*, 273 III.App.3d 830, 837, 210 III.Dec. 132, 652 N.E.2d 1108, 1113 (1995)
- 13. In <u>People v. Laugharn</u>, 233 III.2d 318, 323 (2009), the Supreme Court pronounced a bright-line rule that a section 2–1401 petition may not be dismissed before the passage of the usual 30–day period to answer or otherwise plead.
- 14. There is no statutory basis for the appointment of counsel in a section 2–1401 proceeding. <u>People v. Gaines</u>, 335 III.App.3d 292, 295–96, 269 III.Dec. 350, 780 N.E.2d 822 (2002). However, neither is the appointment of counsel expressly prohibited. See <u>People v. Pinkonsly</u>, 207 III.2d 555, 280 III.Dec. 311, 802 N.E.2d 236 (2003).
- 15. This Court denies the Defendant's request for appointed counsel.
- 16. Where the trial court is neither required to, nor prohibited from, taking an action, the court will be said to have discretion to do or not do that action. "A trial court commits error when it refuses to exercise discretion based on the erroneous belief that it does not have discretion." <u>People v. Pinkston.</u> 2013 IL App (4th) 111147, ¶ 14, 370 III.Dec. 910, 989 N.E.2d 298.

| 17    |  |
|-------|--|
|       | Wherefore, the Court denies this <u>"PETITION FOR RELIEF FROM</u> <u>SMENT PURSUANT TO 735 ILCS 5/2-1401 ET SEQ."</u> filed by the defendant |
|       | The Circuit Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to the Defendant.   |
| Date: | Judge  |

Judge Miller - Version 1.9.2019