


include whether plaintiff 's pleadings are legally sufficient to state a claim on Counts VII, VIII and X, and whether the Dealer's November 28, 2005 Answer was a nullity and/or whether it was timely filed or properly served.

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- 
1. Whether the dollar figures of plaintiff's claim and the Dealer's counterclaim exceeded the jurisdictional limit of the trial court;
 2. Whether orders issued in November of 2005 shall be void which were entered after plaintiff submitted a motion for substitution of judge as of right;
 3. Whether the Dealer should be allowed to proceed after it did not file a timely Answer or did not properly serve it upon plaintiff in 2005;
 4. Whether the Dealer's Counterclaim is a non-meritorious filing; and whether sanction should be imposed under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 137;
 5. Whether the Dealer's trial counsel, Ms. Vorberg had standing to address the court on and after August 7, 2006, after failing to file a substitution appearance form;
 6. Whether the trial court erred in permitting the Dealer's counsel to present four letters of her own as trial exhibits, whether those letters contain inadmissible hearsay and deliberate false statement, and whether the Dealer's counsel had engaged in "court order shopping" or "judge shopping" activities;
 7. Whether the trial court erred in deferring the ruling of plaintiff's motions, which raised issues on the court's jurisdictional limit, validity of some orders;