

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
INTRODUCTION	1
ISSUE PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	2
JURISDICTION	3
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF FACTS	4
A Procedural Background	4
B Factual Background	5
1. What Happened Before Plaintiff Sent A Notice of Revocation of Acceptance.....	5
2. What Happened After Plaintiff Sent A Notice of Revocation of Acceptance	7
3. A Major Event After Plaintiff Filed the Lawsuit.....	9
4. What Has Been Revealed During Discovery.....	9
5. Major Events At Trial.....	10
REVIEW STANDARD	11
<u>People v. Gherna</u> , 203 Ill. 2d 165, 175 (2003)	11
<u>Ziemba v. Mierzwa.</u> , 142 Ill. 2d 42, 566 N. E. 2d 1365, 1366 (1991).....	11, 31
ARGUMENT	12
A. Some Orders or Part of Them Entered in 2006 Should Be Void Or Voidable	12
1. The Dollar Figures of Claims And Counterclaims Exceed the Jurisdictional Limit of the Trial Court	12

<u>People v. Abney</u> , 90 Ill. App. 3d 235, 243, 232 N. E. 2d 784, 788 (1967).....	12
<u>Bindell v. City of Harey</u> , 212 Ill. App. 3d 1042, 571 N. E. 2d 1017, 1019 (1 st Dist. 1991).....	13
<u>Potenz Corp. v. Petrozzini</u> , 170, Ill. App. 3d 617, 525 N. E. 2d 173, 175 (1988).....	13
2. Orders or Parts of Them Should Be Void Or Voidable So Long As They Are Based on Void Orders.....	13
<u>In re Dominique F.</u> , 145 Ill 2d 311, 324, 583 N. E. 2d 555, 561 (1991).....	13
<u>In re C. M. A.</u> , 306, Ill. 3d 1061, 1067 715 N. E. 2d 674, 679 (First Dist. 1999).....	13
<u>Rodisch v. Esparza</u> , 309 Ill. App. 3d 346 722 N. E. 2d 326, 330 (2 nd Dist. 1999).....	14
<u>Austin v. Smith</u> , 312 F 2d 337, 343 (1962).....	14
B. Defendant Has Been in Default For Failure to Plead As to Plaintiff’s Claims on Counts I – VIII	14
<u>National Bank of Monmouth v. Multi National Industries, Inc.</u> 286 Ill. App. 3d 638, 640, 678 N. E. 2d 7, 9 (1997).	14, 15
<u>Evans v. Corporate Services</u> , 207 Ill. App. 3d 197, 301 (1990).....	15
<u>Corgan v. Muehling</u> , 574 N. E. 2d 602, 609 (1991).....	16
<u>Bachman v. Kent</u> , 293 Ill. App. 3d 1078, 1086 (1 st Dist. 1997).....	16
C. Part 1 of The Final Judgment Order Should Be Reversed As A Matter of Law.....	16

1. Documentary Evidence Shows The Dealer Violated MVICSA, And The Title Transfers of the Subject Vehicle from And to the Dealer Were Illegal.....	16
49 U. S. C. § 32702 (7).....	16
49 U. S. C. § 32705 (a)(3).....	17
49 U. S. C. § 32705 (a)(2).....	17, 18, 19
49 C. F. R. § 580.5(c).....	17
<u>Owens v. Samkle Automotive Inc.</u> 425 F. 3d 1318, 1321 n. 4 (11 th Cir. 2005).....	17, 20
49 U. S. C § 32710(a)	17
49 U. S. C. § 32705 (a)(1).....	17
49 U. S. C. § 32705 (b)(2)(A).....	18
2. Uncontested Or Incontestable Evidence Shows The Dealer Violated MVICSA with Intent to Defraud.....	18
<u>Yazzie v. Amigo Chevrolet Inc.</u> , 189 F. Supp. 2d 1245, 1248-49 (D. N. M. 2001).....	19
<u>Hughes v. Box</u> , 814 F. 2d 498, 502 (8 th Cir. 1987).....	19
<u>Ryan v. Edwards</u> , 592 F. 2d 756, 760-61 (4 th Cir. 1979).....	19
<u>Kragull v. Chevrolet</u> , 2004 WL 1429963, at *5 (Ill. Cir. 2004),.....	19
<u>Haynes v Manning</u> , 917, 917 F. 2d 450, 453 (10 th Cir. 1990).....	20
<u>Tusa v. Omaha Auto Auction Inc.</u> , 712 F. 2d 1248 1253-54 (8 th Cir. 1983)).....	20
<u>Heiffler v. Joe Bells Auto Serv.</u> 946 F. Supp. 348, 352 (E. D. Pa. 1996).....	20
<u>Oettinger v. Lakeview Motors, Inc.</u> , 675 F. Supp. 1488 1494 (E. D. Va. 1988)	20

3. Uncontested or Incontestable Evidence Shows The Dealer Violated Magnuson-Moss Act And Illinois UCC	20
<u>Currie v. Spencer</u> , 772 S. W. 2d 309, 310-311 (Ark. 1989).....	21
15 U. S. C §2310(d)(1).....	21
16 C. F. R. Ch. I § 455.1 (a) and (b) (1-1-03 Edition).....	21, 24
Illinois UCC 810 ILCS 5/2-314.....	21
Illinois UCC 810 ILCS 5/2-315.....	21
15 U. S. C. § 2308.....	21, 38
4. Uncontested or incontestable Evidence Shows The Dealer Violated ICFA, Illinois UCC And Committed Common Law Fraud	21
<u>Miller v. William Chevrolet/Geo, Inc.</u> 326 Ill. 3d 642, 655; 762 N. E. 2d 1 (1 st Dist. 2001).....	22, 24, 27
<u>Tweedy v. Wright Ford Sales, Inc.</u> , 64 Ill. 2d 570, 574 357 N. E. 2d 449, 452 (1976)	23
<u>Lipinski v. Martin J. Kelly Oldsmobile, Inc.</u> 325 Ill. App. 3d 1139, 1149, 759 N. E. 2d 66, 74 (2001).....	23
<u>Russow v. Bobola</u> , 2 Ill. App. 3d 837, 277 N. E. 2d 769, 771 (1972).....	23
UCC 810 ILCS 5/2-313.....	23
<u>Carter v. Mueller</u> , 120 Ill. App. 3d 314, 319, 457 N. E. 2d 1335, 1340 (1983).....	24
815 ILCS 505/2.....	24, 25, 26
<u>Totz v. Du Page Acura</u> , , 236 Ill. App. 3d 891 602 N. E. 2d 1374, 1380 (1992).....	24

<u>Duran v. Leslie Oldsmobile, Inc.</u> , 229 Ill. App. 3d 1032, 1039, 594 N. E. 2d 1355, 1361 (1992).....	24
<u>Robinson v. Toyota Motor Credit Corp.</u> , 351 Ill. App. 3d 1086, 1095, 735 N. E. 2d 724, 733, 249 Ill. Dec. 120, 129 (1 st Dist. 2000).....	25
<u>Siegal v. Levy Organization Development Co.</u> , 153 Ill. 2d 534, 543, 607 N. E. 2d 194, 198 (1992).....	25
<u>Williams v. Bruno Appliance & Furniture Mart, Inc.</u> 62 Ill. App. 3d 219, 222, 379 N. E. 2d 52, 54 (1 st Dist, 1978).....	25
5, <u>Contrary to Defendant’s Argument, Revocation of Acceptance Is A Cause of Action Under Magnuson-Moss Act, ICFA And Illinois UCC</u>	25
<u>Pearson v. Daimler-Chrysler Corp.</u> , 349 Ill. App. 3d 688 813 N. E. 2d 230, 235 (1 st District, 2004).....	25
<u>Lara v Hyundai Motor America</u> , 331 Ill. App. 3d 53, 62, 770 N. E. 2d 721, 727 (2002).....	25, 27
810 ILCS 5/2-608.....	25, 26
810 ILCS 5/2-721.....	25, 26
<u>Gaddy v Galarza Motor Sport Ltd.</u> 2000 WL 1364451 at *3 (N. D. Ill. 2000).....	25
<u>Innis v. Methot-Buick Opel, Inc.</u> , 506 A. 2d 212, 219 (Me.1986).....	26
<u>Zabriskie Chevrolet, Inc., v. Smith</u> , 240 A. 2d 195, 205 (N. J.1968).....	26
810 ILCS 5/2-719 (2).....	26
<u>Radford v. Dailer Chrysler Corporation.</u> 168 F. Supp. 2d 751, 753-4 (N. D. Oh. 2001).....	27
6. <u>The Dealer’s Counsel and Key Witness Were Caught Providing Deliberate False Statements at Trial</u>	28
<u>Godfrey v. United States</u> , 997 F 2d 335, 338 (7 th Cir. 1993).....	28

	<u>Tele v. Sunrise Chevrolet, Inc.</u> , No. 03 C 2626, 2004 WL 1194751. *8 (N. D. Ill. May 28, 2004).....	28
7	Punitive Damages Should Be Imposed Against The Dealer.....	30
	<u>E. J. Mckeman Co. v Gregory</u> , 252 Ill. App. 3d 514, 536 (1993).....	30
	<u>Mathias v. Accor Economy Lodging Inc.</u> , 374 F. 3d 672, 677 (7 th Cir. Oct. 21, 2003).....	30
	<u>Crowder v. Bob Obling Enters., Inc.</u> , 148 Ill. App. 3d 313, 101 Ill. Dec. 748, 499 N. E. 2d 115, 119 (4 th Dist. 1986).....	31
	<u>Washburn v. Vandiver</u> , 379, S. E. 2d 65, 69 (N. C. Ct. App. 1989).....	31
D.	Count X Is Legally and Factually Sufficient to State a Claim	31
	<u>In re Ingersoll</u> , 710 N. E. 2d 390; 186 Ill. 2d 163, 168 (Ill. 1999).....	32, 40
	<u>Wilson v Moore</u> , 13 Ill. App. 3d 632, 301 N. E. 2d 39, 40 (1 st Dist. 1973).....	33
	<u>Edwards v. Estate of Harrison</u> , 235 Ill. App. 3d 213 601 N. E. 2d 862, 869 (1 st Dist. 1992).....	34
E.	The Predetermined and Biased “Final Judgment” Is A Production of Fundamental Errors	34
1.	The Trial Judge Erred in Failing to Purge Void Orders And in Deferring Ruling on Jurisdictional Matters.	34
	<u>Littleton v. Berling</u> , 468 F. 2d 389, 412 (7 th Cir. 1972).....	34, 42
2.	Plaintiff’s Due Process Rights Were Deprived When Statutory Procedure And Discovery Rules Were Ignored.....	35
	<u>Williams v. A. E. Staley Manufacturing Co.</u> 83 Ill. 2d 559, 566 416 N. E. 2d 252 (1981).....	36
	<u>Buehler v. Whalen</u> , 70 Ill. 2d 51, 67, 374 N. E. 2d 460 (1977).....	37

	<u>Bright v. Dicke</u> , 166 Ill. 2d 204, 210, 652 N. E. 2d 275, 277-78 (1995).....	37
	<u>Romano Brothers Beverage Co. v D’Agostino-Yerow Assc. Inc.</u> 1996 U. S. Dist. LEXIS 10730, 47 (N. E Ill. 1996).....	38
3	The Trial Judge Erred in Arbitrarily Ruling on Affirmative Defenses.....	38
	<u>Larkin v Sanelli</u> , 213 Ill. App. 3d 597, 602, 572 N. E. 2d 1145, 1149 (1 st Dist. 1991).....	38
4.	The Trial Judge Erred in Allowing Defendant’s Counsel To Present Inadmissible And False Evidence at Trial.....	38
	<u>Jones v. City of Chicago</u> , 610 F. Supp. 350, 354 (N. D. Ill. 1984).....	40
	<u>Tomm’s Redemption, Inc., v. Jae Park</u> , 333 Ill. App. 3d 1003 777 N. E. 2d 522, 528 (1 st District, 2002).....	40
5	Part 1 of the “Final Judgment Order” Is in Intrinsic Conflicition With the Rest Parts of the Same Order.....	40
	735 ILCS 5/2-1203.....	41
6	Plaintiff’s Constitutional Rights Were Violated By the “Final Judgment Order”	41
	The First Amendment Of The U. S. Constitution.....	42
	The Fourteenth Amendment Of The U. S. Constitution, Section 1	42
	<u>Sakun v. Taffer</u> , 268 Ill. App. 3d 343, 643 N. E. 2d 1271, 1276 (1 st Dist. 1994).....	42
	CONCLUSION	42