

MM

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

QUASIM Bolling  
Plaintiff

v

GREGORY KLIMASZEWSKI # 6531  
And  
LAWRENCE WILLEMS # 7394  
DEFENDANTS

CASE # 14-CV-1574

THE HONORABLE JUDGE  
JOHN Z LEE  
(PRESIDING)

**FILED**

MAY 14 2018

THOMAS G. BRUTON  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

MAY 14 2018 3:50

MOTION FOR FINAL JUDGEMENT  
IN CASE #  
14-CV-1574

Now comes the (Plaintiff) Pro-se-Litigant and  
petitioner, MR. QUASIM Bolling, And Respectfully  
moves this Honorable Court and petition a final  
Call, order, or judgement In the above mentioned  
case. Until Docket 231 crossed the plaintiff had  
no reason to petition A motion for final judgement.

That's usually the Defendants Approach Due to  
A lack of evidence on the plaintiffs Approach to  
the Civil Case. . . . However

After the plaintiff RECEIVED notification that SARA MAEY McDONALD would be Resigning from the Case of Bolling v. Klimaszewski, He had NO other Choice but to file for this particular motion and the plaintiff MR. Bolling States these facts for Appellate Review.

1. MS Wong was the 1st ATTORNEY Representing the Defendants Klimaszewski And WILLEMS. When she filed for a LEAVE to withdraw, MS Mc Donald Relieved MS Sheri Wong. Then pursuant to MS Wong withdrawing MS McDONALD withdrew Approximately nine months ago And MR Bret Kabanowski Stepped in and that who the plaintiff Pro-se-litigant MR. Bolling Have been Attempting to Converse, Communicate, and file motions with for the Last several months will have accurate times upon Appearance for this motion.

Then upon the Pro-se litigant plaintiff of wrong doings throughout the Civil and Criminal proceeding MR. BOLLING, Receives A letter from MS Mc Donald Stating that she is withdrawing from Case # 14-cv-1576. Shortly after MR. Bolling requested a Standing order Settlement Conference with the Defendants. JUDGE LEE Denied the motion due to the fact that the Plaintiff had failed to converse with MR. Kabanowski NOT MS McDONALD. So upon visiting 30 North LaSalle Suite 900 the plaintiff was made aware that there were more than one Defense Attorney on Case # 14-cv-1576,

17X

In which I the plaintiff found more than Awkward. Then I the plaintiff always understood that officers Klimaszewski # 6531 And Lawrence Williams # 7394 NEVER ONCE made a Clean Stop nor is there any Evidence of Narcotics. Upon Mr Bolling not being aware of the Law, nor his Civil Rights, as a Citizen of the U.S.A, his own Defense Counsel at the Stage in Criminal proceedings used his own testimony in Return to win his Criminal Charge. And Collect a Sum of \$2500 And a Agreement with the State to not be held responsible for the officers unprofessional Improper forceful Conduct. Upon Being made aware Mr Bolling filed a Complaint even after he regained his freedom against his Defense Attorney in the Criminal Case. He filed with the A. R. D. C of Misconduct and illegal advise from Counsel in which the A. R. D. C are waiting for the outcome of the present Case At hand.

For Appellate Review And Supreme Court  
As A PRO-SE LITIGANT I FEEL AS FOLLOW

1. THE ARRESTING OFFICERS VIOLATED MY CIVIL RIGHTS BY ME WALKING DOWN THE STREETS IN MY LIVING AREA. USING PHYSICAL FORCE AS A EMERGENCY TAKE DOWN AND MAKING ME ADMIT TO SOMETHING I NEVER HAD I WAS SCARED FOR MY LIFE WHEN THEY ABRUPTLY THREW ME TO THE GROUND.

July  
In Civil Action no 1:08-cv-3172 JTC Although this  
is a case for pursuant to Local Rule 56.1 (B)(2) Plaintiff  
respectfully submit the following responses to Defendants  
undisputed facts 1. Pursuant to L.R. 56.1 (B)(2)(a)(2)(iii)  
Plaintiff dispute defendant's contention that since 2005 Secretary  
of State has removed at least 25 individuals from the  
list of eligible voters because they were not US  
Citizens Defendants Exhibit 1 the cited record source  
purports list only 17 individuals as non Citizens

In *Bollino v. Klimaszewski* the Defendants  
make more than one accusations of recovered narcotics  
However the August report states a specific amount  
There is no actual report of the testing of the  
illegal narcotics signatures E.T.C. Now the State  
rest there case on these specific findings and petitions  
a summary judgement in which the plaintiff is  
willfully agreeing to a summary judgement only  
if the proper information was given as in the  
mentioned case above.

The plaintiff states for the record, Although  
the first case cited is different a narcotic case, and a  
citizen case. The results are still the same, If there  
is no evidence to challenge then there should be no  
case. As a pro-se litigant, Mr. Bollino states  
that in his civil case, that the defendants have  
used the proceeds, and protocol for the federal  
court and procedure to their advantage.

NY  
and have left Case Statute open, for months  
in which the defense should have filed for a trial  
or jury trial in which to terminate the case.

Now as for Mrs McDonald's filing for withdrawal  
yes the plaintiff wishes to know was that in  
the Rms of Case # 14-cv-1574. There would  
of been some kind of violations due to the  
fact that the plaintiff has been associating w/ a  
phantom Attorney, which is another fact in  
the judicial system against pro-se litigants.

The plaintiff is petitioning motion to dismiss with  
prejudice due to the fact that the defendants have  
been using their professionalism, as Attorneys of  
law to Embarrassor Intimidate further use to  
stop a United State Citizens to enforce the Constitution  
of the United States of America for Quasim Bolling

### Rule 4.3: Dealing with Unrepresented person

In dealing on behalf of a client with a person who  
is not represented by counsel, a lawyer shall not state or imply  
that the lawyer is disinterested. When the lawyer  
knows or reasonably should know that the unrepresented person  
misunderstands the lawyer's role in the matter, the lawyer  
shall not give legal advice to an unrepresented person  
other than the advice to secure counsel if the lawyer  
knows or reasonably should know that the interest

14

HOWEVER, for the last SEVERAL months the plaintiff Quasim Bolling has been visiting petitioning and filing motions to MR. Bret KABANCINSKI. is to the fact that Mrs McDonald had withdrawn her position as the Defendants Counsel back in the year 2017, Right after Mrs Sheri Wong withdrew as Attorney for the Defendants Gregory Klimaszewski and Lawrence Wille Both Employed by the City of Chicago Police Depu

Now the plaintiff Quasim Bolling has worked diligently with the Appropriate Attorney for the Defense as it was bought down to him from the District Courts. The plaintiff says that all of his information and work have been destroyed or lost due to the changes, withdrawals and motions to leave by the Defendants Representation. The plaintiff asks the Honorable Courts only for Appellant Review to Investigate further of the Defendants Accusations of Illegal drug. It is plan to visualize that the plaintiff Civil Rights has been violated all through the Criminal proceeding as well as his Civil Rights. In the plaintiff Criminal proceeding in which was won only to the notion of Client Attorney Relationship. In which the plaintiff was told by his hired Attorney to Admit to something that was not ever found for his freedom. In which was sold at \$25,000 to walk from the Penal Institution.

And Now At this point for APPELLATE  
REVIEW the PLAINTIFF IS ASKING At this Level  
A THROUGH REVIEW FROM THE HONORABLE JUDGE  
JOHN Z. LEE And Set for A STANDING ORDER  
SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE which was suggested by  
ATTORNEY MR. BRET KABANCINSKI WHO WAS SAID TO  
BE THE DEFENSE REPRESENTATION. MR. MARY MCDONALD  
HAS WITHDRAWN FROM CASE # 14-CV-1574. In which there  
WERE ANY motions or petitions filed to HER

In which this should be illegal for the States  
Attorney to file A withdrawal if she NEVER  
WAS ON THE CASE FOR THE PRO-SE litigant. IT WAS  
DONE TO EXTEND TIME FOR MR. KABACINSKI TO FILE  
his Final motion The plaintiff request A full Review  
BEFORE STATING Another Constitutional Violation OR  
EXPLAIN the previous motion.

JTH

Of such a person are or have a reasonable possibility of being in conflict with the interest of the Client

This is in fact what the Defense have been doing to the plaintiff Pro-se litigant Quasim Bolling we would further go into a Second Chapter of this motion for final judgement due to the fact that appearance is necessary thank you for your cooperation and may the Court find justice and favor in the plaintiff Quasim Bolling for the unfairness in this civil procedure

Quasim Bolling  
Respectfully Submitted  
Quasim Bolling

5-14-18