

POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
I. <u>Clarification of Several Material Facts Which Were Misstated By Defendant in Its Attempt to Mislead Or Defraud This Court</u>.....	1
1 Defendant Shall Not Be Allowed to Create Another Version of Plaintiff’s Issues for Review.....	1
2 Defendant shall Not Be Allowed to Create Another Version of Plaintiff’s Allegations	2
<u>15 U. S. C. § 2310(d)(1)</u>	3
3 Contrary to Defendant’s Fraudulent Contention, Plaintiff’s Motion for Substitution of Judge Had Been Granted on December 8, 2005.....	4
4 Defendant Did Not “Re-file” Its Motion to Dismiss After It was Stricken -- The Dealer Became at Default for Failure to Plead After October 20, 2005.....	5
5 When the “Judge Shopping” Occurred.....	6
6 Lawyer Vorberg Did Not File A Written Appearance Form for Herself.....	8
7 Plaintiff Did Not Wave the Issue of Illegality of The Sale at Trial.....	8
<u>49 U. S. C. § 32702 (7)</u>	9
8 Defendant’s Lawyer, Acting as a Witness, Submitted Four Letters of Her Own at Trial, Which Contained Numerous Fraudulent Statements...9	
II. <u>Clarification of Plaintiff’s Position on Several Issues</u>.....	14
1. On December 8, 2005, As a Matter of Law, Judge Davis Did the Right Thing by Granting the Motion for Substitution of Judge.....	14
<u>In re C. M. A.</u> , 306, Ill. 3d 1061, 715 N. E. 2d 674, 689 (First Dist. 1999)....	14
<u>Kern v DaimlerChrysler Co. et al</u> , 848 N. E. 2d 125, 129 (5 th District, Ill. App. Ct., 2006).....	14
<u>735 ILCS 5/2-1001(a)(2)</u>	14, 15

2. Plaintiff’s Fundamental Rights Were Deprived. The Judgment Entered at the Trial Court is Predetermined.....	15
<u>Illinois Supreme Court Rule 218.....</u>	15
<u>735 ILCS 5/2-1203.....</u>	17
3. Lack of Jurisdiction for Judge Rhine And/Or the Trial Court.....	17
<u>Illinois Supreme Court Rule 281.....</u>	18
4. Defendant Committed and is Still Committing Fraud on Court.....	18
<u>Bulloch v. United States, 763 F 2d 1115, 1121 (10th Cir. 1985).....</u>	18
<u>Kenner v. C. I. R., 387 F. 2d 689, 691 (1968).....</u>	18
<u>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc., 501 U. S. 32, 44 (1991).....</u>	19
<u>Bright v. Dick, 166 Ill. 2d 204, 210 (1995).....</u>	20
5. Errors Exist in the September 30, 2008 Order.....	20
<u>People ex rel. Brzica, 268 Ill. App. 3d 420, 423 (1994).....</u>	21
6. Inconsistencies Exist in the September 30, 2008 Order	21
<u>Owens v. Samkle Automotive Inc 1318, 1321 n4, 425 F. 3d 4 (11th Cir. 2005).....</u>	22
<u>Yazzie v. Amigo Chevrolet Inc., 189 F. Supp. 2d 1245, 1248-49 (D. N. M. 2001).....</u>	22
<u>Currie v. Spencer, 772 S. W. 2d 309, 310-311 (Ark. 1989).....</u>	23
<u>Miller v. William Chevrolet/Geo, Inc. 326 Ill. 3d 642, 655; 762 N. E. 2d 1 (1st Dist. 2001).....</u>	23
<u>Williams v. Bruno Appliance & Furniture Mart, Inc., 62 Ill. App. 3d 219, 222, 379 N. E. 2d 52, 54 (1st Dist, 1978).....</u>	23
III. <u>Plaintiff/Appellant’s Comments on the Record</u>.....	23
IV. <u>Conclusion</u>.....	24