Case No. __________

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

LUKE A. THOMAS, Movant, vs. HOLLY J. HENZE, Respondent.	Original Motion for Supervisory Order Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 383 Cass County Cir. Ct. No. 2022-DC-15

MOTION FOR SUPERVISORY ORDER PURSUANT TO SUPREME COURT RULE 383

Luke A. Thomas
Movant, Pro Se
8240 N Knoxville Ave, STE C
PMB 1077
Peoria, Illinois 61615
Thomaslitigation2022@gmail.com
ARDC No: 6278591

Case No. _________

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

LUKE A. THOMAS,

Movant,

vs.

HOLLY J. HENZE,

Respondent.

Original Motion for Supervisory Order Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 383

Cass County Cir. Ct. No. 2022-DC-15

MOTION FOR SUPERVISORY ORDER PURSUANT TO ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT RULE 383

Respondent-Movant, Luke A. Thomas, acting *pro se*, respectfully petitions this Honorable Court pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 383 and Article VI, Section 16 of the Illinois Constitution, for the issuance of a Supervisory Order directed to the Circuit Court of the Eighth Judicial Circuit, Cass County, Illinois.

Supervisory intervention is urgently required to immediately stay all substantive proceedings pending the adjudication of a Substitution of Judge (SOJ) for Cause, to cure an ongoing structural paralysis, to vacate legally void orders compelling the violation of federal and state firearms statutes, and to remedy an unconstitutional deprivation of property that has left massive quantities of explosive, regulated ammunition completely unaccounted for. Furthermore, supervisory relief is the only available remedy because the trial court conducted the final trial without preserving any electronic recording, effectively destroying the judicial record and subverting the standard appellate process (Supporting Record, Exhibit B, p.017). A full review of the conduct of those administering these proceedings indicates these failures were intentional to prevent discovery of criminal, civil and ethical malfeasance requiring this Court to use its full supervisory powers and oversight duties to protect the integrity of our profession and legal system.

In support of this Motion, Respondent-Movant relies upon the Master Verified Affidavit (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, pp. 006-016), the Official Court Reporter certification of missing transcripts (Supporting Record, Exhibit B, pp. 017-018), the corresponding transcripts of proceedings, and states as follows:

I. JURISDICTION AND NATURE OF THE EMERGENCY

This Court possesses supervisory authority over all courts in Illinois pursuant to Article VI, Section 16 of the Illinois Constitution. Immediate supervisory intervention is required because the trial court's subversion of Respondent-Movant's formally granted Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations (Supporting Record, Exhibit F, p. 031) is merely a symptom of a much deeper, systemic corruption of the proceedings.

The trial court has weaponized its judicial authority to shield Petitioner—the acting Menard County State's Attorney—from the consequences of executing an off-book liquidation of a federally regulated Federal Firearms License (FFL) inventory (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 012; Exhibit FFF, pp. 521–532), actively suppressing illicit *ex parte* communications (Supporting Record, Exhibit I, p. 051; Exhibit Y, pp. 248–249), and other crimes conducted throughout the pendency, and then forced the matter to trial intentionally failing to preserving a record for appellate review. *(Supporting Record, Exhibit B, p. 017)*.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Medical Baseline, ADA Subversion, and the "Fluid Docket" Respondent-Movant is a licensed Illinois attorney suffering from lasting physical and cognitive limitations (ADHD and PTSD) resulting from aggressive treatments for Stage IIIb Rectal Cancer (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 007; Exhibit D, p. 027; Exhibit N, pp. 070–071). While the trial court formally granted the Movant's request for ADA accommodations in July 2025 (Supporting Record, Exhibit F, p. 031), Judge Henze subsequently issued a directive forcing a "fluid docket" evidentiary hearing, declaring she would hear "as many pending motions/petitions as time will allow" *(Supporting Record, Exhibit A, pp. 014–015)*. This executed a deliberate ambush designed to overwhelm a cognitively accommodated, disabled litigant.

The Trial Court's Uncontroverted Knowledge, Mockery, and Administrative Subversion of Documented Disabilities Under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), a public entity has an affirmative duty to accommodate known or obvious disabilities. The Eighth Judicial Circuit has possessed actual, documented knowledge of Respondent-Movant's severe medical conditions from the absolute inception of his incapacitation. In 2019, following a Stage III rectal cancer diagnosis, intensive robotic surgeries, and chemotherapy, a formal, circuit-wide letter was disseminated to the judiciary notifying the circuit of his severe medical limitations *(Supporting Record, Exhibit N, pp. 070–071)*..

At the commencement of this specific litigation, former presiding Judge Jerry J. Hooker already possessed actual knowledge of these realities. Judge Hooker acknowledged reviewing Respondent-Movant's personal Facebook posts—which detailed his ongoing medical struggles and are formally preserved in the court record (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 010). Instead of honoring his affirmative duty under the ADA, Judge Hooker openly mocked Respondent-Movant's physical limitations and cognitive disabilities on the record (Supporting Record, Exhibit S, pp. 113–124). This egregious judicial abuse compelled Respondent-Movant to file a formal motion demanding the trial court articulate the specific factual basis for its derogatory remarks and hostile rulings *(Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 010)*.

This structural prejudice seamlessly continued under the successor judge, Hon. Holly J. Henze. In an extraordinary administrative maneuver, Judge Henze bypassed standard protocol, administratively hijacked the role of the Court Disability Coordinator (CDC), and summarily granted Respondent-Movant's formal ADA accommodation requests for PTSD and ADHD (Supporting Record, Exhibit F, p. 031). Judge Henze granted these sweeping accommodations without demanding an evidentiary hearing, requiring further medical evaluation, or requesting a single updated record (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 014).

This summary approval functions as a binding judicial admission: the trial court was fully aware of Respondent-Movant's severe, debilitating cognitive conditions all along. The court possessed the medical baseline from the very start, chose to mock and weaponize it, and only formally granted the accommodations to create an illusion of compliance.

Immediately after admitting the absolute reality of these disabilities, the trial court subverted its own ADA order by deploying "fluid dockets" to force Respondent-Movant into immediate adversarial hearings, intentionally exploiting the very ADHD and PTSD limitations the court had just formally recognized (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, pp. 014–015).

B. The Curated Investment Portfolio, Seizure, and Kidnapping Frame-Up The seized assets were not a standard collection, but a highly curated, inflation-hedged investment portfolio investment grade, pre-ban Russian weaponry (e.g., Saigas, Veprs), commercial/corporate firearm inventory and related items , and an estimated 25,000 to 30,000 rounds of high-capacity ammunition, anticipating severe import scarcity (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 008; Exhibit G, pp. 035, 041). On September 12, 2022, Petitioner utilized an *ex parte* emergency order to remove the entirety of this portfolio, together with firm, FFL, and tax records to an undisclosed location (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 008). Also taken was evidentiary surveillance equipment and DVR recorders active during the date of the taking *(Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 008)*.

When Respondent-Movant exposed Petitioner's underlying public aid fraud *(Supporting Record, Exhibit S, p. 113; Exhibit T, p. 131)* and the unlawful taking of his property, Petitioner retaliated by attempting to frame Respondent-Movant for kidnapping (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 014). Judge Henze explicitly acknowledged the falsity of the kidnapping allegations on the record; however, knowing this, the court still had the county pay for a mental health evaluation against Respondent-Movant for no other purpose than to manufacture delay, alienate Respondent from his children and otherwise try to prevent Respondent from being able to bring the combined malfeasance to light (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 008).

C. The "Bedroom Inspection" and Judicial Complicity When Respondent-Movant demanded accountability for the hidden federal inventory, former presiding Judge Hooker refused to order standard discovery. Instead, the court proposed a highly prejudicial arrangement dictating that Respondent-Movant could only inspect the federal inventory if he agreed to view the firearms "on the bed" in the opposing party's parents' bedroom, flanked by the acting Cass County Sheriff (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 013). Following objection to this extrajudicial procedure, Respondent-Movant was completely denied the right to view or inventory his own federally regulated property, facilitating total spoliation.

D. Missing Transcripts and the Blizzard Trial Knowing that the kidnapping allegations were false and that massive amounts of federal inventory were missing, Judge Henze proceeded to force a final trial on January 11 and 12, 2024, during a severe winter blizzard (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 012). Astoundingly, the court didn't think to keep a recording or transcript of the trial. The Official Court Reporter, Nicole L. Kopec, formally certified that *"No ER found. No transcript can be produced"* for these dates, permanently erasing the trial from the judicial record. *(Supporting Record, Exhibit B, p. 017).*

E. Extrajudicial Coordination and Glaring Conflicts of Interest Regarding the FFL Inventory Throughout the proceedings, Respondent-Movant repeatedly notified Judge Hooker that the civilian asset inventory was facially deficient, specifically emphasizing that it was entirely "devoid of any ammunition" and completely omitted thousands of rounds of missing, regulated explosive material (Supporting Record, Exhibit G, p. 041). Respondent explicitly informed the court that he required the immediate return of lawful possession to conduct a physical inspection, determine the portfolio's value, and execute the required affidavits with the Illinois State Police (ISP) to maintain lawful federal and state compliance (Supporting Record, Exhibit G, pp. 040–041).

Rather than ordering the return of the property, ordering an accounting of the missing ammunition, or appointing a receiver, Judge Hooker engaged in bizarre and extrajudicial conduct designed to bypass standard regulatory procedures. Judge Hooker became fixated on forcing Respondent-Movant to coordinate directly with the Brown County Sheriff to resolve the FOID and FFL inventory issues. Judge Hooker went so far as to initiate an off-the-record text message to Respondent-Movant stating that *"my Sheriff can assist him in fast tracking his FOID request,"* later attempting to paper over the *ex parte* contact via email(Supporting Record, Exhibit I, p. 051). Judge Hooker subsequently formalized this absurdity by entering a court order explicitly directing Respondent-Movant to *"provide name & info to B.C. Sheriff to expedite FOID card"*—a directive entirely contrary to standard ISP regulatory procedures (Supporting Record, Exhibit J, p. 052).

This forced coordination masks a glaring, structural conflict of interest. Public records confirm that the Brown County Sheriff, Justin D. Oliver, is the registered owner and active Master FFL dealer for "Oliver Firearms Training & Sales, LLC" (Supporting Record, Exhibit K, pp. 054–055; Exhibit L, p. 056). For the presiding judge to actively orchestrate a backdoor regulatory arrangement involving Respondent-Movant's highly valuable, seized FFL inventory through a local sheriff who operates a competing commercial firearms business constitutes an egregious breach of judicial impartiality and completely taints the trial court's handling of these federal assets.

III. ARGUMENT

A. Spoliation of the Judicial Record and Denial of Appellate Due Process The trial court completely abrogated Respondent-Movant's fundamental right to a meaningful appeal by failing to secure a structural record of a trial that resulted in the permanent deprivation of his children, the liquidation of his FFL, and the absolution of Petitioner's property conversion. Because no electronic recording was maintained, standard appellate review is impossible, necessitating this Court's immediate supervisory intervention (Supporting Record, Exhibit B, p. 017).

B. Evidentiary Spoliation and the Missing Ammunition Cache The trial court engineered a legally absurd "Catch-22" by refusing to designate the FFL inventory as non-marital because Respondent-Movant could not produce the exact firm ledgers and logbooks that Petitioner had deliberately stolen during the initial raid (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 013.

Most egregiously, an estimated 25,000 to 30,000 rounds of explosive, regulated ammunition were **never included, and never answered for** (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 013; Exhibit G, p. 041). Despite continuous notice, this missing ammunition was entirely fenced off-book. The Will Sullivan Auction Company ledger explicitly confirmed that its production constituted *"everything that I have,"* proving zero rounds of the missing ammunition ever reached the liquidation facility (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 013; Exhibit FFF, p. 521). The trial court's refusal to order an evidentiary tracing sanctions the illicit private retention of thousands of rounds of regulated explosive material.

C. Unlawful Liquidation and PICA Violations Rather than permit the lawful, federally compliant transfer of the inventory to Minnesota, where Respondent-Movant resided, the trial court ordered the opposing party to commercially consign the inventory seventeen days after the Protect Illinois Communities Act (PICA) ban went into effect (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, pp. 009, 012). This resulted in an off-book auction of highly restricted PICA-banned items, intentionally bypassing the tracking mandates of the Gun Control Act of 1968 (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 012).

D. The "Warming Center" Atrocity and Disgorgement of Converted Proceeds The opposing party intentionally withheld the financial truth regarding the illicit sale to financially starve Respondent-Movant. She filed a sworn Post-Judgment Financial Affidavit claiming only $28,447.32 in "gun money," when the auction ledger revealed the true net payout was $37,539.60 (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 013; Exhibit GG, p. 0356; Exhibit FFF, p. 521).

The grotesque reality of this financial starvation peaked when Respondent-Movant, actively caring for his minor son Grant during a severe Type 1 diabetic medical crisis, made a desperate plea to the trial court for emergency financial relief (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 012; Exhibit U, pp. 184–191). Facing imminent homelessness, he was met with a callous directive from the trial court to simply "go to a warming center" (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 012). At that exact moment, Petitioner possessed actual knowledge of—and was actively concealing—tens of thousands of dollars in liquidated marital assets. Immediate disgorgement of these converted funds is required to cure the intentional deprivation of counsel.

E. Concealment of Ex-Parte Communications (Rule 2.9 Violations) Pursuant to Illinois Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.9, a judge is mandated to promptly notify parties of the substance of any unauthorized *ex parte* communication. Judge Henze has actively refused to disclose the contents of illicit communications between the court and the opposing party, utilizing the chaotic "fluid docket" to bury motions demanding this mandatory disclosure (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 014; Exhibit MM, *Motion for Ruling on Pending Motion to Compel Disclosure of Ex-Parte Communications,* pp. 414-419) .

F. Mandatory Stay for SOJ Adjudication and Venue Restriction Under Illinois law, once a Petition for Substitution of Judge (SOJ) for Cause is filed, the trial judge loses all authority to enter substantive rulings until the SOJ is transferred and adjudicated. Instead of halting the docket, the court has attempted to trap Respondent-Movant by issuing an unconstitutional injunction mandating that he file all pleadings exclusively in Cass County (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 015, Exhibit KK, p. 412). The trial court's entire docket must be frozen to preserve the integrity of this process.

G. Extrajudicial Coordination and Glaring Conflicts of Interest Regarding the FFL Inventory Throughout the proceedings, Respondent-Movant repeatedly notified Judge

Hooker and Judge Henze that the inventory prepared by the perpetrators was facially deficient, specifically emphasizing that it was entirely "devoid of any ammunition" and completely omitted thousands of rounds of missing, regulated explosive material (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 015; Exhibit G, p. 041). Respondent explicitly informed the court that he required the immediate return of lawful possession to conduct a physical inspection, determine the portfolio's value, and execute the required affidavits with the Illinois State Police (ISP) to maintain lawful federal and state compliance. (Supporting Record, Exhibit G, pp. 040–041, Exhibit)

Rather than ordering the return of the property, ordering an accounting of the missing ammunition, or appointing a receiver, Judge Hooker engaged in bizarre and extrajudicial conduct designed to bypass standard regulatory procedures. Judge Hooker became fixated on forcing Respondent-Movant to coordinate directly with the Brown County Sheriff to resolve the FOID and FFL inventory issues. Judge Hooker went so far as to initiate an off-the-record text message to Respondent-Movant stating that *"my Sheriff can assist him in fast tracking his FOID request,"* later attempting to paper over the *ex parte* contact via email (Supporting Record, Exhibit I, p. 051). Judge Hooker subsequently formalized this absurdity by entering a court order explicitly directing Respondent-Movant to *"provide name & info to B.C. Sheriff to expedite FOID card"*—a directive entirely contrary to standard ISP regulatory procedures (Supporting Record, Exhibit J, p. 052).

This forced coordination masks a glaring, structural conflict of interest. Public records confirm that the Brown County Sheriff, Justin D. Oliver, is the registered owner and active Master FFL dealer for "Oliver Firearms Training & Sales, LLC" *(Supporting Record, Exhibit K, pp. 054–055; Exhibit L, p. 056)*. For the presiding judge to actively orchestrate a backdoor regulatory arrangement involving Respondent-Movant's highly valuable, seized FFL inventory through a local sheriff who operates a competing commercial firearms business constitutes an egregious breach of judicial impartiality and completely taints the trial court's handling of these federal assets.

IV. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Respondent-Movant respectfully requests that this Honorable Court exercise its supervisory authority and enter an Order directing the Circuit Court of the Eighth Judicial Circuit to:

1. **Enter a Supervisory Order immediately staying** all substantive proceedings in Cass County Case No. 2022-DC-15 pending the transfer and adjudication of the filed Petition for Substitution of Judge for Cause by an out-of-circuit judge.
2. **Vacate** the January 18, 2024, Judgment for Dissolution of Marriage as legally void due to the complete destruction of the trial record, and for compelling the violation of state criminal statutes (PICA) and federal ATF regulations.
3. **Vacate** the unconstitutional venue restriction mandating all filings be restricted exclusively to Cass County (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 015).
4. **Transfer** the underlying proceedings to an uncompromised judicial circuit outside the Eighth Judicial Circuit to ensure an impartial adjudication of the

remaining property, custody, ammunition spoliation (which was never included and never answered for), and conversion issues (Supporting Record, Exhibit G, p. 041; Exhibit FFF, p. 521).

5. **Immediately order the disgorgement and release** of the $37,539.60 in proceeds generated from the Will Sullivan Auction to Respondent-Movant, *instanter*, for the express purpose of securing legal counsel, as Respondent-Movant has been subjected to documented financial starvation and the unlawful conversion of his corporate assets (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 013; Exhibit FFF, p. 521).
6. **Enter an Order compelling the immediate disclosure** of all federal transfer records and the physical location of all unliquidated FFL inventory, Russian weaponry, and the 25,000 to 30,000 rounds of missing ammunition to ensure federal compliance. (Supporting Record, Exhibit A, p. 015; Exhibit G, p. 041).
7. **Order** a review of the ADA procedures and make such referrals to the ARDC and JIB as deemed appropriate.
8. **Make** such referrals to the appropriate prosecutorial authorities for criminal investigations as deemed appropriate.
9. **Grant** any further relief this Court deems necessary to protect the integrity of the judicial process.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Luke A. Thomas

LUKE A. THOMAS, Movant

Thomaslitigation2022@gmail.com

ARDC No. 6278591

VERIFICATION

Under penalties as provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the statements set forth in this instrument are true and correct, except as to matters therein stated to be on information and belief and as to such matters the undersigned certifies as aforesaid that he verily believes the same to be true.

Dated: June 8, 2026 BY: /s/ Luke A. Thomas

Luke A. Thomas, Movant

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS

LUKE A. THOMAS, Movant, vs. HOLLY J. HENZE, Respondent.	Original Motion for Supervisory Order Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 383 Cass County Cir. Ct. No. 2022-DC-15

NOTICE OF FILING AND PROOF OF SERVICE

TO: Honorable Holly J. Henze (hhenze@adamscountyil.gov)

Gwendolyn M. Thomas, Petitioner *Pro Se* (gwenthomaslaw@gmail.com) in 2022-DC-15

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on June 8, 2026, I electronically filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Illinois the following documents: **(1) Motion for Supervisory Order Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 383**, and **(2) Supporting Record (Appendix)**, copies of which are hereby served upon you.

Signed this 8th day of June, 2026.

/s/Luke A. Thomas

BY:

Luke A. Thomas, Respondent

PROOF/CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I Luke A. Thomas, an attorney at law duly licensed to practice in the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that I electronically served the foregoing **Notice of Filing, Motion for Supervisory Order, and Supporting Record** upon the parties listed above by causing a true and correct copy to be transmitted via electronic mail to the email addresses of record on the 8th day of June, 2026.

BY:/s/ Luke A. Thomas

Luke A. Thomas, Movant

LUKE A. THOMAS,Movant
Thomaslitigation2022@gmail.com
ARDC No. 6278591