

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION**

DAVID BASEK, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )

Case No.

TRI-STATE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT, an )  
Illinois Municipal Corporation, the TRI-STATE )  
FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BOARD OF )  
TRUSTEES, HAMILTON GIBBONS, in his )  
individual capacity and as a Trustee of the Tri-State )  
Fire Protection District’s Board of Trustees, JILL )  
STRENZEL, in her individual capacity and as a )  
Trustee of the Tri-State Fire Protection District’s )  
Board of Trustees, MICHAEL ORRICO, in his )  
individual capacity and as a Trustee of the Tri-State )  
Fire Protection District’s Board of Trustees, the )  
TRI-STATE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT )  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, ROBERT )  
JEWELL, in his individual capacity and as a )  
Commissioner of the Tri-State First Protection )  
District Board of Commissioners, WILLIAM )  
ANDERSON, in his individual capacity and as a )  
Commissioner of the Tri-State First Protection )  
District Board of Commissioners, and )  
CHRISTOPHER BAUMBACH, in his individual )  
capacity and as a Commissioner of the Tri-State )  
First Protection District Board of Commissioners, )  
and MICHELLE GIBSON, in her individual )  
capacity and as Chief of the Tri-State Fire )  
Protection District, )  
)  
Defendants. )

Jury Trial Demanded

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, David Basek, by and through his attorneys, complains against Defendants, Tri-State Fire Protection District, the Tri-State Fire Protection District Board of Trustees, Hamilton Gibbons, Jill Strenzel, Michael Orrico, the Tri-State Fire Protection District Board of

Commissioners, Robert Jewell, William Anderson, Christopher Baumbach, and Michelle Gibson and states as follows.

### **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. David Basek brings this civil action against Defendants to obtain reinstatement of his position and to obtain other damages suffered. Defendants have deprived Plaintiff of his due process rights under the Constitution of the United States of America and the Constitution of the State of Illinois by terminating Plaintiff from his employment without providing him the pre-disciplinary procedures or hearing to which he is entitled, which termination has not only resulted in the loss of his job and salary as well as other benefits, but also operates to diminish his pension benefits. Defendants have additionally violated Plaintiff's rights by terminating him in retaliation for his exercise of rights under the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA") and the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act ("IWCA").

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331, jurisdiction to redress the deprivation of rights secured by the Constitution of the United States pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1343(a) and 42 U.S.C. §1983 and §1988, and the FMLA pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §2601 et seq.; supplemental jurisdiction is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367(a).

3. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 because the acts giving rise to the claims alleged in this Complaint occurred within this district.

### **THE PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff, David Basek (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff" or "Mr. Basek") is a citizen and resident of Illinois and was at all relevant times until on or around October 29, 2012 employed by Defendant Tri-State Fire Protection District in the appointed officer position of

Division Chief. At all times relevant hereto, Plaintiff was an employee as defined under the FMLA.

5. Defendant Tri-State Fire Protection District (hereinafter referred to as “Defendant Tri-State” or “Tri-State” or “the District”) is an Illinois municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois and is an employer as defined under the FMLA.

6. Defendant Tri-State Fire Protection District Board of Trustees (hereinafter “Board of Trustees”) is charged with acting as the corporate authority of Defendant Tri-State, with responsibility for exercising all of the powers and controlling all the affairs and property of the District, and is an employer as defined under the FMLA.

7. Defendant Tri-State Fire Protection District Board of Commissioners (hereinafter “Board of Commissioners”) is charged with making decisions regarding an employee’s removal from his or her position with Defendant Tri-State and holding a hearing related to any such disciplinary action, and is an employer as defined under the FMLA.

8. Defendant Trustees Hamilton Gibbons, Jill Strenzel, and Michael Orrico are elected officials charged with responsibility for exercising all of the powers and controlling all the affairs and property of the District, and are employers as defined under the FMLA. Each has policymaking authority for Defendant Tri-State.

9. Defendant Commissioners Robert Jewell, William Anderson, and Christopher Baumbach, are appointed officials charged with making decisions regarding an employee’s removal from his or her position with Defendant Tri-State and holding a hearing related to any such disciplinary action, and are employers as defined under the FMLA. Each has policymaking authority for Defendant Tri-State.

10. Defendant Michelle Gibson is the Chief of the Tri-State Fire Protection District, is charged with overseeing the day-to-day operations of the District, and is an employer as defined under the FMLA. Defendant Gibson has policymaking authority for Defendant Tri-State.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

11. Mr. Basek first became employed by Defendant Tri-State as a union firefighter in or around 1986.

12. Over the next 20 years, Mr. Basek established an exemplary record of professionalism and dedication to his duties as a public servant.

13. As a result of Mr. Basek's excellent work performance, he was appointed to the position of Division Chief in or around 2005.

14. Mr. Basek continued to perform his duties as Division Chief in an exemplary manner.

15. In or around June 2011, Mr. Basek began to receive medical treatment for a heart condition.

16. Mr. Basek's treatment required him to take medical leaves of absence from work throughout the remainder of 2011.

17. In or around November 2011, Mr. Basek filed a claim at the Illinois Industrial Commission for workers' compensation benefits pursuant to the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act regarding his heart condition.

18. While in the course of receiving treatment in or around December 2011, Mr. Basek was told that his supervisor was displeased about Mr. Basek having filed a workers' compensation claim.

19. Upon returning to work in 2012, Mr. Basek began experiencing harassment related to his workers' compensation claim, including comments making light of his heart condition and his claim that his heart condition resulted from his service to Defendant Tri-State.

20. On or around May 27, 2012, Mr. Basek suffered an FMLA qualifying, non-workplace injury.

21. At this time, Mr. Basek began a two-month medical leave of absence pursuant to the FMLA.

22. Within weeks of beginning his FMLA leave, on or around June 13, 2012, Tri-State's Fire Chief, Michelle Gibson, sent Mr. Basek and several other employees an e-mail vaguely identifying an investigation into unidentified possible violation(s) of District Rule(s). No specific rules identified.

23. The e-mail sent to Mr. Basek and several others stated, "[a]ttached is a notice of investigation for the individuals listed consider yourself served if you are listed on the notice."

24. No further information was provided to Mr. Basek regarding the nature or targets of the "investigation."

25. Additionally, at this time and while out on his medical leave of absence, Mr. Basek was instructed to begin providing a weekly report on district business or actions he was involved with to Chief Gibson.

26. Upon returning from his medical leave of absence on or around July 24, 2012, Mr. Basek attempted to discuss with Chief Gibson the investigation into the unidentified violation(s) referenced in the e-mail and the procedure for providing her with his weekly report.

27. However, Chief Gibson refused to discuss the investigation or the requirements of the weekly reports.

28. Instead, Mr. Basek was informed by Deputy Chief Jack Mancione to “let sleeping dogs lie” and not to worry about it and not to ask questions.

29. Mr. Basek nevertheless began to provide Deputy Chief Mancione with a weekly report and continued to perform his duties as Division Chief without any incident or complaint.

30. Also upon his return from medical leave, Mr. Basek was not returned to his prior work station in a spacious cubicle of his own, but was instead required to work from a desk against a wall typically reserved for part-time employees.

31. Around this same time, Mr. Basek discovered he had been removed from the District’s website and was no longer identified as Division Chief, as he had been prior to his FMLA leave.

32. Subsequently, on or about October 29, 2012, Mr. Basek was called into a meeting with Chief Gibson and Deputy Chief Mancione and discharged from his position as Division Chief.

33. Chief Gibson claimed that as part of an unspecified investigation, the unidentified rule violations had been sustained against Mr. Basek and that she was discharging him from his job as Division Chief, but offered that he could work in a union position of Career Service Lieutenant.

34. The Illinois Fire Protection District Act, 70 ILCS 705 et seq. (hereinafter sometimes referred to as “the Act”) mandates that “no officer or member of the fire department of any protection district who has held that position for one year shall be removed or discharged except for just cause, upon written charges specifying the complainant and the basis for the charges, and after a hearing on those charges before the board of fire commissioners, affording the officer or member an opportunity to be heard in his own defense.”

35. The Rules and Regulations of the Tri-State Fire Protection District as well as the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Fire Commissioners of the Tri-State Fire Protection District provide further protections beyond the Act to an officer or member subject to removal.

36. Per the Rules and Regulations of the Tri-State Fire Protection District, the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Fire Commissioners of the Tri-State Fire Protection District, and the Illinois Fire Protection District Act, 70 ILCS 705, Mr. Basek could only be removed from his position as Division Chief after receiving required due process safeguards, including but not limited to:

- a. a written report of an investigation summarizing the alleged act of misconduct, pertinent portions of the statements of all parties to the incident, physical evidence and other evidence important to the case, and the observations and conclusions of the investigating officer;
- b. a written complaint setting forth a plain and concise statement of the facts upon which the complaint is based;
- c. a public hearing before the Board of Fire Commissioners recorded in compliance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act;
- d. the right to be represented by counsel; and
- e. the opportunity to be heard in his own defense and to cross examine witnesses.

37. Mr. Basek was not provided with a written report of an investigation summarizing the alleged act of misconduct, pertinent portions of the statements of all parties to the incident, physical evidence and other evidence important to the case, and the observations and conclusions of the investigating officer.

38. Mr. Basek was not provided with a written complaint setting forth a plain and concise statement of the facts upon which the complaint is based.

39. Mr. Basek was not provided with a public hearing before the Board of Fire Commissions recorded in compliance with the Illinois Open Meetings Act.

40. Mr. Basek was not provided with an opportunity to be represented by counsel.

41. Mr. Basek was not provided an opportunity to be heard in his own defense.

42. Mr. Basek was not provided an opportunity to cross-examine witnesses.

43. Rather, after enjoying a long-standing and excellent career of nearly 27 years of employment, Mr. Basek was summarily discharged for patently pretextual reasons, just a few months after returning from FMLA leave, and after having filed his first ever claim with the Illinois Industrial Commission.

44. Shortly after his discharge, perhaps realizing that Mr. Basek had been removed unlawfully without due process protections, Defendants offered to voluntarily reinstate Mr. Basek to Division Chief and discussed certain details of the reinstatement, but purported to need time to finalize the terms and details of such reinstatement.

45. After another meeting, several months, and several more inquiries regarding the status of his reinstatement, Mr. Basek had not received any further response or details regarding his reinstatement.

46. Accordingly, in May 2013, Mr. Basek's counsel sent correspondence informing Chief Gibson, Board of Trustees members Jill Strenzel, Hamilton Gibbons, and Michael Orrico, and Board of Commissioners members Robert Jewell, William Anderson, and Christopher Baumbach, that Mr. Basek was discharged without the due process safeguards of pre-termination or post-termination procedures and hearings, and expressly demanded, should Defendants not voluntarily reinstate Mr. Basek as previously discussed, that Mr. Basek be reinstated to his position as Division Chief and provided any charges against him and a hearing date.

47. Defendants thereafter refused to reinstate Mr. Basek to Division Chief and have at all times relevant hereto failed to comply with the pre-disciplinary procedures Mr. Basek is

entitled to, failed to provide Mr. Basek a hearing, and have otherwise refused to provide him with the due process protections to which he is entitled.

48. Defendants' actions are in violation of federal and state law and have caused Plaintiff to suffer damages, including a loss of salary, benefits, loss of earning capacity, diminished pension value, emotional distress and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, humiliation, embarrassment, reputational and career damage, and other non-pecuniary losses.

**COUNT I**  
**DUE PROCESS VIOLATION OF**  
**THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - 42 U.S.C §1983**  
**(against all Defendants individually and jointly)**

49. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 48 and incorporates them as though fully set forth herein.

50. At all relevant times, Plaintiff had a property interest in his employment created by the Illinois Fire Protection District Act (70 ILCS 705/16.13b) and protected by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America.

51. Furthermore, Defendants had promulgated rules and regulations in compliance with the Illinois Fire Protection District Act as due process safeguards in relation to any discharge of an officer.

52. In violation of Plaintiff's due process rights and the Rules and Regulations of the Tri-State Fire Protection District as well as the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Fire Commissioners of the Tri-State Fire Protection District, Defendants deprived Plaintiff of pre-termination and post-termination procedures and hearings.

53. Upon information and belief, Defendants have a policy, practice and/or custom of denying individuals their due process rights in relation to continued employment.

54. The conduct of Defendant was taken in concert, was willful, wanton, intentional and malicious and deliberately indifferent to Plaintiffs' rights under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

55. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions in violation of his Constitutional right to due process, Plaintiff has sustained damages, including a loss of salary, benefits, loss of earning capacity, diminished pension value, emotional distress and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, humiliation, embarrassment, reputational and career damage, and other non-pecuniary losses.

56. Plaintiff demands to exercise his right to a jury trial of this matter.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court find in his favor on and against Defendants on Count I as follows:

- a. Declare that Defendants' conduct is in violation of Plaintiff's due process rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments;
- b. Order Defendants to reinstate Plaintiff to his position as Appointed Division Chief;
- c. Award Plaintiff the value of all compensation lost and benefits lost, including interest, as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct;
- d. Award Plaintiff the value of compensation and benefits he will lose in the future as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, including the loss of value to his pension;
- e. Award Plaintiff punitive damages;
- f. Award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements; and
- g. Award Plaintiff any and all other relief as the Court deems just in the premises.

**COUNT II**  
**DUE PROCESS VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS**  
**(against all Defendants individually and jointly)**

57. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 48 and incorporates them as though fully set forth herein.

58. At all relevant times, Plaintiff had a property interest in his employment created by the Illinois Fire Protection District Act (70 ILCS 705/16.13b) and protected by Article I, Section 2 to the Constitution of the State Of Illinois.

59. Furthermore, Defendants had promulgated rules and regulations in compliance with the Illinois Fire Protection District Act as due process safeguards in relation to any discharge of an officer.

60. In violation of Plaintiff's due process rights under Article I, Section 2 to the Constitution of the State Of Illinois, under the Illinois Fire Protection District Act, under the Rules and Regulations of the Tri-State Fire Protection District, and under the Rules and Regulations of the Board of Fire Commissioners of the Tri-State Fire Protection District, the Defendants deprived Plaintiff of pre-termination and post-termination procedures and hearings.

61. Upon information and belief, Defendants have a policy, practice and/or custom of denying individuals their due process rights in relation to continued employment.

62. Article XIII, Section 5 of the Illinois Constitution further states that membership in a pension or retirement system of any local government unit "shall be an enforceable contractual relationship, the benefits of which shall not be diminished."

63. By removing Plaintiff from his Division Chief position without due process of law and offering him instead a union position making significantly less money, Defendants have diminished Plaintiff's pension benefit.

64. The conduct of Defendant was taken in concert, was willful, wanton, intentional and malicious and deliberately indifferent to Plaintiffs' rights under the Illinois Constitution.

65. As a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' foregoing actions in violation of the his Constitutional right to due process, Plaintiff has sustained damages, including a loss of salary, benefits, loss of earning capacity, emotional distress and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, humiliation, embarrassment, reputational and career damage,, and other non-pecuniary damages

66. Plaintiff demands to exercise his right to a jury trial of this matter.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court find in his favor on and against Defendants on Count II as follows:

- a. Declare that Defendants' conduct is in violation of Plaintiff's due process rights under Article I, Section 2 to the Constitution of the State Of Illinois and in violation of Article XIII, Section 5 to the Constitution of the State Of Illinois;
- b. Order Defendants to reinstate Plaintiff to his position as Appointed Division Chief;
- c. Award Plaintiff the value of all compensation lost and benefits lost, including interest, as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct;
- d. Award Plaintiff the value of compensation and benefits he will lose in the future as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, including the loss of value to his pension;
- e. Award Plaintiff punitive damages;
- f. Award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements; and
- g. Award Plaintiff any and all other relief as the Court deems just in the premises.

**COUNT III**  
**MANDAMUS**  
**(against Defendant Tri-State)**

67. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 48 and incorporates them as though fully set forth herein.

68. By virtue of his property interest in his employment, the Defendants had a duty to provide Plaintiff due process of law.

69. Defendants never provided Plaintiff with the discharge procedures and hearing to which he is entitled.

70. Due process requires that Plaintiff be afforded a hearing and that the hearing be fair and impartial and conducted before an unbiased decisionmaker and due process further entitles Plaintiff to impartial evidentiary rulings.

71. The Board of Trustees appoint individuals to the Board of Commissioners, which Board of Commissioners would typically be charged with overseeing a disciplinary or removal related hearing and rendering a decision on the personnel matters at issue in the hearing.

72. Defendant Tri-State's Chief, Michelle Gibson, and Defendant Board of Trustee member Jill Strenzel maintain an intimate relationship as long-standing, live-in life partners, thereby negating Defendant Strenzel's ability to be impartial in affirming or invalidating decisions made by Defendant Gibson and ability to be impartial in appointing individuals to the Board of Commissioners who would question or overrule Chief Gibson's decisions.

73. Additionally, the other members of the Board of Trustees and the Board of Commissioners were also complicit in the due process violations by also refusing Plaintiff's requested pre-termination and post-termination due process rights and with their complicity in

his termination from employment without these protections, thereby negating any impartiality in a hearing that would now take place.

74. Any hearing set before the Board of Trustees and/or Board of Commissioners would therefore deny Plaintiff his due process right to a fair and impartial hearing.

75. Plaintiff has been and is injured, and will continue to suffer irreparable injury, in that he is being denied his property interest in continued employment as Division Chief without due process of law, and that he has been denied his wages and other benefits as Division Chief, in further violation of Defendants' rules and regulations which mandate that he may not be placed on a suspension without pay pending a disciplinary hearing for longer than 5 or 30 days, depending on who ordered the suspension.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court find in his favor and against Defendant on Count III as follows:

- a. Order Defendant to reinstate Plaintiff to his appointed position of Division Chief;
- b. Order Defendant to provide Plaintiff with fair and proper pre-termination and post-termination procedures and hearings as set forth herein and as otherwise called for under the Fire Protection District Act and the Rules and Regulations of Tri-State as well as the Board of Trustees and Board of Commissioners;
- c. Order that the hearing be conducted before an impartial hearing officer to be paid for by Defendants and selected with Plaintiff's mutual assent;
- d. Award Plaintiff the value of all compensation lost and benefits lost as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct;
- e. Award Plaintiff the value of compensation and benefits he will lose in the future as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct, including the loss of value to his pension;
- f. Award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements; and
- g. Award Plaintiff any and all other relief as the Court deems just in the premises.

**COUNT IV**  
**DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION**  
**IN VIOLATION OF THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT**  
**(against all Defendants individually and jointly)**

76. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 48 and incorporates them as though fully set forth herein.

77. The Family and Medical Leave Act, specifically 29 U.S.C. § 2615, makes it unlawful for an employer to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any individual for exercising rights under the FMLA.

78. As set forth above, Plaintiff engaged in protected activity and exercised rights under the FMLA.

79. By its conduct as alleged herein, Defendants violated the Family and Medical Leave Act by discriminating and retaliating against Plaintiff for his exercise of those rights.

80. Defendants' conduct toward Plaintiff illustrated, and continues to illustrate, a willful and/or reckless disregard of Plaintiff's rights under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

81. Plaintiff demands to exercise his right to a jury trial of this matter.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court find in his favor on and against Defendants on Count IV as follows:

- a. Declare that Defendants' conduct is in violation of the Family and Medical Leave Act;
- b. Enjoin Defendants and all officers, agents, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them from engaging in unlawful employment practices under the FMLA;
- c. Enjoin Defendants and all officers, agents, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them to institute and carry out all policies and practices consistent with the FMLA to provide equal employment opportunities for all and to prevent retaliation;

- d. Award Plaintiff the value of all compensation lost and benefits lost as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct;
- e. Award Plaintiff the value of compensation and benefits he will lose in the future as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, including the loss of value to his pension;
- f. Order Defendants to reinstate Plaintiff's employment, or in the alternative, order Defendants to pay Plaintiff front pay in lieu of reinstatement;
- g. Award Plaintiff liquidated damages;
- h. Award Plaintiff reasonable attorneys' fees, costs and disbursements; and
- i. Award Plaintiff any and all other relief as the Court deems just in the premises.

**COUNT V**  
**RETALIATORY DISCHARGE**  
**IN VIOLATION OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT**  
**(against Defendant Tri-State)**

82. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 1 through 48 and incorporates them as if fully set forth herein.

83. The State of Illinois has a clearly mandated public policy that prohibits any employer from engaging in any retaliatory or discriminatory conduct against an employee because of the exercise of rights under the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act.

84. Section 4(h) of the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act, 820 ILCS 305, et seq. provides in part that: "It shall be unlawful for any employer...to discharge, to threaten to discharge, to refuse to rehire or recall to active service in a suitable capacity an employee because of his or her rights or remedies granted to him or her by [the Illinois Worker's Compensation Act]." 820 ILCS 305/4(h)

85. By its conduct as alleged herein, Defendant has violated the clearly mandated public policy of the State of Illinois by acting in retaliation for Plaintiff's exercise of rights under the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act.

86. Defendant's conduct toward Plaintiff illustrated a willful and reckless disregard of Plaintiff's right to be free from impermissible retaliatory conduct.

87. Plaintiff demands to exercise his right to a jury trial of this matter.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against Defendants on Count V and that it:

- a. Declare that Defendant's actions constitute unlawful retaliatory discharge in violation of the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act;
- b. Award Plaintiff the value of all lost compensation and benefits as a result of Defendant's unlawful conduct.
- c. Order Defendant to reinstate Plaintiff to a position equal to or greater than his former positions; or, in the alternative, award Plaintiff the value of compensation and benefits he will lose in the future as a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct;
- d. Award Plaintiff any applicable compensatory and punitive damages;
- e. Award Plaintiff any applicable reasonable attorney's fees, costs and disbursements;
- f. Enjoin Defendant and all officers, agents, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them from engaging in any unlawful employment practice;
- g. Enjoin Defendant and all officers, agents, employees and all persons in active concert or participation with them to institute and carry out all policies and practices to provide equal employment opportunities for all and to prevent retaliation;
- h. Award Plaintiff any and all other relief as the Court deems just in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

By: s/ M. Megan O'Malley  
Attorney for the Plaintiff

M. Megan O'Malley  
Jacob B. Shorr  
**O'Malley & Madden, P.C.**  
542 So. Dearborn Street  
Suite 660  
Chicago, Illinois 60605  
(312) 697-1382  
ARDC No. 6243598  
office@ompclaw.com