

Office of the State Appellate Defender

# Summary of Significant Criminal Issues Pending in the Illinois Supreme Court

*November 26, 2025*

---

**JAMES E. CHADD**

**State Appellate Defender**

**KERRY J. BRYSON**

**SHAWN O'TOOLE**

**Deputy State Appellate Defenders, Editors**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>APPEAL .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>People v. Jones</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 230926-U. ....	1
<b>(New) People v. Vargas</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240609. ...	1
<b>BAIL – PRETRIAL RELEASE &amp; DETENTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>People v. Seymore</b> , State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240616; oral argument held 9/9/2025. ....	1
<b>People v. Marshall</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/29/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 250426-U. ....	2
<b>(New) People v. Post</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 250598. ....	2
<b>BATTERY, ASSAULT &amp; STALKING .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>People v. Heintz</b> , State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 230161, oral argument held 11/12/25. ....	3
<b>COLLATERAL REMEDIES .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(New) People v. Lesley</b> , State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 210330. ....	3
<b>People v. Dobbins</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 230566; oral argument held 9/16/2025. ....	3
<b>People v. Carroll</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2024 IL App (4th) 231207. ....	4
<b>People v. McCoy</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 240198-U. ....	4
<b>(New) People v. Lynon</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231422-U. ....	5
<b>People v. Hammond</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 230583-U. ....	5
<b>CONSPIRACY &amp; SOLICITATION .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>People v. Shepherd</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 230283-U. ....	5
<b>COUNSEL.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>People v. Gizel</b> , State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231183-U. ....	6
<b>People v. Marshall</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/29/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 250426-U. ....	6
<b>DOUBLE JEOPARDY – COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>People v. Collins</b> , State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (2d) 240005. ....	7
<b>EVIDENCE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>People v. Heintz</b> , State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 230161, oral argument held 11/12/25. ....	7
<b>FITNESS .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>People v. Gizel</b> , State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231183-U. ....	8
<b>People v. Johnson</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/25/24 from 2024 IL App (5th) 220608. ....	8

<b>IDENTIFICATION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>People v. Johnson</b> , State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 220494. ....	8
<b>People v. McCoy</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 240198-U.....	9
<b>INSANITY – MENTALLY ILL – INTOXICATION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>People v. Luchins</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 221604-U.....	9
<b>JUDGE .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(New) People v. Morris</b> , State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2023 IL App (1st) 220035.....	10
<b>JURY .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>People v. Vesey</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/25/24 from 2024 IL App (4th) 230401; oral argument held 9/10/2025. ....	10
<b>JUVENILE PROCEEDINGS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>People v. Thomas</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (5th) 230304-U. ....	11
<b>People v. Smith</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 240121-U .....	11
<b>People v. Jones</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from People v. Jones, 2025 IL App (4th) 230926-U.....	11
<b>People v. McGee</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231591-U. ....	12
<b>People v. Green-Hosey</b> , State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240284. ....	12
<b>KIDNAPPING, UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT AND RELATED OFFENSES.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>People v. Wade</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231936-U. ....	12
<b>PRELIMINARY HEARING .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>People v. Chambliss</b> , State leave to appeal granted 5/29/24 from 2024 IL App (5th) 220492; oral argument held 9/9/2025. ....	13
<b>PROBATION, PERIODIC IMPRISONMENT, CONDITIONAL DISCHARGE &amp; SUPERVISION .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(New) People v. Vargas</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240609. .	13
<b>SENTENCING .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(New) People v. Morris</b> , State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2023 IL App (1st) 220035.....	13
<b>People v. Stuckey</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 241021-U.....	14
<b>People v. Thomas</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (5th) 230304-U. ....	14
<b>People v. Jones</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from People v. Jones, 2025 IL App (4th) 230926-U.....	14
<b>People v. McGee</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231591-U. ....	15
<b>People v. Nibbelin</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 240446-U.....	15

<b>People v. Green-Hosey</b> , State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240284. ....	15
<b>People v. Brown</b> , State leave to appeal granted 11/27/24 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221859-U, oral argument held 11/12/25. ....	16
<b>People v. Seymore</b> , State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240616; oral argument held 9/9/2025. ....	16
<b>(New) People v. Stafford</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240250. ....	16
<b>SPEEDY TRIAL</b> .....	17
<b>People v. Jackson</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2025 IL App (5th) 230504-U.....	17
<b>STATUTES</b> .....	17
<b>People v. Brown</b> , State leave to appeal granted 11/27/24 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221859-U, oral argument held 11/12/25. ....	17
<b>People v. Benson</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221230-U.....	17
<b>(New) People v. Sandlass</b> , State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240557-U. ....	18
<b>TRAFFIC OFFENSES</b> .....	18
<b>People v. Cruz Aguilar</b> , State leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2024 IL App (5th) 220651. ....	18
<b>VERDICTS</b> .....	18
<b>People v. Wade</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231936-U. ....	18
<b>WEAPONS</b> .....	19
<b>People v. Benson</b> , Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221230-U.....	19

## APPEAL

No. 131926

**People v. Jones**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 230926-U.

Whether the appellate court erred when it held that the Illinois Supreme Court's decision in **People v. Mata**, 217 Ill. 2d 535 (2005), that “‘sentencing issues’ or ‘sentencing-phase issues’ are rendered moot by the governor’s commutation,” meant defendant’s proportionate penalties attack on his sentence, which had been commuted by the governor from death to natural life, is moot.

Defense counsel: Joseph Benak, Chicago OSAD

No. 132234

**(New) People v. Vargas**, Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240609.

Whether completion of a sentence renders moot an appellate challenge to the underlying probation revocation, either because probation revocation does not create collateral consequences or because immigration status is not a sufficient collateral consequence.

Defense counsel: Dominique Estes, Elgin OSAD

## BAIL – PRETRIAL RELEASE & DETENTION

No. 131300

**People v. Seymore**, State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240616; oral argument held 9/9/2025.

Whether the appellate court has jurisdiction under Rule 604(h) when defendant appeals a jail term imposed as a sanction under 725 ILCS 5/110-6(f), because the sanctions order is either “an order revoking pretrial release” (albeit temporarily) under Rule 604(h)(1)(ii), or “an order imposing conditions of release” under Rule 604(h)(1)(i).

Whether 730 ILCS 130/3, which requires day-for-day good conduct credit for time served in county jail, applies to defendants serving time in county jail as a sanction for violating pre-trial release conditions under 725 ILCS 5/110-6(f).

Defense counsel: Samuel Steinberg, Chicago OSAD

No. 132129

**People v. Marshall**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/29/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 250426-U.

Whether a defendant may be considered to have intentionally relinquished a right he was never told he possessed. More specifically, whether a defendant can be found to have waived review of issues related to his pretrial detention not included in his motion for relief in accordance with Rule 604(h)(2) where the required admonishments under Rule 605(d)(1) fail to inform defendant that any issue not raised in the motion will be considered waived.

Whether a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel can ever be raised in a pretrial detention appeal under Rule 604(h).

Whether the State failed to prove that defendant committed a detainable offense where courts have determined that only aggravated battery causing great bodily harm is detainable and the State presented insufficient evidence of great bodily harm at defendant's detention hearing.

Defense counsel: Deborah Pugh, Chicago OSAD

No. 132403

**(New) People v. Post**, Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 250598.

Whether the standard of review for detention hearings announced in **People v. Morgan**, 2025 IL 130626, applies to continued pretrial detention hearings.

Whether a defendant must demonstrate a change of circumstances before a court must revisit the issue of pretrial detention.

Defense counsel: James Wozniak, Chicago OSAD

## BATTERY, ASSAULT & STALKING

No. 131340

**People v. Heintz**, State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 230161, oral argument held 11/12/25.

Whether Illinois Rule of Evidence 405(b)(2), which allows a defendant raising a self-defense theory to introduce “specific instances of the alleged victim’s prior violent conduct” if certain requirements are met, allows a defendant to introduce evidence of such conduct where that conduct occurred after the charged offense.

Defense counsel: Mathew J. Mueller, Morris, IL

## COLLATERAL REMEDIES

No. 130707

**(New) People v. Lesley**, State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 210330.

Whether, for purposes of the Certificate of Innocence statute [735 ILCS 5/2-7-2], a petitioner who voluntarily pled guilty to an offense which was subsequently deemed unconstitutional did not cause or bring about his conviction under subsection (g)(4).

Whether a petitioner who entered a negotiated guilty plea to multiple indictments must prove his innocence of all charges of both indictments in order to obtain a certificate of innocence.

Defense counsel: Joel Flaxman, Chicago

No. 131187

**People v. Dobbins**, Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 230566; oral argument held 9/16/2025.

Whether a previously-filed action for a certificate of innocence can be maintained under the Illinois Survival Act [755 ILCS 5/27-6] after a petitioner’s death.

Defense counsel: Debra Loevy & Joshua Tepfer, The Exoneration Project, Chicago

No. 131360

**People v. Carroll**, Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2024 IL App (4th) 231207.

Whether a post-conviction petitioner must demonstrate prejudice when alleging that retained post-conviction counsel rendered unreasonable assistance for failing to present and shape claims into adequate legal form, or whether remand is automatically required as is the case when appointed counsel violates Rule 651(c).

Whether a post-conviction petitioner must demonstrate prejudice when alleging that retained post-conviction counsel labored under an actual conflict of interest.

Defense counsel: Law Office of Stephen L. Richards

No. 131565

**People v. McCoy**, Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 240198-U.

Whether Illinois courts should recognize and address the concept of “memory contamination” in eyewitness identifications.

Whether, when considering the conclusiveness of newly discovered evidence of actual innocence, courts should apply an objective standard, specifically whether the new evidence places the trial evidence in a different light and undermines the court’s confidence in the judgment of guilt, or a subjective standard, requiring that the new evidence be compelling enough to satisfy the post-conviction judge of the petitioner’s innocence.

Whether affirmative proof of innocence is required to satisfy the actual innocence standard or whether it is sufficient that the newly discovered evidence disprove the entirety of the State’s case.

Defense counsel: Debra Loevy, The Exoneration Project, Chicago



No. 132043

**(New) People v. Lyon**, Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231422-U.

Whether a *pro se* defendant's failure to raise a claim in a **Krankel** proceeding results in forfeiture of that claim in his subsequent *pro se* post-conviction petition.

Defense counsel: Linda Olthoff, Chicago OSAD

No. 132067

**People v. Hammond**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 230583-U.

Whether a post-conviction attorney's Rule 651(c) certificate allows a presumption that they attempted but failed to find necessary supporting evidence, when the record otherwise objectively shows that counsel did not attach required evidence in support of the defendant's claims

Defense counsel: Caroline Bourland, Chicago OSAD

## CONSPIRACY & SOLICITATION

No. 131240

**People v. Shepherd**, Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 230283-U.

Whether a person commits solicitation of murder for hire under 720 ILCS 5/8-1.2(a) only by actually "procuring" another person to commit first-degree murder or whether it is enough to merely "solicit" another person to commit murder.

Defense counsel: Dimitri Golfis, Ottawa OSAD

## COUNSEL

No. 131527

**People v. Gisel**, State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231183-U.

Whether a trial court abuses its discretion and commits second prong plain error when it allows a defendant to proceed *pro se* where defendant is found fit to stand trial but where there also is evidence that defendant's mental illness is severe enough to render him incapable of self-representation in accordance with **Indiana v. Edwards**, 544 U.S. 164 (2008).

Defense counsel: Maximillian Hughes-Zahner, Chicago OSAD

No. 132129

**People v. Marshall**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/29/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 250426-U.

Whether a defendant may be considered to have intentionally relinquished a right he was never told he possessed. More specifically, whether a defendant can be found to have waived review of issues related to his pretrial detention not included in his motion for relief in accordance with Rule 604(h)(2) where the required admonishments under Rule 605(d)(1) fail to inform defendant that any issue not raised in the motion will be considered waived.

Whether a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel can ever be raised in a pretrial detention appeal under Rule 604(h).

Whether the State failed to prove that defendant committed a detainable offense where courts have determined that only aggravated battery causing great bodily harm is detainable and the State presented insufficient evidence of great bodily harm at defendant's detention hearing.

Defense counsel: Deborah Pugh, Chicago OSAD

## DOUBLE JEOPARDY – COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL

No. 131300

**People v. Collins**, State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (2d) 240005.

Whether, pursuant to the issue-preclusion component of the double jeopardy clause, an acquittal on a severed charge of unlawful possession of a weapon by a felon barred the State from prosecuting defendant for aggravated unlawful use of a weapon, because it would have to prove the same element - knowing possession of a firearm - that State failed to prove at the earlier trial for UPWF, or whether issue-preclusion does not apply where defendant agreed to a severance and was acquitted on the charge that was tried first, pursuant to **Currier v. Virginia**, 585 U.S. 493 (2018).

Defense counsel: Zachary Wallace, Elgin OSAD

## EVIDENCE

No. 131340

**People v. Heintz**, State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (3d) 230161, oral argument held 11/12/25.

Whether the trial court acted within its discretion in allowing evidence of defendant's prior battery charge but excluding evidence of defendant's acquittal of that charge on hearsay and relevance grounds, and whether the Court should revisit **People v. Ward**, 2011 IL 108690, to clarify the proper framework for assessing the admissibility of acquittal evidence.

Defense counsel: Mathew J. Mueller, Morris, IL

## FITNESS

No. 131527

**People v. Gizel**, State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231183-U.

Whether a trial court abuses its discretion and commits second prong plain error when it allows a defendant to proceed *pro se* where defendant is found fit to stand trial but where there also is evidence that defendant's mental illness is severe enough to render him incapable of self-representation in accordance with **Indiana v. Edwards**, 544 U.S. 164 (2008).

Defense counsel: Maximillian Hughes-Zahner, Chicago OSAD

No. 130932

**People v. Johnson**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/25/24 from 2024 IL App (5th) 220608.

Whether the appellate court violated due process when it: (1) vacated the trial court's order finding defendant restored to fitness without also vacating the guilty plea that was entered after the erroneous fitness finding; and (2) ordered a retrospective restoration proceeding. (§§21-2, 21-3(f), 21-4)

Defense counsel: Bradley Jarka, Chicago OSAD

## IDENTIFICATION

No. 131337

**People v. Johnson**, State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 220494.

Whether, when addressing challenges to the sufficiency of the evidence to convict, reviewing courts may apply the factors set forth in **Neil v. Biggers**, 409 U.S. 188, in evaluating eyewitness identification testimony or whether reviewing courts should defer to the trier of fact's credibility determinations on that question.

Defense counsel: Christina Solomon, Chicago OSAD

No. 131565

**People v. McCoy**, Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 240198-U.

Whether Illinois courts should recognize and address the concept of “memory contamination” in eyewitness identifications.

Whether, when considering the conclusiveness of newly discovered evidence of actual innocence, courts should apply an objective standard, specifically whether the new evidence places the trial evidence in a different light and undermines the court’s confidence in the judgment of guilt, or a subjective standard, requiring that the new evidence be compelling enough to satisfy the post-conviction judge of the petitioner’s innocence.

Whether affirmative proof of innocence is required to satisfy the actual innocence standard or whether it is sufficient that the newly discovered evidence disprove the entirety of the State’s case.

Defense counsel: Debra Loevy, The Exoneration Project, Chicago

## **INSANITY – MENTALLY ILL – INTOXICATION**

No. 131820

**People v. Luchins**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 221604-U.

Whether a defendant may raise a defense of involuntary intoxication after voluntarily consuming a cannabis edible that he was unaware was laced with a dangerous adulterant which caused him to enter a psychotic delusional state.

Defense counsel: Jessica Arizo, Elgin OSAD

## JUDGE

No. 129992

**(New) People v. Morris**, State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2023 IL App (1st) 220035.

Whether the appellate court misconstrued defendant's excessive sentence claim as a claim of judicial bias, which was not raised on appeal, and then erred in granting relief on that ground. Alternatively, if the appellate court's decision is construed as finding an abuse of discretion in the sentence itself, whether that decision was error.

Defense counsel: Grace Palacio, Chicago OSAD

## JURY

No. 130919

**People v. Vesey**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/25/24 from 2024 IL App (4th) 230401; oral argument held 9/10/2025.

Whether the appellate court majority incorrectly affirmed the trial court's decision to deny a defense request for a self-defense instruction at defendant's trial for aggravated battery of a peace officer, where the appellate court deferred to the trial court's decision, finding it "within the bounds of reason," rather than applying the "some evidence" standard, and where the dissent found clear evidence that the defendant was acting in response to excessive force which, in its view, is alone sufficient to warrant a self-defense instruction. (§32-8(a))

Defense counsel: Elliott Borchardt, Elgin OSAD

## JUVENILE PROCEEDINGS

No. 132048

**People v. Thomas**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (5th) 230304-U.

Whether it's possible for an appellate court to correctly hold both that a proportionate penalties claim was forfeited because it wasn't raised on direct appeal, and that appellate counsel was not ineffective for failing to raise the claim because the basis for the claim was not supported by precedent at the time of his direct appeal.

Defense counsel: Pamela Rubeo, Chicago OSAD

No. 132018

**People v. Smith**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 240121-U

Whether an adult petitioner, who establishes that his transfer to adult court for a crime committed as a juvenile was void, has an available remedy, as in **People v. Brown**, 225 Ill. 2d 188, 199 (2007) (“[t]he transfer is void just as the transfer statute is void,” and defendant is “entitled to a new transfer hearing”), or has no remedy in light of **People v. Hunter**, 2017 IL 121306 (remand for new juvenile transfer hearing “no longer feasible” because defendant was an adult and the juvenile court lacked jurisdiction over his case).

Defense counsel: Victoria Rose, Chicago OSAD

No. 131926

**People v. Jones**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from *People v. Jones*, 2025 IL App (4th) 230926-U.

Whether the appellate court erred when it held that the Illinois Supreme Court's decision in **People v. Mata**, 217 Ill. 2d 535 (2005), that “‘sentencing issues’ or ‘sentencing-phase issues’ are rendered moot by the governor’s commutation,” meant defendant’s proportionate penalties attack on his sentence, which had been commuted by the governor from death to natural life, is moot.

Defense counsel: Joseph Benak, Chicago OSAD

No. 131880

**People v. McGee**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231591-U.

Whether the supreme court’s holding in **People v. Moore**, 2023 IL 126461, that “**Miller** does not present new proportionate penalties clause principles with respect to *discretionary* sentencing of young adult defendants,” (emphasis added), applies to proportionate penalties challenges by emerging adults serving mandatory life sentences, so that those serving mandatory life sentences cannot cite **Miller** and emerging brain science as “cause” in their motion for leave to file a successive post-conviction petition.

Defense counsel: Carrie Darden, Chicago OSAD

No. 131560

**People v. Green-Hosey**, State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240284.

Whether an emerging adult defendant can establish a proportionate penalties violation by showing that he was subject to a mandatory sentence of *de facto* life without parole and was developmentally equivalent to a juvenile or whether defendant must affirmatively demonstrate that his *de facto* life sentence “shocked the moral sense of the community.”

Whether an emerging adult defendant must offer affirmative evidence that he has the specific characteristics of a juvenile in order to satisfy his burden of showing that he is developmentally equivalent to a juvenile

Defense counsel: Toni Heniff, Elgin OSAD

## **KIDNAPPING, UNLAWFUL RESTRAINT AND RELATED OFFENSES**

No. 131745

**People v. Wade**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231936-U.

Whether a defendant can be convicted of two counts of aggravated kidnaping, predicated on separate felonies, for a single underlying act of kidnaping.

Defense counsel: Emily Filpi, Chicago OSAD



## PRELIMINARY HEARING

No. 130585

**People v. Chambliss**, State leave to appeal granted 5/29/24 from 2024 IL App (5th) 220492; oral argument held 9/9/2025.

Whether the failure to hold a prompt preliminary hearing constitutes second prong plain error, requiring reversal of a conviction without retrial, where defendant does not object until after conviction following an otherwise fair trial. (§38-1)

Defense counsel: Julie Thompson, Mt. Vernon OSAD

## PROBATION, PERIODIC IMPRISONMENT, CONDITIONAL DISCHARGE & SUPERVISION

No. 132234

**(New) People v. Vargas**, Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240609.

Whether completion of a sentence renders moot an appellate challenge to the underlying probation revocation, either because probation revocation does not create collateral consequences or because immigration status is not a sufficient collateral consequence.

Defense counsel: Dominique Estes, Elgin OSAD

## SENTENCING

No. 129992

**(New) People v. Morris**, State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2023 IL App (1st) 220035.

Whether the appellate court misconstrued defendant's excessive sentence claim as a claim of judicial bias, which was not raised on appeal, and then erred in granting relief on that ground. Alternatively, if the appellate court's decision is construed as finding an abuse of discretion in the sentence itself, whether that decision was error.

Defense counsel: Grace Palacio, Chicago OSAD

No. 132060

**People v. Stuckey**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 241021-U.

Whether a sentencing court errs when it considers a defendant's childhood misbehavior in school as aggravating evidence at sentencing, given that the evidence is often unreliable hearsay, the crime is unrelated to the misbehavior, the misbehavior occurs at a young age, and courts often neglect to consider the misbehavior in the context of **Miller**.

Defense counsel: Amy Kemp, Springfield OSAD

No. 132048

**People v. Thomas**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (5th) 230304-U.

Whether it's possible for an appellate court to correctly hold both that a proportionate penalties claim was forfeited because it wasn't raised on direct appeal, and that appellate counsel was not ineffective for failing to raise the claim because the basis for the claim was not supported by precedent at the time of his direct appeal.

Defense counsel: Pamela Rubeo, Chicago OSAD

No. 131926

**People v. Jones**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from *People v. Jones*, 2025 IL App (4th) 230926-U.

Whether the appellate court erred when it held that the Illinois Supreme Court's decision in **People v. Mata**, 217 Ill. 2d 535 (2005), that "sentencing issues' or 'sentencing-phase issues' are rendered moot by the governor's commutation," meant defendant's proportionate penalties attack on his sentence, which had been commuted by the governor from death to natural life, is moot.

Defense counsel: Joseph Benak, Chicago OSAD

No. 131880

**People v. McGee**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231591-U.

Whether the supreme court’s holding in **People v. Moore**, 2023 IL 126461, that “**Miller** does not present new proportionate penalties clause principles with respect to *discretionary* sentencing of young adult defendants,” (emphasis added), applies to proportionate penalties challenges by emerging adults serving mandatory life sentences, so that those serving mandatory life sentences cannot cite **Miller** and emerging brain science as “cause” in their motion for leave to file a successive post-conviction petition.

Defense counsel: Carrie Darden, Chicago OSAD

No. 131825

**People v. Nibbelin**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (4th) 240446-U.

Whether a defendant may raise ineffective assistance of counsel on direct appeal when trial counsel fails to procure a fee waiver assessment as required by Rule 404, or whether defendant must raise that claim in a Rule 472 motion.

Defense counsel: Nancy Vincent, Springfield OSAD

No. 131560

**People v. Green-Hosey**, State leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240284.

Whether an emerging adult defendant can establish a proportionate penalties violation by showing that he was subject to a mandatory sentence of *de facto* life without parole and was developmentally equivalent to a juvenile or whether defendant must affirmatively demonstrate that his *de facto* life sentence “shocked the moral sense of the community.”

Whether an emerging adult defendant must offer affirmative evidence that he has the specific characteristics of a juvenile in order to satisfy his burden of showing that he is developmentally equivalent to a juvenile

Defense counsel: Toni Heniff, Elgin OSAD

No. 130930

**People v. Brown**, State leave to appeal granted 11/27/24 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221859-U, oral argument held 11/12/25.

Whether the 2021 amendment to 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-95(a), which provides that a defendant must have been at least 21 years of age at the time of his first qualifying offense in order to qualify for sentencing as a habitual criminal, applies retroactively.

Defense counsel: Arianne Stein, Chicago OSAD

No. 131300

**People v. Seymore**, State leave to appeal granted 3/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240616; oral argument held 9/9/2025.

Whether the appellate court has jurisdiction under Rule 604(h) when defendant appeals a jail term imposed as a sanction under 725 ILCS 5/110-6(f), because the sanctions order is either “an order revoking pretrial release” (albeit temporarily) under Rule 604(h)(1)(ii), or “an order imposing conditions of release” under Rule 604(h)(1)(i).

Whether 730 ILCS 130/3, which requires day-for-day good conduct credit for time served in county jail, applies to defendants serving time in county jail as a sanction for violating pre-trial release conditions under 725 ILCS 5/110-6(f).

Defense counsel: Samuel Steinberg, Chicago OSAD

No. 132265

**(New) People v. Stafford**, Defense leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240250.

Whether a defendant released on bond prior to trial on the condition that he submit to GPS monitoring and, with certain exceptions, home confinement, is entitled to sentencing credit under 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-100(b), or whether the statute is inapplicable because the definition of “home confinement” in 730 ILCS 5/5-8A-2(C) requires that the conditions be set by the “supervising authority,” and a trial court is not a supervising authority.

Defense counsel: Jaime Montgomery, Elgin OSAD

## SPEEDY TRIAL

No. 131608

**People v. Jackson**, Defense leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2025 IL App (5th) 230504-U.

Whether, following a period of agreed delay, the speedy trial clock restarts when a defendant demands trial or whether the clock does not restart until the case is again placed on the trial call.

Defense counsel: Madison Heckel, Chicago OSAD

## STATUTES

No. 130930

**People v. Brown**, State leave to appeal granted 11/27/24 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221859-U, oral argument held 11/12/25.

Whether the 2021 amendment to 730 ILCS 5/5-4.5-95(a), which provides that a defendant must have been at least 21 years of age at the time of his first qualifying offense in order to qualify for sentencing as a habitual criminal, applies retroactively.

Defense counsel: Arianne Stein, Chicago OSAD

No. 131191

**People v. Benson**, Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221230-U.

Whether a defendant may raise a second amendment challenge to a conviction for unlawful use of a weapon by a felon, if he can establish that he is a non-violent person or not otherwise dangerous. If so, what standard and what process should a court use to determine non-dangerousness? Should the court consider only the predicate felony for the UUWF offense, or should it consider defendant's entire criminal history? Should the court look only to the nature of the predicate in the charged offense, or should it hold an evidentiary hearing as to the facts of the prior conviction? Or is the State entitled to present any evidence relevant to dangerousness, whether related to a prior conviction or not?

Defense counsel: Elizabeth Cook, Chicago OSAD

No. 132186

**(New) People v. Sandlass**, State leave to appeal granted 11/26/25 from 2025 IL App (2d) 240557-U.

Whether the plain language of sections 2-118.1(b) and 11-501.1(h) of the Vehicle Code require the trial court to wait until the Secretary of State has filed a confirmation of a statutory summary suspension with the trial court before holding a hearing on a defendant's petition to rescind suspension.

Defense counsel: James Jenks, North Riverside

## TRAFFIC OFFENSES

No. 131382

**People v. Cruz Aguilar**, State leave to appeal granted 5/28/25 from 2024 IL App (5th) 220651.

Whether a person commits aggravated DUI under 625 ILCS 5/11-501(d)(1)(H) when he or she drives under the influence with a suspended license, where the statute requires a showing that the driver "did not possess a driver's license."

Defense counsel: Manuela Hernandez, Chicago OSAD

## VERDICTS

No. 131745

**People v. Wade**, Defense leave to appeal granted 9/24/25 from 2025 IL App (1st) 231936-U.

Whether a defendant can be convicted of two counts of aggravated kidnapping, predicated on separate felonies, for a single underlying act of kidnapping.

Defense counsel: Emily Filpi, Chicago OSAD

## WEAPONS

No. 131191

**People v. Benson**, Defense leave to appeal granted 1/29/25 from 2024 IL App (1st) 221230-U.

Whether a defendant may raise a second amendment challenge to a conviction for unlawful use of a weapon by a felon, if he can establish that he is a non-violent person or not otherwise dangerous. If so, what standard and what process should a court use to determine non-dangerousness? Should the court consider only the predicate felony for the UUWF offense, or should it consider defendant's entire criminal history? Should the court look only to the nature of the predicate in the charged offense, or should it hold an evidentiary hearing as to the facts of the prior conviction? Or is the State entitled to present any evidence relevant to dangerousness, whether related to a prior conviction or not?

Defense counsel: Elizabeth Cook, Chicago OSAD