IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
Municipal Department – District 1 - Housing Section

CITY OF CHICAGO Plaintiff, vs. 1720 N SEDGWICK ST, ASSOCIATED BANK NA, NON-RECORD CLAIMANTS, UNKNOWN OWNERS, Atty. Joseph Younes, Esq., et al. Defendants, and Richard B. Daniggelis, Proposed Intervening Defendant.	)	**Case No.: 2017-M1-400775** Before: Hon. PATRICE MUNZEL BALL-REED, Associate Judge Case Type: HOUSING District: First Municipal

MOTION TO INTERVENE BY INTERVENOR, Richard B. Daniggelis

I, Richard B. Daniggelis, hereby move this Court, pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/2-408, for permission to intervene in the above-captioned matter.

1) I have the right to intervene under 735 ILCS 5/2-408(a)(2) because "the representation of the applicant's interest by existing parties is or may be inadequate and the applicant will or may be bound by an order or judgment in the action."
2) Moreover, I have the right to intervene under 735 ILCS 5/2-408(a)(3) because "the applicant is so situated as to be adversely affected by a distribution or other disposition of property in the custody or subject to the control or disposition of the court or a court officer."

Argument whereof:

Where intervention as of right is asserted, "the trial court's jurisdiction is limited to determining timeliness, inadequacy of representation and sufficiency of interest; once these threshold requirements have been met, the plain meaning of the statute directs that the petition be granted." ***City of Chicago v. John Hancock Mutual Life Ins. Co.*, 127 Ill.App.3d 140, 144 (1st Dist. 1984).** [Emphasis added in underline & bold; not in original] Petitioner satisfies all three requirements, **giving me the right to intervene under 735 ILCS 5/2-408(a)(3).**

Timeliness: Courts evaluating timeliness consider "the totality of the circumstances," ***United States v. Alcan Aluminum, Inc.*, 25 F.3d 1174, 1181 (3d Cir. 1994**), "[p]rejudice is the heart of the timeliness requirement," ***Jones v. Caddo Parish Sch. Bd.*, 735 F.2d 923, 946 (5th Cir. 1984) (*en banc*).** Indeed, "courts are in general agreement that an intervention of right under Rule 24(a) must be granted unless the petition to intervene would work a hardship on one of the original parties." ***McDonald v. E.J. Lavino Co.*, 430 F.2d 1065, 1073 (5th Cir. 1970) (citation omitted).** Since the court—and all parties—have long known the legal arguments and views of Intervenor, by means of his lengthy litigation to regain the title to his house and property—which were stolen by means of obvious title/ mortgage fraud—no party is prejudiced or caught off guard.

Moreover: This Motion is timely because Intervenor had attempted to file his Motion (in open court by verbal motion) before any party (excepting prospective Intervenor, Gordon Watts) had filed any responsive pleading. Trial court judge, Patrice Ball-Reed, did not let me speak, but I did try to file my motion, **and this is a well-known fact:** Therefore, no parties would be prejudiced by granting intervention at this stage.

Inadequacy of Representation: Since this court is considering Joseph Younes to be the true owner, and since he is not the lawful owner, then it is clearly obvious that my interests are not being represented. The legal standing of the true owner (myself) is (or should be) at least as great or greater than the legal standing of an "owner" who obtained the house and property by fraudulent means.

Sufficiency of Interest: Proof of my claims of fraudulent transfer of title (which, of course, would give me 100% and complete legal standing) are described in great detail by litigation **which is an active case and which is currently pending (on motion for reconsideration) before the Law Division in case number 2007-CH-29738: see the 3rd and last exhibit.** This was was a Chancery case, where Judge Michael F. Otto ruled that Mr. Younes is the owner, but Judge Otto gave no legal basis for his ruling, and, in fact, there is no legal basis, which is why I, and many others, are fighting this matter in court:

1) I entered an affidavit of forgery into the Recorder's Office, giving notice that my house (for which it is documented that I never received any payment) was stolen via mortgage fraud.
2) Both Benji Philips and Andjelko Galic have represented me in court.
3) Gordon Wayne Watts, who is also asking to Intervene, as a matter of right, has filed numerous pleadings (as a "friend of the court" and now as an Intervenor) making the case that my house was stolen, and attempting to cover a few bases that my attorneys inadvertently overlooked.
4) Since Mr. Watts' name now appears on the court docket as a defendant (see 3rd exhibit, below), he now now officially an Intervenor in that case. (If he has intervention rights, mine should be greater, as I am the genuine and true owner.)
5) Judge Ball-Reed, recently, invited me, in open court, to file Intervention should I wish to participate in this court case. **I am now so doing.**

Furthermore, while I do have an attorney representing me in the Law Division case, he is either unwilling or unable (or both) to represent me here in the Civil Division "Code Violation" case, and I would prefer him to not represent me because he has missed court dates and otherwise not represented me well (as described in the exhibits attached, both my own statement to the First Appellate Court and their own description of Mr. Galic's behavior and lack of representation). See below for exhibits.

Regarding Mr. Watts, he told me that he wanted to intervene to protect his own interests, and I told him that I did not object, so long as it did not somehow interfere with my case—or prevent me from having a fair day in court. Moreover, I will verify his claims that I owe him some amounts of monies for research and other technical assistance he's given me. While we did not agree on any specified amount, I will trust him to be honest in his claims of the documents he's submitted to support his claims.

Since Gordon was allowed to intervene in the sister case, which is currently pending before the law division (see the 3rd exhibit, below, where he is now, finally, a named defendant, as he had asked the court to grant), and his "interests" are merely monies owed to him by me for various research and technological assistance (no legal representation, as he is not a lawyer, mind you, just a lot of research and technical assistance with computer technology, and the like), I should be allowed to intervene: My interests are at least as great at those of Mr. Watts: I am the genuine owner (even if not currently, the "legal owner"). Thus, my "intervention" rights are (or should be) at least as great, *and then greater.*

Lastly, while Gordon may have certain views on his requests of this court (and he and I both agree that Mr. Younes stole my house from me), and I trust this court listen to and consider his views and suggestions, nonetheless, my proposed solutions may possibly differ, and may not necessarily be the same, so I also ask the court to remember that I am "the principal," as I am the true owner, and my opinion should count the most.

Conclusion

Specifically, I ask the court to put a halt to all proceedings in this case until the Law Division case (*GMAC v. Daniggelis, et al*, 2007-CH-29738, pending before the Law Division, as I speak) is fully and completely resolved. I also believe that there should be threat of criminal prosecution for repeated code violations, mortgage fraud, contempt of court, and other things, as a means to force him to fix the house that he illegally damaged, and respectfully point out no less than two Police reports were filed about this: One about the bank illegally breaking in, and another about exploitation involving mortgage fraud, which I filed with the police. A copy of both police reports in on file in that case, and is exhibit 'A' of Mr. Watts' 04/21/2017 filing in that case before the Law Division, should This Court wish to examine it to verify my claims or get further information. I wish to speak for myself, and have my day in court, even though **(see below, in exhibits)** I do not have an attorney. Justice is not fair unless it listens with equal attentiveness to all litigants, both rich and poor. **Therefore, I respectfully ask this court to consider my motion for intervention just as much "coming from myself," as the court does for "people with attorneys."**

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: This Thursday, October 19, 2017

_____

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

The undersigned Movant, Richard B. Daniggelis, hereby certifies under penalties of perjury as provided by law pursuant to 735 ILCS 5/1-109, this motion to intervene is only being served upon the court because I am *in forma pauperis* (a result of me having been made homeless and having to spend my limited resources to find housing for myself and storage for my belongings).

I respectfully ask this court, if it is necessary, to serve all the proper parties as is required by law, since I can not serve them myself.

Signature: _____
Richard B. Daniggelis, *Intervenor, pro se*

Dated: This Thursday, October 19, 2017

Exhibits, in the following order:

1) Court's order, calling out Attorney Galic, my attorney, for doing a poor job of representing me (2 pages)
2) My motion, citing Atty. Galic's poor representation as to why my attorney couldn't file (5 pages)
3) A screenshot of the docket in the Law Division case, where I am contesting ownership of my house, and which is pending on motion for reconsideration. (1 page)

See below:

No. 1-14-2751

IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF ILLINOIS
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

RICHARD DANIGGELIS, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. JOSEPH YOUNES, Defendant-Appellee.	)))))))))	Appeal from the Circuit Court of Cook County No. 07 CH 29738 Honorable Michael F. Otto, Judge Presiding.

ORDER

Appellant, Richard Danigellis, has requested additional time to file his brief on appeal. Danigellis' brief was due April 27, 2016. On May 17, 2016, appellee, Joseph Younes, filed a motion to dismiss the appeal given Danigellis' failure to file a brief. Danigellis did not respond to the motion to dismiss, but on May 27, 2016, filed his motion for extension of time in which he seeks until August 1, 2016 to file his brief.

Given the history of this case, appellant's failure to timely file his brief in inexcusable. On September 12, 2014, Danigellis filed an untimely notice of appeal. We denied leave to file a late notice of appeal. On March 25, 2015, the supreme court directed us to allow the filing of Danigellis' late notice of appeal.

The record on appeal was initially due on July 31, 2015. Although our order vacating the prior denial of leave to file a late notice of appeal was entered on May 6, 2015, counsel for Danigellis did not request the Clerk to prepare the record until July 14, 2015, more than two

months later. Further, Danigellis neither filed the record nor sought an extension of time to do so until March 3, 2016, more than seven months after the record was due. Over Younes' objection, we granted the extension and the record was filed on March 23, 2016.

As noted, the due date for Danigellis' brief came and went with no brief being filed and no timely motion for extension of time. It was only after Younes sought dismissal that Danigellis belatedly filed his motion to extend time.

Given Danigellis' repeated disregard of deadlines coupled with his failure to timely seek extensions of those deadlines, we have dismissed Danigellis' appeal by separate order. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for extension of time is DENIED as moot.

ORDER ENTERED

JUN 16 2016

APPELLATE COURT, FIRST DISTRICT

JUSTICE

JUSTICE

JUSTICE

O.B. (3)

N0. 1-14-2751

Trial Court No,: 2007 CH 29738

IN THE APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS

FIRST DISTRICT

GMAC Mortage, LLC n/k/a Bank of America, N.A. aka)
)
"LaSalle Bank National Association," aka "US Bank, NA.")
as trustee for Morgan Stanley Loan Trust 2006-16AX,)
)
Plaintiff)
)
Vs.)
)
Richard B. Daniggelis)
)
)
Defendant)

EMERGENCY MOTION EX PARTE FOR REINSTATEMENT OF APPEAL

1. Richard B. Daniggelis , the defendant, proceeding In Forma Paperis, and pro se, because my attorney, Andjelko Galic, has left the country for some personal reason and did not respond to a May 17, 2016 motion by J.Younes to dismiss the case for lack of timely progress. It appears this court dismissed this case on June 8,2016 despite a pending motion by Mr Galic on or about May 15, 2016 asking for an extention to file answers or motions.

2. I have not received any response from Mr. Galic despite leaving him telephone messages and sending him e-mails this week since learning of the dismissal order, There have been no replies to my submissions to his office.

3. Due to the status of the dismissal and the uncertainty of action by my Attorney, I am filing this Emergency Motion to Reinstate my case on the basis of the pending Motion to Extend

or if there is no valid pending motion, then to request this Emergency Motion to reinstate my case because of the inaction of my attorney and to give me time to find my attorney or hire another one.

4. I respectfully ask This Court to grant my motion instanter due to the emergency nature of my situation, allow me to proceed ex parte without contacting the other parties and having the Court serve them their service copies which I cannot do because I am In Forma Pauperis.

EMERGENCY MOTION, ex parte, FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND INJUNCTION WITH STAY PENDING APPEAL

5. If the court decides it cannot decide instanter, I move that the Court grant a stay of enforcement over any lower courts action and over any further gutting of and destruction of the inside of my house which has been in my family since my family owned it in the early 1900's.

6. J. Younes has been gutting the inside of my house since the issue of the dismissal Order on June 8, 2016 and hauling away the debris. It is imperitive that this be stopped until all these issues are decided. It will be clear from the evidence that the illegal transfer by forged deed and documents should be set aside and title cleared in my name to reinstate my ownership and large financial equity. The evidence will make the likelihood of my winning the decision over whelming.

Certificate of Service

The undersigned, hereby certifies under penalties of perjury as provided by law pursuant to

735 ILCS 5/1-109, that I am only serving this court because I am In Forma Pauperis, and I respectfully ask this court to serve all parties who might need to be served.

Respectfully submitted,

I WILL SERVE BY US MAIL ON JUNE 17, 2016

Richard Daniggelis
Richard B. Daniggelis, pro se

Motion for Waiver of Court Fees

1. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 298 (Application for Waiver of Court Fees) and ILAppellate Court, ist Dist. Local RULE 13 (WAIVER OF FEES), I hereby move This Court for Waiver of Court Fees.
2. Attached is my notarized statement assets and liabilities

Respectfully submitted

Richard B. Danniggelis, pro se

AFFIDAVIT

I, Richard Daniggelis, hereby attesting and giving a sworn statement that the foregoing statements are true:

1) Paul Shelton, an attorney who fraudulently transferred the title of my house in Lincoln Park, Chicago, Illinois in July 2006 was disbarred in January 2016 for mortgage fraud (see attached).

2) Paul Shelton, transferred the title from my name Richard Daniggelis, to the name of Joseph Younes, an attorney who was his former partner for ten (10) years according to Paul Shelton.

3) I made out a sworn statement to this effect in April 2007 that the deed that was used in a closing, was forged (see attached).

4) The two attorneys Joseph Younes and Paul Shelton arranged a closing without my knowledge or authorization whatsoever.

5) The deed was prepared by Paul Shelton, whose name is on the top of the deed (see attached).

6) Paul Shelton, was a real estate attorney and an agent for Stewart Title and Stewart Title was the Title Company that handled the closing.

7) The forged deed was notarized by Paul Shelton's wife, Lisa Vitek, whom, I never saw before the day she was in court giving false testimony that I gave her my driver's license at the time of the notarizing (see attached).

8) I never accepted any money what so ever for my house.

9) I was told that Joseph Younes never brought any of his own money to the closing and that there was a man named Larouche who was involved financially during the closing.

10) As I maintain, I was the rightful owner, I stayed in the house, going to court representing myself as well as well as having pro bono attorneys. Andjelko Galic has represented me for about the last five (5) years.

11) I am still in court in spite of the preponderance of evidence where even the one who prepared the deed, Paul Shelton, was disbarred this year for mortgage fraud. Joseph Younes the one who, together with Paul Shelton, arranged the closing, is still practicing law and his name is still on my title.

12) Joseph Younes is being investigated in the same way Paul Shelton was investigated by the Attorney General's Office, the State Attorney's Office and the ARDC which disbarred Paul Shelton and are all seeking to find out how my house was put in Joseph Younes' name.

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COOK COUNTY)

Richard Domingelis
Signature of Affiant

Subscribe and sworn before me:

This_____ day of _____, by

_____
Signature of Notary

My Commission expires on: _____

Cook County Clerk of the Circuit Court

Electronic Docket Search

Chancery, Domestic/Child Support, Civil and Law Divisions

Case Information Summary for Case Number
2007-CH-29738

Filing Date: 10/17/2007
Division: Law Division
Ad Damnum: $0.00

Case Type: CONTRACT
District: First Municipal
Calendar: W

Party Information

Plaintiff(s)	**Attorney(s)**
GMAC MORTGAGE LLC	PIERCE & ASSOCIATES 1 N DEARBORN #1300 CHICAGO IL, 60602 (312) 346-9088
BANK AMERICA NA CHICAGO VOLUNTEER LEGAL LASALLE	KALLMAN JOHN K 221 N LASALLE #1200 CHICAGO IL, 60601 (312) 578-1515
US BANK NATIONAL ASSOCI	

Defendant(s)	**Defendant Date of Service**	**Attorney(s)**
DANIGGELIS RICHARD		CHICAGO VOLUNTEER LEGAL S 33 N DEARBORN 400 CHICAGO IL, 60602 (312) 332-1624
GORDON WAYNE WATTS HLB MORTGAGE INVEST ONE LAROCQUE JOHN		STONE MCGUIRE SIRGEL 801 SKOKIE BLVD#200