

UNOFFICIAL COPY

00151237

1/50/0033 08 001 Page 1 of 2

2000-03-01 11:27:17

Cook County Recorder 23.50

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, CHANCERY DIVISION



00151237

DONALD SUCHORSKI,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT J. KORZENIEWSKI, as
Independent Administrator for
the Estate of Helen F.
Korzeniewski,

Defendant.

No. 00 CH 2293

LIS PENDENS NOTICE

David R. Shannon, one of the attorneys for Donald Suchorski, hereby certifies that the above captioned cause for Specific Performance was filed in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois (Chancery Division) on February 23, 2000, and is now pending in that court. The property affected by the cause is commonly known as 7448 W. 105 St., Palos Hills, Cook County, Illinois (P.I.N. 23-13-204-021-0000). The legal description of the property is as follows:

Lot Seventy-nine (79) in Robert Bartlett's Harlem Avenue Garden Homesites, being a subdivision of the North 1200 feet of the East Half (1/2) of the North East Quarter (1/4) and the North 1575 feet of the West Half (1/2) of the North East Quarter (1/4) of Section 13, Town 37 North, Range 12, East of the Third Principal Meridian.

Certification

Under penalties provided by law pursuant to Section 1-109 of the Code of Civil Procedure, the undersigned certifies that the information set forth in this instrument is true and correct.

David R. Shannon

Prepared By:
David R. Shannon, Attorney for
Donald Suchorski
111 West Washington Street
Suite 1900
Chicago, Illinois 60602
(312) 407-7800

of America, D.C.Ind.1996, 922 F.Supp. 1306.

Although the plaintiff's RICO claim was time barred, the district court retained supplemental jurisdiction to resolve the plaintiff's state law claims for tortious interference with contract, tortious interference with business relationships, breach of contract, and fraudulent misrepresentation. Pillington v. United Airlines, Inc., D.C.Fla.1996, 921 F.Supp. 740.

An arrestee's claim that the city would be liable under state law for any judgment entered against police officers who arrested the plaintiff were part of the same case and controversy as the plaintiff's federal claims against those officers based on wrongful arrest. Spiegel v. City of Chicago, D.C.Ill.1996, 920 F.Supp. 891.

Supplemental jurisdiction did not apply to claims asserted by potentially liable parties in a CERCLA cost recovery action against their insurers for indemnity. The claims were not part of the same case or controversy. Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Irving Rubber & Metal Co., D.C.Pa.1996, 920 F.Supp. 612.

"Supplemental jurisdiction is not limited to restatements of the same basic ground for recovery." Lyman v. Foot First Podiatry Centers, D.C.Ill.1996, 919 F.Supp. 1141, 1148 (Castillo, J.).

O'Keefe v. General Acc. Ins. Co., D.C.N.Y.1996, 918 F.Supp. 115 (declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction).

The district court would exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims against school officials, since those claims were so related to the claims asserted against the defendant school-district under Title VII that they formed part of the same case and controversy. Miller v. Brungardt, D.C.Kan.1996, 916 F.Supp. 1096.

State law claims and Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) were related such that exercising supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims was proper. Johnson County Airport Authority v. Parsonitt Co., D.C.Kan.1996, 916 F.Supp. 1090.

The complete preemption doctrine subjected one count of the plaintiff's multi-count complaint to removal. The remaining state law claims were within the courts' supplemental jurisdiction. Cherkov v. TPLC, Inc., D.C.Tex.1996, 916 F.Supp. 608.

Choroszy v. Wentworth Institute of Technology, D.C.Mass.1996, 915 F.Supp. 746.

The district court could not exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the plaintiff's state law claims, the plaintiff's federal Fair-Credit Reporting Act claim depended upon a different set of facts from plaintiff's state law claims. Sabet v. Boardwalk-Regency Corp., D.C.Mich.1996, 913 F.Supp. 993.

Inc., C.A.3d, 1995, 54 F.3d 156.

Zuniga v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Michigan, C.A.6th, 1995, 52 F.3d 1395 (supplemental jurisdiction may be used to remove claims that are part of the same case or controversy, even those claims subject to ordinary preemption by ERISA).

Edmondson & Gallagher v. Alban Towers Tenants Assn., C.A.1995, 48 F.3d 1260, 310 U.S.App.D.C. 409.

Hubbard v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield Assn., C.A.5th, 1995, 42 F.3d 942, certiorari denied 115 S.Ct. 2276, 515 U.S. 1122, 132 L.Ed.2d 280.

FDIC v. Bathgate, C.A.3d, 1994, 27 F.3d 850.

Barnett v. Sylacauga Auto-Plex, D.C.Ala.1997, 973 F.Supp. 1358 (containing a detailed discussion of the legislative history and interpretation of the "case and controversy" language in 28 U.S.C.A. 1367).

Van Jegerius v. Mercury Fin. Co., D.C.Ind.1996, 940 F.Supp. 1344.

The district court exercised supplemental jurisdiction over tort claims against officials of a foreign nation, in a suit alleging that the officials conspired wrongfully to force an American family to remain silent about a royal family's involvement in a serious boating accident. Jungquist v. Nahyan, D.C.D.C.1996, 940 F.Supp. 312, reversed on other grounds C.A.1997, 115 F.3d 1020, 375 U.S.App.D.C. 117.

Marcus v. AT & T Corporation, D.C.N.Y.1996, 938 F.Supp. 1158.

Tennessee ex rel. Pierotti v. 777 N. White Station Road, D.C.Tenn.1996, 937 F.Supp. 1296.

The district court would maintain supplemental jurisdiction over a shipper's New York bailment claims that were interwoven with the shipper's admiralty action. R.E.K. Argentina S.A. v. M/W Dr. Juan B. Alberdi, D.C.N.Y.1996, 935 F.Supp. 358.

Clarke v. Whitney, D.C.Pa.1996, 934 F.Supp. 148.

City of New Orleans v. Kernan, D.C.La.1996, 933 F.Supp. 565.

The court lacked supplemental jurisdiction over a former employee's state law claims because they overlapped only slightly with the federal claims under Section 1983. Hamell v. Nazario, D.C.Del.1996, 930 F.Supp. 171.

Jacampo v. Hasbro, Inc., D.C.R.I.1996, 929 F.Supp. 562.

The federal court could not exercise supplemental jurisdiction to enforce an alleged state law right to inspect books and records of the defendant corporation in a securities fraud action. The state law right arose from alleged misconduct that was not related to the underlying facts of the federal securities claims. Fisk v. Superannuites, Inc., D.C.N.Y.1996, 927 F.Supp. 718.

*52933 Section 1367 does not extend supplemental jurisdiction to claims filed in separate federal courts. Emerson Power Transmission Corp. v. Koller Bearing Co.