

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHER DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

MICHAEL WILLARD, WILLIAM FRIERSON, ALLON CAMPBELL,		) .	JUDGE	KENNEL	LY			
and GARY MOORE,	<b>₽</b> ₹%. ≪	) ()	_at					
Plaintiffs,				.88		c:: :-> :-}		<b>-</b> ,
v.		)	No.		<u>ب</u> ين آ-ر	fico She	Č)	!
DONALD SNYDER, Director of Illinois Department of	MAG	) GISTR/ )	ATE JU	DGE ASF	ئے نان	i dit		17) 0 <sub>11</sub> ,
Corrections, JAMES CERVONE, Assistant Deputy Chief, Adult Parole/Field Operations, RICH		·) ·)	JURY	DEMAND	ED		ŏ\	
LAPIDOS, Parole Agent,		) )						
Defendants.		)						

## CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES

Now comes the Plaintiffs, MICHAEL WILLARD, WILLIAM FRIERSON, ALLEN CAMPBELL and GARY MOORE, through their attorneys, THOMAS PETERS, KEVIN PETERS, and ELYSE YOELIN, and states as follows:

#### COUNT I

#### PARTIES, JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Plaintiff Willard is a citizen of the United States and an Illinois parolee who currently is in custody at the Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 2. Plaintiff Frierson is a citizen of the United States and an Illinois parolee who currently is in custody at the Big Muddy

/-/

Correctional Center.

- 3. Plaintiff Campbell is a citizen of the United States and an Illinois parolee who currently is in custody at the Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 4. Plaintiff Moore is a citizen of the United States and an Illinois parolee who is residing in Chicago, Illinois.
- 5. Defendant Snyder is the Director of the Illinois
  Department of Corrections. In that capacity, he sets the
  policies and practices relating to parolees and he is sued in his
  individual and his official capacities.
- 6. Defendant Cervone is the Assistant Deputy Chief of Adult Parole/Field Operations for the Illinois Department of Corrections. In that capacity, he implements the policies of Defendant Snyder and trains other IDOC employees in accordance with those policies and practices, and Cervone is sued in his individual and his official capacities.
- 7. Defendant Lapidos is a parole agent for the Illinois
  Department of Corrections. In that capacity, he worked at the
  Cook County Jail and was responsible for scheduling preliminary
  parole revocation hearings. Lapidos is sued in his individual
  capacity only.
- 8. All of the acts and omissions alleged in this complaint were made under color of state law.
- 9. This action is brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 for violations of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

10. All of the Defendants maintain offices and do business in or near Chicago, Illinois, and the site for all of the preliminary parole revocation hearings is Chicago, Illinois.

19083.ac.

11. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$1331, 1334 and 2201.

#### FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 12. Michael Willard (No. B73178) was paroled from the Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 13. Following his release on parole, Plaintiff Willard was assigned a parole agent in Cook County, Illinois.
- 14. In early January, 2001, Plaintiff Willard was arrested in Chicago for an alleged technical (non-criminal) violation of parole.
- 15. Plaintiff Willard denies that he had committed a parole violation at any time prior to his arrest in January, 2001.
- 16. Within a few hours of his arrest, Plaintiff Willard was taken to the Cook County Jail.
- 17. Defendant Lapidos was assigned as a parole agent to the Cook County Jail when Plaintiff Willard was arrested.
- 18. Defendant Lapidos' duties at that time included serving notice of parole violation charges and scheduling preliminary parole revocation hearings.
- 19. Defendant Lapidos did not serve Plaintiff Willard with notice of charges of the alleged parole violation.
- 20. Defendant Lapidos did not schedule a preliminary parole revocation hearing for Plaintiff Willard.

A 1888 1840

- 21. Defendant Lapidos did not secure a waiver of preliminary parole revocation hearing from Plaintiff Willard.
- 22. Instead, acting pursuant to the policies and practices of Defendants Snyder and Cervone, Defendant Lapidos arranged for (or allowed) Plaintiff Willard to be transferred to the Joliet Correctional Center.
- 23. Plaintiff Willard was transferred to the Joliet Correctional Center within a few days of his arrest.
- 24. Plaintiff Willard had not waived his right to a preliminary parole revocation hearing, at or near the site of the alleged violation, when he was transferred to the Joliet Correctional Center.
- 25. It is, and was in January of 2001, the policy and practice of Defendants (Snyder and Cervone) to return alleged parole violators to the institution from which they were paroled.
- 26. As a direct result of that policy of Defendants Snyder and Cervone, Plaintiff Willard was transferred from the Joliet Correctional Center to the Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 27. The Big Muddy Correctional Center is located in Ina, Illinois.
  - 28. Ina is hundreds of miles from Chicago.
- 29. Plaintiff Willard did not waive his constitutional right to a prompt preliminary parole revocation hearing at any time prior to his transfer from the Joliet Correctional Center to the Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 30. Plaintiff Willard has been in custody for more than sixty days and he still has not had a preliminary parole

revocation hearing.

- 31. Plaintiff Willard has a well-established constitutional right to a prompt preliminary parole revocation hearing.
- 32. Plaintiff Willard has a well-established constitutional right to a preliminary parole revocation hearing near the site of the alleged parole violation.
- 33. Plaintiff Willard has a well-established right to counsel, to call witnesses, and to confront and cross examine witnesses at his preliminary parole revocation hearing.
- 34. Defendants' (Snyder, Cervone, and Lapidos) policies and practices as applied to Plaintiff Willard violated Plaintiff Willard's constitutional rights as identified in paragraph 30-33 above.
- 35. Defendants' policy, of shipping alleged parole violators out of the Cook County Jail to the Joliet correctional Center and then to the institution from which the parole was granted, creates a system which guarantees that no Cook County parolee will receive a prompt preliminary parole revocation hearing at or near the site of the alleged parole violation.
- 36. Defendants' policy, of shipping alleged parole violators out of the Cook County Jail to the Joliet correctional Center and then to the institution from which the parole was granted, creates a system which guarantees that Cook County parolees will not have counsel or favorable witnesses present when a preliminary parole revocation hearing finally is held.
- 37. Absent exigent circumstances, a preliminary parole revocation hearing should be held within ten (10) days of a

400

parolee's arrest and the hearing should be held at or near the site of the alleged violation.

Wherefore, Plaintiff Willard prays the Court will a) issue a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from continuing their policy of transferring parolees from the Cook County Jail before the parolee has had, or waived, a preliminary parole revocation hearing; b) permanently enjoining Defendants from continuing their policy as alleged herein; (c) award costs and attorney's fees.

#### COUNT II

- 1-11. Plaintiff Frierson re-alleges paragraphs 1-11 of Count I as paragraphs 1-11 of Count II.
- 12. Plaintiff Frierson (No. B31775) was paroled from the Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 13. On or about February 11, 2001, Plaintiff Frierson was arrested for a technical (non-criminal) parole violation.
- 14. At the time of his arrest, Plaintiff Frierson was with his fiancee, Gloria Williams.
- 15. Plaintiff Frierson denies that he violated any condition of his parole on the day of his arrest or on any other day.
- 16. Plaintiff Frierson was not served with notice of the parole violation charges, has not waived his right to a prompt preliminary parole revocation hearing, and has not had a parole revocation hearing.

17-37. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 17-37 of Count I as paragraphs 17-37 of Count II.

er zagybala.

Wherefore, Plaintiff Frierson prays the Court will a) issue a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from continuing their policy of transferring parolees from the Cook County Jail before the parolee has had, or waived, a preliminary parole revocation hearing; b) permanently enjoining Defendants from continuing their policy as alleged herein; (c) award costs and attorney's fees.

#### COUNT III

- 1-11. Plaintiff Campbell re-alleges paragraphs 1-11 of Count I as paragraphs 1-11 of Count III.
- 12. Plaintiff Campbell was paroled from Big Muddy Correctional Center.
- 13. Following his release on parole, Plaintiff Campbell was assigned to a parole agent in Chicago, Illinois.
- 14. On or about February 23, 2001, Plaintiff Campbell was arrested for a technical (non-criminal) parole violation.
- 15. Plaintiff Campbell did not violate any of the terms or conditions of his parole prior to his arrest in Chicago, Illinois.
- 16. Within a few hours of his arrest, Plaintiff Campbell was transferred to the Cook County Jail.
- 17. Defendant Lapidos was assigned as a parole agent to the Cook County Jail when Plaintiff Campbell was arrested.

1. 5 2.1.5

- 18. Defendant Lapidos' duties at that time included that he was to serve notice of parole violation charges and scheduled preliminary parole revocation hearings.
- 19. Defendant Lapidos did not serve Plaintiff Campbell with notice of charges of the alleged parole violators.
- 20. Defendant Lapidos did not schedule a preliminary parole revocation hearing for Plaintiff Campbell.
- 21. Defendant Lapidos did not secure a waiver of preliminary hearing from Plaintiff Campbell.
- 22. Instead, acting pursuant to the policies and practices of Defendants Snyder and Cervone, Defendant Lapidos arranged for (or allowed) Plaintiff Campbell to be transferred to the Joliet Correctional Center.
- 23-37. Plaintiff Campbell re-alleges paragraphs 23-37 of Count I as paragraphs 23-37 of Count III.

Wherefore, Plaintiff Campbell prays the Court will a) issue a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from continuing their policy of transferring parolees from the Cook County Jail before the parolee has had, or waived, a preliminary parole revocation hearing; b) permanently enjoining Defendants from continuing their policy as alleged herein; (c) award costs and attorney's fees.

#### COUNT IV

- 1-11. Plaintiff Moore re-alleges paragraphs 1-11 of Count I as paragraphs 1-11 of Count IV.
  - 12. Plaintiff Moore was released on parole.

- 13. On or about January 1, 2001, Plaintiff Moore was arrested for a technical (non-criminal) parole violation.
- 14. Plaintiff Moore denies that he violated any of the terms or conditions of his parole.
- 15. Plaintiff Moore was taken into custody, on the parole violation charge, at the Cook County Jail.
- 16. He remained at the Cook County Jail for a few days and then was transferred to the Joliet Correctional Center.
- 17. From the Joliet Correctional Center, he was transferred to the Big Muddy Correctional Center in Ina, Illinois.
- 18. Plaintiff Moore was not served with notice of the parole violation charges while in the Cook County Jail or while at the Joliet Correction Center.
- 19. Defendant Lapidos did not serve Plaintiff Moore with notice of charges of the alleged parole violators.
- 20. Defendant Lapidos did not schedule a preliminary parole revocation hearing for Plaintiff Moore.
- 21. Defendant Lapidos did not secure a waiver of preliminary hearing from Plaintiff Moore.
- 22-37. Plaintiff re-alleges paragraphs 22-37 of Count I as paragraphs 22-37 of Count IV.
- 38. Plaintiff Moore was in custody for approximately sixty (60) days before the Prisoner Review Board held a preliminary parole revocation hearing at Big Muddy Correctional Center and ordered him released.

Wherefore, Plaintiff Moore prays the Court will a) issue a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from continuing their

policy of transferring parolees from the Cook County Jail before the parolee has had, or waived, a preliminary parole revocation hearing; b) permanently enjoining Defendants from continuing their policy as alleged herein; (c) award damages, costs and attorney's fees.

#### COUNT V

### CLASS ACTION FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 1-37. Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1-37 of Count I as paragraphs 1-37 of Count V.
- 38. Defendants' policies and practices have been in effect for several months.
- 39. The number of Cook County parolees who have been adversely affected by Defendants' policies exceeds five hundred.
- 40. Plaintiffs (Willard, Frierson, and Campbell) represent a class of Cook County parolees who have been or will be arrested for technical parole violations in Cook County, Illinois from June 1, 2000 to the present.
- 41. The class, as so defined, is too numerous to make joinder of all class members practicable.
- 42. Defendants have established a unified policy that affects all Cook County parolees charged with technical violations in the same way.
- 43. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of all class members.
- 44. Common issues of law and fact predominate over any minor differences in treatment.

and the second s

- 45. Plaintiffs' counsel can fairly and adequately represent the class.
- 46. The constitutional rights of all class members are being violated by Defendants' systematic policies and practices as described herein.

Wherefore, Plaintiffs (Willard, Frierson, and Campbell) prays the Court will a) issue a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from continuing their policy of transferring parolees from the Cook County Jail before the parolee has had, or waived, a preliminary parole revocation hearing; b) permanently enjoining Defendants from continuing their policy as alleged herein; (c) award the Plaintiff class costs and attorney's fees.

#### COUNT VI

#### CLASS ACTION FOR DAMAGES

- 1-37. Plaintiff Moore re-alleges paragraphs 1-37 of Count I as paragraphs 1-37 of Count VI.
- 38. Plaintiff Moore represents a class of Cook Count parolees who were detained without the benefit of a prompt preliminary parole revocation and who have been, or will in the future be, found not to have violated the terms and conditions of their parole.
- 39-46. Plaintiff Moore re-alleges paragraphs 39-46 of Count V as paragraphs 39-46 of Count VI.

entration of the

Wherefore, Plaintiff Moore prays the Court will award him and the class he represents damages, costs and attorney's fees.

> THOMAS PETERS KEVIN PETERS ELYSE YOELIN

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS 542 S. Dearborn, Suite 750

Chicago, IL 60605

312-697-0022

Case: 1:0	1-cv-01884 Document #: 1	Filed: 0	3/16/01 Page 13 t	of 14 PageID #:13	3
JS 44 (Rev. 12/96)			ER SHEET		**
	and the information contained herein nei by local rules of court. This form, approve purpose of initiating the civil docket shee	o by the Ju			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	JUDGE KENNI	Fliv	DEFENDANTS	c. S	雪当 /
Michael Will	laru, et ai.	38	Donald Snyde	r, et. al	5 B W
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF	and the state of t	5 AU V	COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF I	I WIGH CIGITED DEL TUDATI	Cook <sub>o</sub>
	INUS PLAINTIFF CASES) ISTRATE JUDGE ASHMAN	e programa de la composição de la compos	(II NOTE: IN LAND COND TRACT OF LAN	N U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES DEMINATION CASES, USE, ND INVOLVED.	SONLY)
Thomas P Kevin Pe	tonness and telephone number) eters ters and Elyse Yoelin earborn St. #750	n markas	attonneys (# known) James Ryar Attorney	General (176	R 1 9 2001
	IL 60605 (312) 697-		Chicago,		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI		(Fo	TIZENSHIP OF PRIN or Diversity Cases Only)	AN	D ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT)
្នា U.S. Government Plaintiff	X3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Hitzen of This State CX	of Business	
C12 U.S. Government Defendant	Oiversity     (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		itizen of Another State  itizen or Subject of a	of Business	und Principal Place D 6 C In Another State
	(D) ACE		Foreign Country ONE BOX ONLY)	e diej see dit deel die dej diejde eejste dit die ees	Appeal to Dis
IV. ORIGIN		11/24/	Transferre		Judge from
	e Court Appellate Court	⊒ ₄ Reinstal Reopen	ed (specify)	Litigation	Judgment
V. NATURE OF SUIT	(PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY) TORTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
CONTRACT  [] 110 Insurance [] 120 Mailine [] 130 Millier Act [] 140 Nogotlable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL I ☐ 310 Aliplane ☐ 362 Personal ir ☐ 315 Aliplane Product Med Mall Llability ☐ 365 Personal ir	INJURY njury practice njury -	S10 Agriculture     G20 Other Food & Drug     O25 Drug Related Setzure     of Property 21 USC 881     G30 Liquor Laws	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/et
1) 150 Recovery of Overpayment 8 Enforcement of Judgment 1) 151 Medicare Act 1) 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Exc) Veterans)	Slander [] 368 Asbestos F	Porsonal duct Liability ROPERTY	C 640 R H & Truck 650 Atriline Regs 660 Occupational Safety/I lealth	PROPERTY RIGHTS    820 Copyrights   830 Patont   840 Trademark	☐ 476 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
[] 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits [] 160 Stockholders'Suits [] 190 Other Contract	Liability 371 Truth in Le 350 Motor Vehicle 380 Other Pers Property C Product Liability 385 Property C	ending sonal Damage Damage	LABOR  710 Fair Labor Standards Act	SOCIAL SECURITY  B61 HIA (1395ff) B62 Black Lung (923)	Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410  891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization A 893 Environmental Matters
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PO	ETITIONS	720 Labor/Mgmt Relations 17 730 Labor/Mgmt Reporting & Disclosuru Act	□ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID THIE XVI □ 865 FISI (405(g))	S94 Energy Allocation Act (1) 895 Freedom of Information Act (1) 900 Appeal of Fee Determine
[] 220 Foreclosure [] 230 Hent Lease & Ejectment [] 240 Toils to Land [] 245 Tori Product Llability	1 442 Employment   Sontence   HABEAS COR   530 General   535 Death Per   540 Mandamu	RPUS: nally	[] 740 Rallway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  170 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	Unider Equal Access to .    950 Constitutionality of State Statutes   960 Other Statutory Actions
1] 290 All Other fleut Property	□ 550 CMI Rights □ 555 Prison Co	its	13 791 Empl Ret Inc. Sucurity Act	26 USC 7609	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	DO NOT CITE JURISDICTIONAL STATUTES O	UNLESS DIVE	ILING AND WRITE DRIEF STATEMERSHY)		
42	U.S.C. 1983 Para	olee I	Que Process V		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS A	CTION		JURY DEMA	
VIII. This case	is not a refiling of a previously dis	smissed ac	tion. , previously dismissed by	y Judge	e a set
		s is a side of		i en e straje i juliu julierie (e. l. lediji liji julierie (e. j. liji julierie (e. j. liji julierie (e. j. liji	The gibb growth and the last
DATE _ / . f	SIGNATURE	OF ATTOR	NEY OF RECORD	<del>)</del>	

OMETER STATES DISTRICT COURT

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

The Assessment

In the Matter of Willard, et. al. v. Snyder, et. al.

JUDGE KENNEL Case Number:
MAGISTRATE JUDGE ASHMAN

1884

UPPRETE

APPEARANCES ARE HEREBY FILED BY THE UNDERSIGNED AS ATTORNEY(S) FOR:

Michael Willard, Allon Campbell, Gary Moore, and William Frierson

(A)	(B)
SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE
NAME TOURS TELLS	le Pella
THOMAS PETERS	KEVIN PETERS
FIRM	FIRM
STREET ADDRESS	
542 S . DEARBORN ST., #750	STREET ADDRESS
CITY/STATE/ZIP	542 S. DEARBORN ST., #750
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60605	CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60605
TELEPHONE NUMBER (312) 697-0022	TELEPHONE NUMBER
IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)	(312) 697-0022 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)
02183587	06184460
MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES (1) NO	MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES NO
TRIAL ATTORNEY? YES NO	TRALATTORNEY? YES XX NO
	DESIGNATED AS LOCAL COUNSEL? YES NO
(C)	(D)
SIGNATURE (R. Q.	(D) SIGNATURE
SIGNATURE  ELY  NAME	
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin	SIGNATURE NAME
SIGNATURE  ELY  NAME	SIGNATURE
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM STREET ADDRESS	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750	SIGNATURE NAME
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750 CITY/STATE/ZIP	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET AIXORESS  CITY/STATE/ZIP
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750  CHYSTATEZIP Chicago, IL 60605  TELEPHONE NUMBER 312-697-0022	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET ADDRESS
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750 CITY/STATE/ZIP Chicago, IL 60605 TELEPHONE NUMBER 312-697-0022 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET AIXORESS  CITY/STATE/ZIP
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750 CITYSTATE/ZIP Chicago, IL 60605 TELEPHONE NUMBER 312-697-0022 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE) 6273283	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET ADDRESS  CITY/STATE/ZIP  TELEPHONE NUMBER  IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750 CITY/STATE/ZIP Chicago, IL 60605 TELEPHONE NUMBER 312-697-0022 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE) 6273283 MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?  YES NO EX	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET AIXORESS  CITY/STATE/ZIP  TELEPHONE NUMBER
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750 CITY/STATE/ZIP Chicago, IL 60605 TELEPHONE NUMBER 312-697-0022 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE) 6273283 MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES NO KX	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET ADDRESS  CITY/STATE/ZIP  TELEPHONE NUMBER  IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)  MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?  YES
NAME Elyse A. Yoelin FIRM  STREET ADDRESS 542 S. Dearborn St., #750 CITY/STATE/IP Chicago, IL 60605 TELEPHONE NUMBER 312-697-0022 IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE) 6273283 MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR? YES NO EX	SIGNATURE  NAME  FIRM  STREET ADDRESS  CITY/STATE/ZIP  TELEPHONE NUMBER  IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (SEE ITEM 4 ON REVERSE)  MEMBER OF TRIAL BAR?  YES