

2

1. What steps do/would you, as an elected judge, take to maintain your independence from campaign contributors and special interest groups? Do you impose any limits beyond those required by law on contributions?

Answer: As a Candidate, I do not intend to accept donations and my expenditures shall not exceed \$3,000. It is presumptuous to declare my intentions for an office before I have been elected to it.

2. Illinois currently has a mixed system of selecting judges. Most are elected by voters, some are appointed to fill vacancies, and others (associates) are selected by other judges. Is this the best way to select judges and to ensure the highest quality judiciary? Are there specific reforms in the judicial selection process that you would like to see? What are the pros and cons of merit selection of judges vs. election? Should sitting judges run for re-election rather than retention?

Answer: The Cook County system is the best in the world. The only reform that I can recommend now is more web-based materials, information, access, etc. I think that our system has a good mix of both merit and elected judges, I do not see any negatives. I believe that once elected judges should only run for retention.

3. What would you say to a frustrated voter faced with a ballot with dozens of judicial candidates, almost all of whom are unknown to the voter, about how to cast an informed ballot?

Answer: Become informed. The rights of Citizenship are precious.

4. Has the recent Supreme Court decision on the First Amendment rights of judicial candidates altered your views on and/or approach to "campaigning" for judicial office?

Answer: I assume that we are referring to the *Republican Party of MN v. White* case. While I respect Justice Thomas, I would have voted with the dissent to keep judicial candidates from declaring their opinions.

5. In close cases, judges (particularly appellate judges) often have choices to make as to the direction in which they believe the law should go. In those circumstances, some of the greatest judges have been activists, others have practiced restraint, and others have followed no particular philosophy about the place of the judiciary in our system of separate branches sharing power. Which of these approaches/philosophies best captures your views of the proper role of judges in society?

Answer: I shall not be an activist Judge.

6. It is often said that because the judiciary neither commands the sword nor the purse, its power and legitimacy rest on the persuasiveness of its opinions. Yet a large number of cases -- even cases worth large sums of money and presenting significant and/or novel legal issues -- are resolved in the Circuit Courts of Illinois through the issuance of one line orders that fail to give even an inkling of the Court's reasoning. Do you see this as a problem for the judiciary? If so, do you have any ideas on how to remedy the problem? How should orders -- particularly those subject to appeal -- be written? As a prospective circuit judge, do you believe the

parties are entitled to the basis of your ruling including the findings of fact and your application of the law to those findings of fact? If an appellate candidate, please offer your thoughts.

Answer: A well Written Order is king. The Orders should try to mimic law school memoranda. Yes, I do believe that litigants are entitled to the basis, reasoning, law that formed my decision.

7. Recently proponents of "Sunshine in Litigation" have sought legislation to eliminate or severely restrict the judicial entry of protective orders in litigation between private parties involving products that may be considered dangerous to the public. Opponents of these efforts argue that protective orders are necessary to ensure privacy, protect trade secrets and foster settlements. What is your view of the role which protective orders serve in the efficient resolution of private litigation? Do you agree that judges should have broad discretion to enter such orders when appropriate? How would you respond to each side of the debate?

Answer: The Courts are public instruments. There are very few instances where protective orders are appropriate except by statute or national security.

8. Are there civil litigation reforms that you would like to see enacted to remedy particular problems that you have detected, either as a practicing lawyer or as a sitting judge? Are there reforms that would benefit the civil justice system? What needs to be changed? Should the enactment of any such changes be the province of the legislature, the Supreme Court or by Constitutional amendment?

Answer: Yes, there must be more civility, honesty and professionalism. This includes both judges and lawyers. My motto is without "passion or prejudice."

9. Do you feel that our judicial system adequately deters and penalizes frivolous litigation? If not, what reforms would you like to see?

Answer: Yes, no reforms needed.

10. Do you believe the Illinois Constitution precludes legislative establishment of limitations on civil damages? Are there or should there be distinctions among economic, non-economic and punitive damages?

Answer: No Comment.

11. The so-called "English Rule," where the loser pays, seems to be a popular concept among Illinois citizens. Do you believe that a "loser pays" requirement in civil cases would help reduce the number of frivolous civil lawsuits filed in Illinois? Are there reasons why Illinois should/should not consider such a rule?

Answer: I believe that there is a reason why it is the "English Rule" and not the American Rule. Our country is great and our history is unique. These United States of America are an incredible experiment. If the legislature decides to enact a "loser pays" requirement, then all judges will enforce it.