

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS  
COUNTY DEPARTMENT, DOMESTIC RELATIONS DIVISION**

FILED  
9/5/2023 12:00 AM  
IRIS Y. MARTINEZ  
CIRCUIT CLERK  
COOK COUNTY, IL  
2016D009534  
Calendar, 23  
24227987

FILED DATE: 9/5/2023 12:00 AM 2016D009534

IN RE THE FORMER MARRIAGE OF: )  
)  
PETER MATT, )  
)  
                  *Petitioner,* )  
)  
                  and )  
)  
MEGAN MATT, )  
                  n/k/a MEGAN MASON, )  
)  
                  *Respondent.* )

Case No. 2016 D 009534

**MEGAN MASON’S SECTION 2-615 MOTION TO DISMISS MICHAEL BENDER’S PETITION FOR  
APPROVAL AND ALLOCATION OF PAYMENT**

I, Megan Mason, respondent pro se in case 2016 D 9534 move that the court dismiss with prejudice MICHAEL BENDER’S petition for payment under Illinois Law 750 ILCS 5/2-615, which states:

*“a) All objections to pleadings shall be raised by motion. The motion shall point out specifically the defects complained of, and shall ask for appropriate relief, such as: that a pleading or portion thereof be stricken because substantially insufficient in law, or that the action be dismissed, or that a pleading be made more definite and certain in a specified particular; or that designated immaterial matter be stricken out, or that necessary parties be added, or that designated misjoined parties be dismissed, and so forth. (b) If a pleading or a division thereof is objected to by a motion to dismiss or for judgment or to strike out the pleading, because it is substantially insufficient in law, the motion must specify wherein the pleading or division thereof is insufficient.”*

Michael Bender does not have jurisdiction to order fees imposed on a fellow citizen outside of those circumstances which are narrowly and specifically defined under Illinois Law. This principle is first supported by The Constitution of The United States of America which protects the life, liberty and happiness of Americans. This principle is reflected in Illinois Law 750 ILCS 5/506 which defines those narrow

circumstances where the court might judiciously and ethically order parents to surrender their wealth, parenting rights and free time to a court ordered Guardian Ad Litem. It specifically states:

***“(a) Duties. In any proceedings involving the support, custody, visitation, allocation of parental responsibilities, education, parentage, property interest, or general welfare of a minor or dependent child, the court may, on its own motion or that of any party, appoint an attorney to serve in one of the following capacities to address the issues the court delineates: (1) Attorney. The attorney shall provide independent legal counsel for the child and shall owe the same duties of undivided loyalty, confidentiality, and competent representation as are due an adult client. (2) Guardian ad litem. The guardian ad litem shall testify or submit a written report to the court regarding his or her recommendations in accordance with the best interest of the child. The report shall be made available to all parties. The guardian ad litem may be called as a witness for purposes of cross-examination regarding the guardian ad litem's report or recommendations. The guardian ad litem shall investigate the facts of the case and interview the child and the parties.”***

Finally, Guardian Ad Litem under Cook County Circuit Court’s published, written rules is to:

***“The guardian ad litem is required to investigate the facts of the case, interview the child(ren) and the parties, and testify or submit a written report to the court regarding his or her recommendations in accordance with the best interest of the child.”***

In considering the relevant laws, Mr. Bender’s motion must be stricken and denied and Mr. Bender ordered not to harass me again because his petition is profoundly - which is to say substantially - insufficient in law. Mr. Bender asserts that he is entitled to seek court ordered payment under ILCS 5/506(b). He is not entitled to petition this court to order me to pay him for the following reasons:

1. On June 6, 2019 court employee Robert Johnson, acting personally under color of Illinois law, ordered that Michael Bender be appointed Guardian Ad Litem. This order was illegal and void upon entry because Judge Johnson lacked jurisdiction to order Mr. Bender, who he has referred to as his mentor and someone who advises him daily on his decisions, in the role of Guardian Ad Litem.
  - a. I entered into a marital settlement and mutually agreed upon parenting plan in this court on September 27, 2017. This court approved and entered the mutually agreed upon parenting plan. I incorporate by reference my parenting plan and MSA (Exhibit A).
  - b. The entry closed the case finally.

FILED DATE: 9/15/2023 12:00 AM 2016D009534

- c. No party moved to modify the parenting plan under any Illinois law between September 27, 2017 and June 6, 2019, when Mr. Bender was ordered through extrajudicial action.
  - d. Under 750 ILCS 5/506 a Guardian Ad Litem may be appointed during any proceeding. Since there was no proceeding before the court, the court lacked jurisdiction to order a GAL and in so doing infringed upon my personal freedom and deprived me of wealth unlawfully. There was no proceeding when Mr. Bender was ordered and so his appointment was and is illegal.
  - e. Under Cook County local rules, The GAL's role is even more narrowly confined to "investigate the facts of the case". There was no ongoing case when Mr. Bender was appointed, the case having closed through divorce and mutually agreed upon parenting plan in September, 2017, so his appearance violated and continues to violate Cook County local court rules.
  - f. It is now 2023 and Mr. Bender has been acting as the unlawful, permanent GAL for four years. I am not a party in any case that has been ongoing for four years.
2. It is not possible that Mr. Bender's appointment was lawful because he was ordered less than 2 years after the entry of the Marital Settlement and Parenting Plan. According to 750 ILCS 5/610.5, a party may not move the court to modify the parenting plan less than two years after the parties voluntarily enter into a parenting plan. Not only was there no motion to the court to modify my parenting plan but under Illinois law there could not have been a lawful motion to modify the parenting plan filed at the time of Mr. Bender's appointment.
  3. There was no parentage case before the court and so it is not possible there was a basis in law to order Mr. Bender's appointment and therefore it was void upon entry.
  4. Even if Mr. Bender's appointment had been lawful, which is simply unimaginable to a person of reasonable intelligence, he has not performed any official duties in relation to my family and could therefore not request payment. As this court intimately knows, since his appointment, Mr. Bender has acted only to obfuscate and hide multitudinous evidence of Mr. Matt's parental unfitness, offensive character, and ongoing federal financial crimes. Indeed it is my understanding that like Mr. Matt, Mr.

Bender is now the target of ongoing federal criminal investigations into his actions in this very case. Just as one cannot be a little bit pregnant, a court appointee cannot be a little bit criminally corrupt and so we must assume that the known felon Michael Bender has always been acting in furtherance of his criminal conspiracies because of any one of his documented federal crimes against me, the court or my children.

5. Were Mr. Bender entitled to petition this court for payment for legitimate GAL services, under 750 ILCS 5/506, the statute states that the court must, “consider resources for payment”. Indeed, the court was aware that I do not have resources for payment at the time of Mr. Bender’s appointment. Subsequently, the court has been presented with a preponderance of evidence showing that I do not and never have had the resources to pay Mr. Bender. Indeed, ongoing court ordered fees have deprived me of all wealth, have destroyed my ability to work in a high paying profession by forcing usurious fees on me which have lowered my credit more than 200 points and forced me into bankruptcy, which has made me unable to afford the living expenses in the Chicago metropolitan area. At no point have Mr. Bender’s fees been reasonable or just and at no point have I had the means to pay them.
6. Were the court, or rather court employee Robert Johnson acting personally in this court, to illegally order me to pay Mr. Bender fees, I would not have the means to do so.
  - a. On June 1, 2023 I lost my home in Wilmette and was unable to afford a new residence or be approved as a renter because of my low credit.
  - b. On July 14, 2023 I was terminated from my employment as a wealth manager. See the termination letter. (Exhibit B).
  - c. On August 7, 2023 I filed Chapter 7 bankruptcy. (Exhibit C)
  - d. I do not currently have any income.

**WHEREFORE, Respondent asks that this court.**

- A. Strike and deny Michael Bender’s petition for fees.

- B. Order Michael Bender to pay Megan Mason \$3,929, the amount of funds previously collected under duress and through acts of fraud upon Megan Mason and upon the court, within thirty days of entry of this order.
- C. The court being aware of Mr. Bender's criminality, his demonstrated inability to state a coherent thought and his low moral character, write a letter to Presiding Judge Scanniccio asking her to remove Michael Bender from the list of approved Guardian Ad Litem, child reps, or any other role in The Domestic Relations Division of The Circuit Court of Cook County, in order to protect vulnerable children from his abuse and malfeasance.

Respectfully Submitted by,

Megan Mason

Respondent Pro Se