

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT  
MACON COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

**SHERRY A. DOTY  
CIRCUIT CLERK**

DAN CAULKINS et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

No. 2023 CH 3

JB PRITZKER et al.,

Defendants.

**FINAL JUDGMENT**

1. For the reasons set forth below, the Court enters final judgment in favor of defendants on counts I, II, III, and VI of the complaint and in favor of plaintiffs on counts IV and V of the complaint.
2. Plaintiffs allege in counts I, II, and III of the complaint that Public Act 102-1116 violates the single subject and three readings rules in article IV, section 8(d) of the Illinois constitution and that the method by which it was passed violates the due process clause in article I, section 2 of the Illinois constitution. *Accuracy Firearms, LLC v. Pritzker*, 2023 IL App (5th) 230035, ¶¶ 21-47, holds identical claims fail as a matter of law. In addition, plaintiffs allege in count VI that they are entitled to an injunction. *Kopnick v. JL Woode Management Co.*, 2017 IL App (1st) 152054, ¶ 34, holds an injunction is not a separate cause of action. The Court is bound to apply the appellate court's holdings to plaintiffs' claims in this case. *People v. Carpenter*, 228 Ill. 2d 250, 259-60 (2008). For these reasons, the Court enters final judgment in favor of defendants on plaintiffs' single subject, three readings, and due process claims in counts I, II, and III, and the claim for an injunction in count VI, of the complaint.
3. Plaintiffs allege in counts IV and V of the complaint that exceptions to the prohibitions on assault weapons and large capacity ammunition feeding devices in sections 24-1.9 and 24-1.10 of the Criminal Code of 2012 violate the equal protection clause in article I, section 2 of the Illinois constitution and the special legislation clause in article IV, section 13 of the Illinois constitution. Plaintiffs further allege sections 24-1.9 and 24-1.10 infringe on their fundamental rights to bear arms, under article I, section 22 of the Illinois constitution and U.S. Constitution, Second Amendment and therefore that to resolve plaintiffs' equal protection claim under article I, section 2 of the Illinois constitution (Count IV) and plaintiffs' special legislation claim under article IV, section 13 of the Illinois constitution (Count V), the Court must subject the challenged exceptions to strict scrutiny. Complaint ¶¶ 2, 128-136, 153, 157. *Accuracy Firearms*, 2023 IL App (5th) 230035, ¶¶ 48-62, considered an equal protection challenge to the exceptions to sections 24-1.9 and 24-1.10. The appellate court held the right to bear arms under article I, section 22 of the Illinois constitution is fundamental for equal protection purposes, that the

challenged exceptions are subject to strict scrutiny as a result, and that the challenged exceptions did not satisfy strict scrutiny. The Court is bound to apply the appellate court's holdings to plaintiffs' identical equal protection claim in this case. *Carpenter*, 228 Ill. 2d at 259-60. Further, equal protection and special legislation claims "are judged by the same standard," *In re Estate of Jolliff*, 199 Ill. 2d 510, 520 (2002), so the Court is also bound to apply those holdings to plaintiffs' special legislation claim in this case. Defendants argue that *Accuracy Firearms* is wrongly decided for multiple reasons but acknowledge that the Court is bound to apply it. For these reasons, the Court enters final judgment in favor of plaintiffs on their equal protection and special legislation claims in counts IV and V of the complaint.

4. Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 18, and in accordance with the Court's findings above, the Court further finds that:
  - a. Sections 24-1.9 and 24-1.10 of the Criminal Code of 2012 violate the equal protection clause in article I, section 2 of the Illinois constitution and the special legislation clause in article IV, section 13 of the Illinois constitution.
  - b. Sections 24-1.9 and 24-1.10 of the Criminal Code of 2012 are facially unconstitutional under these provisions of the Illinois constitution;
  - c. Sections 24-1.9 and 24-1.10 of the Criminal Code of 2012 cannot reasonably be construed in a manner that would preserve their validity;
  - d. the finding of unconstitutionality is necessary to the Court's decision and judgment; and
  - e. this decision and judgment cannot rest upon an alternative ground.

Dated: March 3, 2023



---

Honorable Rodney S. Forbes  
Associate Judge