

1 Name: Adam Hendrix


2 Address: 3907 E Fremont St, Stockton CA,

3 95215

4 Phone: 209-425-7060

5 Fax: _____

6 In Pro Per



7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 Adam Hendrix

11 Plaintiff

12 v.

13 Leonardo Garcia, Illinois

14 Defendant(s).

CASE NUMBER:

2:21-cv-09730-SVW-PVCx

To be supplied by the Clerk of
The United States District Court

COMPLAINT

15

16 Me and the defendent had met in San Francisco in a homeless shelter in May of 2019, where he

17 was fraudulently pretending to be homeless for the government, I really was homeless. We became

18 romantically involved until Defendent returns to home state of Illinois approximately June of

19 2019. Communication exists over the phone where Defendent decieves me into traveling to Illinois

20 where Defendent proceeds to be in a fake relationship with me while simultaneously pursuing a

21 fraudulent void Stalking order against me in his state in September of 2019, and issued 10/31/2019.

22 Defendent maliciously filed a fraudulent restraining order against me and thus committing the

23 crime of perjury and resulting in Severe emotional distress and violations of my civil rights. The

24 definition of Stalking under Illinois law used for the purposes of such order clearly states that

25 Stalking does not include an exercise of the right to free speech or assembly that is otherwise

26 lawful. Defendent is incapable of proving stalking ever occured and according to his local police

27 reports obtained by me demonstrate that I was willfully and lawfully protesting in an exercise of

28 free speech against oppression and domestic violence caused by Defendent.

1 Void order which is one entered by court which lacks jurisdiction over parties or subject matter, or
2 lacks inherent power to enter judgment, or order procured by fraud, can be attacked at any time, in
3 any court, either directly or collaterally, provided that party is properly before court, People ex rel.
4 Brzica v. Village of Lake Barrington, 644 N.E.2d 66 (Ill.App. 2 Dist. 1994). Void judgments
5 generally fall into two classifications, that is, judgments where there is want of jurisdiction of person
6 or subject matter, and judgments procured through fraud, and such judgments may be attacked
7 directly or collaterally, Irving v. Rodriguez, 169 N.E.2d 145, (Ill.app. 2 Dist. 1960). Void judgments
8 are those rendered by court which lacked jurisdiction, either of subject matter or parties,
9 Cockerham v. Zikratch, 619 P.2d 739 (Ariz. 1980). Void judgment is one which has no legal force or
10 effect whatever, it is an absolute nullity, its invalidity may be asserted by any person whose rights
11 are affected at any time and at any place and it need not be attacked directly but may be attacked
12 collaterally whenever and wherever it is interposed, City of Lufkin v. McVicker, 510 S.W. 2d 141
13 (Tex. Civ. App. - Beaumont 1973). A void judgment is one rendered by a court which lacked
14 personal or subject matter jurisdiction or acted in a manner inconsistent with due process. In re
15 Estate of Wells, 983 P.2d 279, (Kan. App. 1999). Therefore case was removed from State court to
16 Federal court for violation of my civil rights with supporting evidence. Under the federal law
17 Defendent state was to proceed no further, Defendent state immediately proceeds with the case by
18 amending and extending the original order to include an additional 2,000 feet violating the law
19 without enforcement. Defendent state maliciously prosecuting me is an attack on the constitution
20 and my freedoms which have resulted in severe emotional distress as it was clearly designed to do.
21 Defendents state lacked personal jurisdiction over me as I am a citizen of California at the time not
22 Illinois and was wrongfully placed and served and lack of due process.
23
24
25
26
27
28