ILLINOIS DEFENSE COUNSEL
IDC QUARTERLY

Feature Article

Irina Y. Dmitrieva
HeplerBroom LLC, Chicago

Protecting the Right to Appeal in Post-Judgment Enforcement Proceedings

An adverse verdict is often not the end of litigation. In significant civil cases, the real battle frequently begins after judgment is entered. Trial counsel must evaluate posttrial motions, preserve issues for appeal, secure a stay of enforcement, and advise clients regarding the financial and operational consequences of collection efforts.

In Illinois, however, the period immediately following entry of judgment creates a procedural danger that many litigants do not fully appreciate until it is too late. Unlike the federal system, Illinois does not provide an automatic 30-day stay of enforcement after judgment. As a result, judgment creditors may immediately initiate supplementary proceedings through citations to discover assets under section 2-1402 of the Illinois Code of Civil Procedure.

Those proceedings can freeze bank accounts, restrain transfers, interfere with payroll, and disrupt ongoing business operations before defendants have a meaningful opportunity to obtain appellate relief. Yet Illinois procedure does provide mechanisms to protect appellate review, including motions to quash or stay citations, supersedeas bonds, and emergency applications to reviewing courts for stays of enforcement.

Illinois' Legal Framework Governing Post-Judgment Enforcement Proceedings

Illinois post-judgment enforcement proceedings are governed primarily by 735 ILCS 5/2-1402 and Illinois Supreme Court Rule 277. Together, they provide judgment creditors with extraordinary leverage immediately after the entry of judgment.

Section 2-1402 authorizes judgment creditors to commence supplementary proceedings for the purpose of locating and applying nonexempt assets toward satisfaction of a judgment. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(a). Those proceedings are initiated through "citations to discover assets" served not only upon the judgment debtor, but also upon "any other person" believed to possess assets of the debtor or to owe money to the debtor. *Id.*; Ill. S. Ct. R. 277(a). *See also BMO Harris Bank N.A. v. Joe Contarino, Inc.*, 2017 IL App (2d) 160371, ¶ 30; *Wells Fargo Bank Minn., N.A. v. Envirobusiness, Inc.*, 2014 IL App (1st) 133575, ¶ 13.

Importantly, citation proceedings are not merely motions filed in the underlying lawsuit. In practice, they function as separate proceedings, are assigned new case numbers, and frequently are transferred to judges who handle collection matters rather than the trial judge who presided over the underlying case. Defendants therefore may find themselves simultaneously litigating post-trial motions before the trial judge, while defending emergency enforcement proceedings before a different court unfamiliar with the underlying trial or anticipated appellate issues.

Supplementary proceedings provide sweeping discovery tools. Judgment creditors may conduct oral examinations of judgment debtors and third parties under oath and compel production of financial records and other documents concerning the debtor's assets and finances. *See* Ill. S. Ct. R. 277(c), (e). In practice, creditors routinely seek bank records,

Statements or expression of opinions in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the association. *IDC Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 3. © 2026. Illinois Defense Counsel. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

tax returns, payroll information, receivables data, contracts, and account statements designed to identify assets available to satisfy the judgment.

Once assets are identified, the statute grants courts broad authority to compel turnover. Courts may order installment payments, authorize garnishment-type relief, require conveyances of property, and enter turnover orders against third parties holding debtor assets. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(c).

Illinois courts construe these proceedings liberally in favor of judgment creditors. *See*, *e.g.*, *Bank of Aspen v. Fox Cartage, Inc*., 126 Ill.2d 307 (1989). For instance, in *Kauffman v. Wrenn*, 2015 IL App (2d) 150285, ,23 ¶the appellate court explained that section 2-1402 "is construed liberally to provide discovery of a debtor's assets and income and to vest the trial court with broad power to apply discovered property to satisfy a judgment." The only relevant inquiries in a supplementary proceeding are (1) whether the judgment debtor possesses assets that should be applied to satisfy the judgment, and (2) whether a third party is holding assets of the judgment debtor that should be applied to satisfy the judgment. *Id.* ¶ 26.

The most consequential feature of the framework, however, is that citations may be issued with virtually no initial judicial involvement whatsoever. Under Supreme Court Rule 277(b), supplementary proceedings commence simply through service of a citation issued by the clerk upon request of plaintiffs' counsel. No hearing, evidentiary showing, judicial findings, or advance court approval is required before the citation becomes operative.

Many defendants do not initially appreciate the practical consequences of that procedure. Although citations contain hearing dates that may be scheduled weeks in the future, the restraints become effective immediately upon service of the citation itself. Section 2-1402(m) provides that "[t]he judgment or balance due on the judgment becomes a lien when a citation is served." 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(m). The lien attaches to nonexempt personal property, including money, accounts, choses in action, and other effects belonging to the judgment debtor. Section 2-1402(f) further authorizes restraining provisions prohibiting the transfer or disposition of nonexempt property during the proceeding. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(f).

Illinois law provides remarkably little protection for ordinary business operations once citation restraints take effect. Section 2-1402(f)(1) broadly prohibits "any transfer or other disposition" of nonexempt assets pending further order of the court, and Illinois courts have interpreted that language aggressively. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(f). In *City of Chicago v. Air Auto Leasing Co*., 297 Ill. App. 3d 873, 878 (1st Dist. 1998), the appellate court rejected the argument that section 2-1402 contains an implied exception for transfers made in the ordinary course of business, holding unequivocally that "[t]here is no statutory exception for transfers made 'in the ordinary course of business.'"

The practical consequences can be severe. Once banks receive citations containing restraining provisions, they frequently freeze accounts immediately. Third parties owing money to the judgment debtor may refuse payment absent court authorization, while vendors and lenders may become reluctant to continue ordinary business relationships after learning that citations are pending. Judgment creditors may take the position that defendants cannot continue paying vendors, creditors, payroll obligations, or other operating expenses absent court approval.

Noncompliance is a risky option because violations may be punished through contempt proceedings. Section 2-1402(f)(1) expressly authorizes courts to punish violations "as and for a contempt," while Rule 277(h) permits courts to hold parties in contempt for failing to obey citations, subpoenas, or orders issued during supplementary proceedings. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(f)(1); Ill. S. Ct. R. 277(h). Illinois courts have further held that corporate officers who authorize transfers in violation of citation restraints may face personal liability even where the transfers were operationally necessary or commercially reasonable. *See Air Auto Leasing*, 297 Ill. App. 3d at 879.

Opposing Citations to Discover Assets

Statements or expression of opinions in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the association. *IDC Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 3. © 2026. Illinois Defense Counsel. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

The combination of citations' broad scope, immediate enforceability, and the absence of an automatic post-judgment stay creates a powerful strategic weapon for judgment creditors. In some cases, plaintiffs may use supplementary proceedings not merely as collection devices, but as tools to exert immediate operational pressure on defendants before appellate review can realistically occur. There are several ways to challenge the citations, to preserve appellate rights.

Seeking a Stay in the Underlying Case

The best way to avoid the enforcement pressure is to request, at the time judgment is entered, that the trial court expressly stay enforcement pending the filing and disposition of post-trial motions or the posting of supersedeas security.

If such relief is not obtained immediately upon entry of judgment, defendants should seek a stay as quickly as possible before citations are served and separate supplementary proceedings begin. Motions to stay should be supported by detailed affidavits from chief financial officers or equivalent personnel explaining the operational consequences of immediate enforcement proceedings. The trial judge who presided over the case often is best positioned to evaluate those concerns because the court is already familiar with the defendant's finances, the anticipated post-trial issues, and the likelihood of appellate proceedings.

Motions to Quash Citations

If citations already have been served, defendants may oppose them through motions to quash or motions to stay supplementary proceedings.

Citations to discover assets are creatures of statute. Section 2-1402 and Rule 277 impose detailed requirements governing their form, contents, and service. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402; Ill. S. Ct. R. 277. Citations that fail to comply with those requirements may be subject to challenge. *See, e.g., Thorson v. LaSalle Nat'l Bank*, 303 Ill. App. 3d 711 (1st Dist. 1999); *Downs v. Rosenthal*, 2013 IL App (1st) 121406.

Among other requirements, citations must contain specific information regarding the judgment, hearing date, statutory exemptions, and required income and asset forms. Service upon natural persons must comply with Supreme Court Rule 105 and include the statutory income and asset form. *See Midwest Com. Funding, LLC v. Kelly*, 2023 IL 128260, ¶ 23. Defense counsel should examine carefully whether citations include all required statutory notices, whether service complied with Rule 105, whether hearing dates satisfy Rule 277, and whether third-party citations are supported by a sufficient factual basis.

Illinois courts also recognize limitations on proceedings against third parties. When citations are directed to third parties, the serving party must mail copies of the citation and notice to the judgment debtor within three business days. 735 ILCS 5/2-1402(b). Before a court may compel a third party to produce assets, the record must contain some evidence that the third party possesses assets belonging to the judgment debtor. In *Schak v. Blom*, 334 Ill. App. 3d 129, 133 (1st Dist. 2002), the court explained that supplementary proceedings cannot be used to impose liability upon third parties who do not possess debtor assets.

Motion to Stay Supplementary Proceedings

Where citations comply technically with statutory requirements, motions to quash may not be available. In those circumstances, defendants may seek discretionary relief through motions to stay supplementary proceedings.

Statements or expression of opinions in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the association. *IDC Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 3. © 2026. Illinois Defense Counsel. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

Illinois courts possess broad authority to supervise supplementary proceedings under section 2-1402 and Rule 277. Rule 277(e) expressly authorizes courts to control proceedings "to the end that the rights and interests of all parties and persons involved may be protected and harassment avoided," while Rule 277(f) confirms that supplementary proceedings continue until terminated by court order. Ill. S. Ct. 277(e), (f).

The success of such motions often depends upon the evidentiary record. Generalized claims of hardship rarely suffice. Courts respond far more favorably to detailed affidavits from corporate officers, financial personnel, or accountants explaining the operational consequences of immediate enforcement restraints.

Affidavits should address concrete operational consequences, including effects on payroll, vendor obligations, tax payments, lending covenants, and ongoing business operations. The objective is to demonstrate not merely inconvenience, but that unrestricted enforcement may substantially impair or destroy the business before appellate review can occur.

Post-Trial Motions

Another mechanism for staying enforcement proceedings is the filing of a timely post-trial motion. Under Illinois law, enforcement of a money judgment generally may be stayed during the pendency of a proper post-trial motion directed against the judgment. See 735 ILCS 5/2-1202(d).

That procedural mechanism, however, creates a substantial strategic dilemma. Illinois preservation rules require litigants to raise all arguments intended for appellate review in a single post-trial motion. Section 2-1202(b) provides that "[r]elief desired after trial in jury cases . . . must be sought in a single post-trial motion," and further requires that the motion "contain the points relied upon, particularly specifying the grounds in support thereof." 735 ILCS 5/2-1202(b). Illinois Supreme Court Rule 366(b)(2)(iii) similarly provides that parties may not raise on appeal issues omitted from the post-trial motion.

Illinois courts enforce those preservation requirements strictly. In *Holt v. City of Chicago*, 2022 IL App (1st) 220400, ,9 ¶the appellate court reiterated that failure to include issues in the post-trial motion results in forfeiture on appeal.

Although these preservation rules are intended to permit trial courts to address alleged errors before appeal, they create a significant practical problem following large verdicts. Defendants facing immediate enforcement proceedings cannot safely file skeletal post-trial motions merely to obtain a stay because omitted arguments may later be deemed forfeited. Yet preparing comprehensive post-trial motions in complex cases often requires extensive transcript review, legal research, and consultation with appellate counsel.

One practical solution is to involve appellate monitoring counsel during trial itself to identify potential appellate issues and preserve objections; it also would be helpful to order expedited trial transcripts daily.

Supersedeas Bond

Enforcement proceedings also may be stayed by posting a supersedeas bond under Illinois Supreme Court Rule 305. Rule 305 permits not only traditional appeal bonds, but also alternative forms of security, including letters of credit, escrow agreements, certificates of deposit, and, in appropriate circumstances, insurance policies sufficient to secure the judgment creditor's interests pending appeal. Ill. S. Ct. 305(a), (j)

Rule 305(a) provides that the bond or other security "ordinarily shall be in an amount sufficient to cover the amount of the judgment and costs plus interest reasonably anticipated to accrue during the pendency of the appeal." Traditionally,

Statements or expression of opinions in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the association. *IDC Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 3. © 2026. Illinois Defense Counsel. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

practitioners often treated the required amount as roughly 1.5 times the verdict to account for the judgment, anticipated post-judgment interest, and costs.

In large verdict cases, the resulting security amounts can be enormous. Illinois judgments accrue post-judgment interest at nine percent per year under section 2-1303, meaning that interest alone may add substantial amounts during the appeal. 735 ILCS 5/2-1303(a). In some cases, the required security may become so substantial that it effectively impairs a party's ability to pursue an appeal. Concerns regarding that problem became particularly pronounced during the *Philip Morris* litigation, where the verdict reportedly exceeded $10 billion. *See Price v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, 341 Ill. App. 3d 941 (5th Dist. 2003), *vacated*.

Following that litigation, the Illinois Supreme Court amended Rule 305 to permit trial courts, in limited circumstances, to approve reduced security where full security "is not reasonably available" to the judgment debtor. Under Rule 305(a), courts considering reduced security may evaluate the amount of the judgment, anticipated interest and costs, the availability and cost of security, and the assets of the judgment debtor and its insurers or indemnitors. If reduced security is approved, however, the court must impose conditions designed to prevent dissipation or diversion of assets during the appeal.

Emergency Appellate Intervention

Where the trial court declines to grant meaningful relief, defendants may need to seek emergency intervention from the appellate court.

Illinois Supreme Court Rule 305(d) provides that requests for stays ordinarily must first be presented to the circuit court. However, parties may seek relief in the reviewing court where application to the trial court is impractical, where relief has been denied, or where the trial court has failed to provide adequate relief.

In exceptional circumstances, litigants also may seek supervisory or mandamus relief. Those remedies remain extraordinary and are reserved for situations involving substantial concerns regarding the administration of justice. *See Edwards v. Atterberry*, 2019 IL 123370.

Reviewing courts nevertheless possess authority to issue stays and other relief where enforcement proceedings threaten to destroy the practical ability to pursue an appeal. Emergency petitions should focus heavily upon irreparable harm. Reviewing courts are far more likely to intervene where the record demonstrates that ongoing enforcement proceedings threaten payroll, business continuity, insolvency, or the destruction of operations before meaningful appellate review can occur.

Conclusion and Practice Considerations

The central concern raised by Illinois' current framework is not simply aggressive collection activity, but the risk that immediate enforcement proceedings may substantially impair litigants' rights to meaningful appellate review. Immediate enforcement proceedings may freeze bank accounts, interrupt payroll, disrupt financing relationships, and create liquidity crises before defendants have a realistic opportunity to complete post-trial briefing. Where operating funds are frozen immediately after judgment, defendants may also lose the practical ability to fund post-trial proceedings, continue paying trial counsel, or retain appellate counsel. For many companies, the practical choice may become whether to continue operating the business or seek appellate review.

Statements or expression of opinions in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the association. *IDC Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 3. © 2026. Illinois Defense Counsel. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

That pressure inevitably affects litigation incentives. The current framework may weaken the incentive to comply strictly with evidentiary and legal rules because immediate enforcement proceedings may effectively foreclose meaningful appellate review. The result is a system that risks rewarding aggressive trial tactics through economic pressure severe enough to compel payment or settlement before appellate review can occur. In practical terms, that dynamic risks depriving litigants of meaningful appellate error correction while undermining confidence in the fairness and integrity of the judicial system itself.

The federal system addresses this problem differently. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(a) generally imposes an automatic 30-day stay after entry of judgment, allowing parties an opportunity to prepare post-trial motions, evaluate appellate issues, and arrange supersedeas security before facing immediate collection activity. A similar approach in Illinois would better protect meaningful appellate review while still preserving judgment creditors' rights.

Until then, defense counsel must anticipate supplementary proceedings before trial concludes. In significant exposure cases, counsel should request temporary stays at the time judgment is entered and begin evaluating bonding issues well before verdict.

If citations are issued immediately after judgment, counsel should examine carefully whether they comply strictly with section 2-1402 and Rule 277, and if they do not, file motions to quash. Alternatively, motions to stay enforcement proceedings should be supported by detailed affidavits explaining the operational consequences of immediate restraints, including effects on payroll, financing, vendors, and ongoing business operations.

Where the trial court refuses meaningful relief, counsel should be prepared to seek emergency intervention from the appellate court under Rule 305(d) and, in extraordinary circumstances, through supervisory orders or mandamus relief. The strongest petitions will focus on concrete irreparable harm threatening the defendant's ability to continue operations and pursue meaningful appellate review.

About the Author

Irina Y. Dmitrieva is a partner with *HeplerBroom, LLC*. She focuses her practice on appellate litigation and critical trial motions. Ms. Dmitrieva has represented both government entities and private clients in federal and state appellate courts, including the Illinois Supreme Court, Illinois Appellate Court, and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Prior to joining HeplerBroom LLC, she handled all appeals on behalf of the Chicago Transit Authority.

About the IDC

The Illinois Defense Counsel (IDC) is the premier association of attorneys in Illinois who devote a substantial portion their practice to the representation of business, corporate, insurance, professional and other individual defendants in civil litigation. For more information on the IDC, visit us on the web at www.IDC.law or contact us at PO Box 588, Rochester, IL 62563-0588, 217-498-2649, 800-232-0169, admin@IDC.law.

Statements or expression of opinions in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the association. *IDC Quarterly*, Volume 36, Number 3. © 2026. Illinois Defense Counsel. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.