

---

IN THE  
APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS  
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

---

CITIBANK SOUTH DAKOTA, N.A.	)	Appeal from the
	)	Circuit Court of
Petitioner-Appellee,	)	Cook County.
	)	
v.	)	No. 10 M1 206746
	)	
FRANCIS ARO,	)	Honorable
	)	Laurence J. Dunford,
Respondent-Appellant.	)	Judge Presiding.

---

JUSTICE KARNEZIS delivered the judgment of the court.  
Presiding Justice Hoffman and Justice Cunningham concurred in the judgment.

**S U M M A R Y O R D E R**

¶ 1 Respondent Francis Aro, *pro se*, appeals from an order of the circuit court of Cook County granting petitioner Citibank South Dakota, N.A. (Citibank) leave to pay a \$60 filing fee on its motion to reinstate from a dismissal for want of prosecution. On appeal, Aro contends that the trial court erred in allowing Citibank to pay this fee three months after reinstating the case.

¶ 2 We initially observe that Aro has failed to comply with the supreme court rules governing appellate review. Ill. S. Ct. R. 341(h) (eff. Jul. 1, 2008), 342 (eff. Jan. 1, 2005). Notwithstanding, we find that our review is not hindered by the insufficiency of Aro's brief where we have the benefit of the record and Citibank's cogent brief. *Twardowski v. Holiday Hospitality Franchising, Inc.*, 321 Ill. App. 3d 509, 511 (2001).

¶ 3 The common law record shows, in relevant part, that in 2010, Citibank filed a complaint against Aro alleging that he defaulted on a charge account with a balance of \$15,733.20. The

case was subsequently dismissed for want of prosecution; however, on May 19, 2011, Citibank filed a motion to reinstate from the dismissal for want of prosecution, and on June 2, 2011, the circuit court vacated its dismissal order and reinstated the case. Thereafter, Aro filed a motion objecting to the reinstatement in which he asserted, *inter alia*, that Citibank did not pay the required fee for reinstatement of the case. On August 29, 2011, the court entered a contested motion briefing schedule, and, over Aro's objection, ordered "[Citibank] to submit \$60.00 filing fee to county clerk Instantner on its previously entered motion to vacate DWP & Reinstate."

Aro filed notice of appeal from that order pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 307 (eff. Feb. 26, 2010), which governs interlocutory appeals as of right. Citibank initially responds that this appeal should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. We agree.

¶ 4 It is well-settled that this court lacks jurisdiction to review a non-final order unless specifically authorized to do so by supreme court rules. *Almgren v. Rush-Presbyterian-St. Luke's Medical Center*, 162 Ill. 2d 205, 210 (1994). A briefing schedule order granting Citibank leave to pay a filing fee is not among the enumerated situations for which an interlocutory appeal as of right may be had under Rule 307, and Aro has made no attempt to argue otherwise. It is thus clear that Aro has failed to meet the requirements for an interlocutory appeal pursuant to Rule 307, and we must therefore dismiss his appeal for lack of jurisdiction. *Sutherland v. Norbran Leasing Co.*, 180 Ill. App. 3d 95, 97 (1988).

¶ 5 This order is entered in accordance with Illinois Supreme Court Rule 23(c)(1) (eff. Jul. 1, 2011).

¶ 6 Appeal dismissed.