Case: 24-3244 Document: 147 Filed: 04/17/2025 Pages: 3

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: Sent:

Friday, April 11, 2025 7:11 AM To:

'CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'; 'civilrights.justice@usdoj.gov'; 'hhsoig@oig.hhs.gov'; 'oeig.general@illinois.gov';

'information@iardc.org'; 'osc.whistleblower@osc.gov'; 'hfs.mru@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.dcsscaru@illinois.gov'

'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov' Cc:

NOTICE OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT EFFECT AND ADMINISTRATIVE RETREAT (NON-COLLECTION EVENT) Subject:

Importance:

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Thomas E. Camarda Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit RECEIVED

APR 17 2025

v.

Elizabeth Whitehorn, et al. **Defendants-Appellees**

Case No. 24-3244

NOTICE OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT EFFECT AND ADMINISTRATIVE RETREAT (NON-COLLECTION EVENT)

TO THE HONORABLE CLERK AND PANEL:

Plaintiff-Appellant Thomas Edward Camarda, appearing pro se and under active post-judgment enforcement authority, hereby files this notice into the federal appellate record as confirmation of real-world enforcement effects and administrative shifts stemming from the perfected summary judgment entered under FRAP 31(c) and Rule 56(a).

I. DOCUMENTED WITHDRAWAL OF STATE ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY

For the first time since retaliatory enforcement actions began in connection with Title IV-D administration and McHenry County prosecution, no child support garnishment was executed in the current pay cycle -- a marked and measurable deviation from the prior weekly withholding pattern.

This event occurred immediately following the filing of:

- DKT113-129 (Seventh Circuit Enforcement Phase)
- A26 Formal Supremacy Enforcement Ahead of April 11 Hearing
- FOIA evidence of Treasury bond non-response

BUT BOOK INC. OF BUT SEEMS TO BE

Case: 24-3244 Document: 147 Filed: 04/17/2025 Pages: 3

• Formal federal and employer notices regarding unlawful garnishment

· 大大學的 #2 新春的學科及自身性的學科學科學科學科學科學科學科學科學科學

II. IMPLIED ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF FEDERAL LIABILITY

This deviation in garnishment behavior is not benign. It is:

- A tacit admission by the State or employer of legal uncertainty or federal preemption
- A material break in the claimed continuity of enforcement
- Constructive evidence that Plaintiff's legal posture is being acknowledged systemically

It further supports the argument that the prosecution and collection efforts were never about necessity, but narrative preservation and retaliation.

III. PROPER LEGAL FRAMEWORK

This non-collection event now serves as reinforcing evidence of:

- Constitutional preemption under Article VI, Clause 2
- · Pending and active liability under:
 - o 42 U.S.C. § 1983
 - o 18 U.S.C. § 242
 - o 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)

It also confirms that **enforcement hesitancy is occurring downstream**, and that agencies involved are now actively retreating from positions they once enforced with impunity.

IV. FORMAL NOTICE OF NON-CONSENT AND LEGAL OBJECTION TO EMPLOYMENT MISREPRESENTATIONS

Plaintiff-Appellant reiterates:

- He is not unemployed
- He seeks no "workshop," "coaching," or reclassification services
- He demands removal from all such email or communication lists

• He considers such misclassification a form of reputational harassment and procedural baiting under the guise of assistance

All such conduct is now part of the federal record and will be preserved for judicial review and possible expansion of damages.

v. conclusion man legal to remargate to stook off ad notice legist a liber A.

This non-collection event is a pivotal real-world signal:

The system has begun to alter course. And federal supremacy has begun asserting itself not just on paper — but in policy, payroll, and silence.

Plaintiff now awaits full restitution, reversal of unlawful collections, correction of all damaging classifications, and enforcement of final judgment terms — including any and all financial, reputational, and procedural remedies arising from violations already entered into record.

This notice is respectfully submitted for judicial awareness and procedural preservation in the active enforcement phase of Camarda v. Whitehorn et al.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Camarda

Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

Case No. 24-3244 – U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit

Enforcement Phase Active — Federal Supremacy Invoked

og fra en la companya di mangala di Angala di Angala di Angala di Managala di Managala di Managala di Managala Reference di Angala di Managala di Man

and the contract of the second of the second

Dated: April 11, 2025