

U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit  
RECEIVED  
APR 16 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

**From:** tcamarda@gmx.com  
**Sent:** Friday, April 11, 2025 10:27 AM  
**To:** 'CA07\_pro\_se\_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'; 'civilrights.justice@usdoj.gov'; 'hhs.oig@oig.hhs.gov'; 'oeig.general@illinois.gov'; 'information@iadc.org'; 'osc.whistleblower@osc.gov'; 'hfs.mru@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.dcscaru@illinois.gov'  
**Cc:** 'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov'  
**Subject:** NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OBSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL RECORD ACCESS AND ATTEMPTED SUPPRESSION OF COURT TRANSCRIPT  
**Importance:** High

## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

**Thomas E. Camarda**  
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

v.

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

**Case No. 24-3244**

### NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE OBSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL RECORD ACCESS AND ATTEMPTED SUPPRESSION OF COURT TRANSCRIPT

#### TO THE HONORABLE CLERK AND PANEL:

Plaintiff-Appellant, now in **post-judgment enforcement** under **DKT113 – Summary Judgment**, hereby submits this notice for **judicial awareness and emergency preservation**.

#### I. ADMINISTRATIVE OBSTRUCTION WITNESSED

On **April 11, 2025**, following Plaintiff-Appellant's appearance in the 22nd Judicial Circuit Court of McHenry County (Case No. 24CM000976), a request was made to obtain the **official court transcript** of the hearing — a transcript necessary for **federal appellate preservation, evidence analysis, and procedural enforcement**.

Plaintiff contacted Court Administration at (815) 334-4385, per posted protocol.

The records clerks named **"Jenny & Judy"** refused to process the request and made the following improper and unlawful statements when Plaintiff requested a transcript::

- **"I do not authorize you to do that"** (confusing the words "Court Record" with a recording device showing a severe listening and comprehension issue)

- **"I don't consent to being recorded"** (despite no recording being made)
- **"You're not allowed to"** (referring to her misunderstanding of the words, **"I AM A COURT RECORD AND YOU CANNOT OBSTRUCT THE RECORD UNDER 18 U.S.C. 2071!"**) It is both astonishing and deeply concerning that a sitting state judge would openly claim exemption from federal law — **and then the employees think they are openly exempt too?** Despite the unambiguous constitutional fact that all state actors, including judicial officers, are bound by the **Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution**. To misunderstand this is not only a legal failure; it is a disqualifying error in the exercise of public authority.
- Repeated interruptions of federally protected procedural protocols — by both the presiding Judge and now the Records Clerk — constitute a deliberate breakdown of lawful process. These protocols exist not as formality, but as a safeguard to ensure that all **jurisdictional, constitutional, and evidentiary rights are acknowledged and preserved.**

These statements were made **after Plaintiff advised that:**

- He is the **prevailing party under federal summary judgment**
- He is in **active enforcement under federal supremacy**
- He is a **federal court recordholder**, not simply a state litigant
- **All parties are on federal notice**, and this transcript is legally required under federal jurisdiction

## II. VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAW

This is not simply a misunderstanding — this is **federal obstruction**. Specifically:

- 18 U.S.C. § 2071 – *Concealment, removal, or mutilation of federal records*
- 18 U.S.C. § 1505 – *Obstruction of proceedings*
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – *Color of law deprivation of access*
- 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) – *Right to enforce federal authority*
- **Press-Enterprise Co. v. Superior Court**, 464 U.S. 501 (1984) – *Constitutional right to court records*
- **Nixon v. Warner Comm., Inc.**, 435 U.S. 589 (1978) – *Judicial transparency is a fundamental right*

The records clerk's behavior constituted:

- **Improper assertion of judicial authority** (a clerk cannot “authorize” transcript access)
- **Suppression of material evidence**
- **Obstruction of a prevailing federal litigant's lawful procedural rights**
- **Ignorance or defiance of binding federal preeminence**

### **III. SYSTEMIC INTERRUPTION AND OBSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT PROTOCOLS**

Throughout the April 11, 2025 enforcement hearing — and again during subsequent post-hearing record preservation efforts — Plaintiff-Appellant experienced a **clear, systemic pattern of interruption, procedural hijacking, and administrative obstruction**, designed to interfere with the preservation of a **federally protected record** and the exercise of federal supremacy.

#### **A. Judicial Interruption of Enforcement Protocols**

During the hearing, Judge Mary Nader repeatedly interrupted Plaintiff-Appellant during the delivery of his **Federal Enforcement Protocols 1 through 3**, which serve a specific procedural purpose:

- To confirm jurisdiction
- To preserve the binding nature of summary judgment
- To deliver a real-time assertion of Article VI supremacy

These interruptions were **not neutral behavior** — they constituted **strategic derailments** of a lawful enforcement process.

#### **B. Clerical Interruption of Transcript Access**

Following the hearing, court clerks “Jenny & Judy” at the McHenry County Circuit Clerk's Office:

- Refused to process a lawful transcript request
- Claimed she did not “authorize” the request
- Obstructed access to the audio and transcript, despite Plaintiff's legal right as the prevailing party

This behavior mirrors the courtroom conduct and reflects a **broader institutional problem**:

**A local judicial culture that views federally mandated procedure as optional, interruptible, or dependent on internal discretion.**

### **C. Legal Consequences of Patterned Interruption**

This dual-pattern of **judicial and administrative obstruction** is not merely unprofessional — it is **illegal** and actionable under:

- 18 U.S.C. § 1503 – Obstruction of justice
- 18 U.S.C. § 2071 – Concealment, removal, or mutilation of records
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Deprivation of rights under color of law
- 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) – All Writs Act: authority to protect federal jurisdiction

Let it be recorded that the Plaintiff's attempts to preserve the record — both during and after the hearing — were met with the same **institutional hostility, procedural disrespect, and constitutional defiance.**

### **IV. PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE FOR THE RECORD**

Plaintiff responded firmly and lawfully:

- Affirmed that he is **part of the federal record**
- Asserted that **Judy has no legal standing** to deny access to federal evidence
- Noted the court is **under DKT113 – Summary Judgment**
- Reminded her that **federal supremacy flows downward and cannot be obstructed by state clerks**
- Correctly cited 18 U.S.C. § 2071 as applicable
- Warned that all statements made were now **subject to transcription and federal review**

### **V. DEMAND FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION**

Let this record serve as **formal notice to the Seventh Circuit** that:

- Plaintiff-Appellant is **being obstructed in enforcement**
- McHenry County Court staff are **blocking access to federally relevant evidence**
- This transcript is not discretionary — it is **required under the active judgment of this Court**

Plaintiff-Appellant demands that:

1. **This Court formally acknowledge this obstruction**
2. **Transcript be immediately ordered, produced, and entered into the record**
3. **The conduct of the clerk be referred for state and federal review**
4. **The State of Illinois be placed on notice that further obstruction will result in:**
  - **Immediate federal escalation**
  - **Referral to the DOJ and Office of Inspector General**
  - **Sanctions and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 enforcement proceedings**

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

Plaintiff-Appellant is not merely seeking a transcript. He is seeking to protect the **integrity of this Court's judgment** against those who now seek to sabotage it at the administrative level.

This Court must act. The obstruction must end.

## **STANDBY FOR EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE FEDERAL JUDGMENT, NULLIFY STATE COURT RETALIATION, AND REFER JUDICIAL OBSTRUCTION FOR FEDERAL REVIEW**

Respectfully submitted,

**Thomas E. Camarda**

Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

Case No. 24-3244

United States Court of Appeals—Seventh Circuit

**Dated:** April 11, 2025