

U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit  
RECEIVED  
APR 16 2023

tcamarda@gmx.com

**From:** tcamarda@gmx.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 10, 2025 1:03 PM  
**To:** 'CA07\_pro\_se\_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'; 'civilrights.justice@usdoj.gov'; 'hhsoig@oig.hhs.gov'; 'oeig.general@illinois.gov'; 'information@iadc.org'; 'osc.whistleblower@osc.gov'; 'hfs.mru@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.dcsscaru@illinois.gov'  
**Cc:** 'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov'  
**Subject:** ENFORCEMENT NOTICE ADDENDUM: JUDICIAL ROLE FRAUD, DIVISIONAL OVERREACH, AND SYSTEMIC SUPREMACY VIOLATIONS IN MCHENRY COUNTY

**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

### ENFORCEMENT NOTICE ADDENDUM: JUDICIAL ROLE FRAUD, DIVISIONAL OVERREACH, AND SYSTEMIC SUPREMACY VIOLATIONS IN MCHENRY COUNTY

The Court is hereby advised of a pattern of jurisdictional abuse and systemic legal misrepresentation within McHenry County — conduct which has now risen to the level of **constitutional sabotage under color of law**.

#### I. ILLEGAL WARRANT ISSUED BY UNAUTHORIZED JUDICIAL DIVISION

In direct violation of constitutional law, statutory limits, and Illinois judicial assignment protocol, a **family law judge within McHenry County issued a criminal arrest warrant** against the Plaintiff-Appellant — a federal litigant — despite having **no assignment, no jurisdiction, and no criminal division authority**.

A **criminal warrant** is a serious constitutional act. It implicates:

- **4th Amendment protections** (seizure and liberty)
- **Due process**
- **Liberty interests protected by federal law**

If a judge **not sitting in criminal court** signs a **warrant for arrest**?

That warrant is **void ab initio** — *invalid from the start*.

This act represents a **gross violation of separation of powers**, judicial ethics, and structural judicial assignments as codified in:

- **705 ILCS 35/1 et seq.** – Illinois Judges Act (jurisdiction assigned by Chief Judge, not assumed)
- **People v. Bruner**, 343 Ill. App. 3d 899 (2003) – A judge may not act outside assigned jurisdiction
- **Franks v. Delaware**, 438 U.S. 154 (1978) – Warrants based on procedurally defective grounds are void
- **People v. Rowell**, 229 Ill. 2d 82 (2008) – Jurisdiction cannot be presumed

Illinois courts are organized by **divisional structure** to uphold separation of powers **within the judiciary** itself:

- **Family Law Judge** = civil jurisdiction over domestic matters
- **Criminal Court Judge** = jurisdiction over felony/misdemeanor matters

When a judge assumes **two roles simultaneously** without legal reassignment?

They violate **Article VI of the Illinois Constitution**, and the **canons of judicial conduct**.

That judge becomes:

- **A witness, a prosecutor, and a trier of fact**
- *In one person*

That is **judicial fraud and ultra vires conduct** (acting outside the law).

This criminal warrant is therefore **void ab initio** — and all actions taken under its authority constitute civil rights violations under:

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983**
- **18 U.S.C. § 242** (Color of Law)
- **18 U.S.C. § 1512** (Retaliatory prosecution)
- **28 U.S.C. § 1443** (Removal jurisdiction for civil rights interference)

Plaintiff is not a criminal defendant. He is the **secured party of record in an active federal enforcement action**. Any procedural action taken against him outside of assigned jurisdiction is legally fraudulent.

## **II. SYSTEMIC JURISDICTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE OVERREACH**

Beyond the warrant, McHenry County's conduct represents an institutional pattern of **procedural recklessness** and intentional misapplication of law. The term "aggressive" — as self-applied by local attorneys — does not reflect lawful assertiveness. It reflects:

- **Weaponized bureaucracy**
- **Misinterpretation of federal process as personal defiance**
- **Hostile obstruction of service and procedural access**
- **Persistent defiance of federal supremacy doctrine**

These recurring descriptions by local attorneys of McHenry County as "aggressive" — often accompanied by visible apprehension — serve as a clear **Constitutional Alarm and warning sign of constitutional abuse**. No attorney should fear asserting **federal supremacy or invoking constitutional rights**. **Plaintiff shouldn't fear**. Yet their hesitation reflects a climate of systemic reprisal, fully documented in *Camarda v. Whitehorn*, and symptomatic of a judiciary operating beyond lawful bounds.

Such conduct directly violates:

- **U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2** – Supremacy Clause
- **28 U.S.C. § 1331** – Federal question jurisdiction
- **Lozman v. Riviera Beach**, 138 S. Ct. 1945 (2018) – First Amendment retaliation for legal filings
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – Deprivation of rights
- **FRAP 31(c)** – Procedural default by appellees triggers finality and enforcement
- **Rule 56(a), FRCP** – Summary judgment now active

### **Clarification of Representation History**

For the record, Plaintiff-Appellant did not part ways with prior counsel due to "irreconcilable differences," but rather due to counsel's unwillingness to raise core

constitutional arguments — specifically, federal supremacy, Title IV-D jurisdictional overreach, and statutory preemption — despite full awareness of their legal merit and centrality to the case.

Counsel's failure to recognize or present these arguments — combined with a visible, witnessed inability to address foundational issues of **jurisdiction, Title IV-D procedure, and federal preemption** — would have materially compromised Plaintiff's ability to **preserve his rights, enforce federal law, and maintain procedural integrity**.

This underscores the unique power of **pro se authority**: it is not limited by the strategic caution, institutional constraints, or subject matter blind spots often imposed by legal counsel. A pro se litigant may proceed directly to the Constitution, to federal supremacy, and to procedural enforcement without institutional filter — and that is precisely what Plaintiff has done.

Accordingly, Plaintiff-Appellant proceeded pro se to ensure the lawful articulation of all relevant federal protections, without dilution, omission, or concession. See prior filings on pro se authority, 28 U.S.C. § 1654 standing, and procedural enforcement rights under **Rule 56(a)** and **FRAP 31(c)**.

Let the record reflect: Plaintiff has both the right and the obligation to assert federal supremacy without intimidation, ridicule, or obstruction. Any attempt to deter those lawful arguments shall be treated as a violation of civil rights under **42 U.S.C. § 1983** and **18 U.S.C. § 242**.

### **III. FEDERAL NOTICE OF VIOLATIONS AND JUDICIAL CONSEQUENCE**

This record formally observes that **no local courtroom, including McHenry County, may continue enforcement of any order or proceeding in conflict with a final federal judgment**.

Attempts to proceed on any basis against the Plaintiff-Appellant — including enforcement, contempt, arrest, or coerced appearances — are legally equivalent to **defying the United States Court of Appeals** and shall be met with:

- Immediate federal injunction requests
- Judicial misconduct filings to JIB and AOUSC
- Expanded 42 U.S.C. § 1983 filings
- Criminal referrals under **18 U.S.C. § 242, § 245, and § 1512**

This Court is further advised:

Plaintiff does not litigate in personality contests or regional silos. He litigates under federal law.

And that law is now active, procedurally perfected, and constitutionally unrebutted.

#### IV. DECLARATION OF VOID ACTIONS AND FUTURE CONSEQUENCES

Let it be recorded:

- The original arrest warrant issued by an improperly acting judicial officer in McHenry County is **hereby declared void ab initio** and the result of **judicial impersonation**.
- The continued prosecution under Case No. 24CM000976 is a **facially unconstitutional enforcement** against a federally protected party.
- McHenry County's internal administrative "aggression" is now a **liability factor**, not a justification.

Any continuation of these actions — post-notice — will confirm deliberate intent and **personal liability**.

#### V. CONCLUSION

The Plaintiff stands in this courtroom **not as a criminal**, but as the **prevailing litigant** of the United States Court of Appeals.

All contrary behavior by McHenry County officials is recorded as **violative, retaliatory, and unlawful**.

Respect for the rule of law is no longer optional —  
It is **federally required, judicially monitored, and consequence-enforced**.

Let the record reflect:

**Aggression is not law. Jurisdiction is not optional. Supremacy is not negotiable.**

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Thomas E. Camarda**

*Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se*

United States Court of Appeals – Seventh Circuit

Case No. 24-3244

***All Rights Reserved – Enforcement Phase Active – Federal Supremacy  
Invoked – Judicial Priority Reserved***