tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2025 11:17 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'; 'judicialconduct@uscourts.gov'; 'civilrights@usdoj.gov'; 'CRM.CivilRights@usdoj.gov'; 'oig.hotline@usdoj.gov'; 'jib@illinois.gov'; 'civilrights@atg.state.il.us'; 'FOIA@treasury.gov'; 'ethics@americanbar.org'
Cc: 'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov'
Subject: EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE FEDERAL JUDGMENT, NULLIFY STATE COURT RETALIATION, AND REFER JUDICIAL OBSTRUCTION FOR FEDERAL REVIEW
Attachments: 4 - EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE FEDERAL JUDGMENT, NULLIFY STATE COURT RETALIATION, AND REFER JUDICIAL OBSTRUCTION FOR FEDERAL REVIEW.pdf

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

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

TO THE HONORABLE CLERK AND PANEL:

Attached please find 4 – **EMERGENCY MOTION TO ENFORCE FEDERAL JUDGMENT, NULLIFY STATE COURT RETALIATION, AND REFER JUDICIAL OBSTRUCTION FOR FEDERAL REVIEW** in the matter of *Camarda v. Whitehorn et al., Case No. 24-3244*, currently before the **United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.**

Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully files this emergency motion under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), FRAP 8, and Rule 60(b)(4) to immediately preserve the integrity of the Seventh Circuit's perfected summary judgment and respond to active constitutional violations occurring in McHenry County, Illinois.

On April 11, 2025, Plaintiff entered the 22nd Circuit under **Special Appearance** and provided physical enforcement documents. Despite judicial notice, Judge Mary Nader interrupted federal protocols, mocked the **appellate judgment as an "opinion,"** denied the applicability of federal law, and permitted retaliatory action

against the prevailing party. This includes the announcement of a **third criminal charge** in real time, based on **protected federal filings and settlement communications**—a textbook violation of:

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983**
- **18 U.S.C. § 242, § 1512**
- **Franks v. Delaware**
- **Blackledge v. Perry**
- **Heck v. Humphrey**
- **Brady v. Maryland**

Judge Nader publicly declared: **"I am a state court judge. I am not bound by federal law."**

Plaintiff repeatedly asserted: **"This is a binding judgment."**

DKT113 was physically submitted into court record.

This emergency motion requests the following:

1. **Immediate federal acknowledgment** of interference with a perfected appellate judgment
2. **Injunction** halting McHenry County prosecution under Case No. 24CM000976
3. **Referral of Judge Mary Nader** for review by AOUSC and DOJ
4. **Formal recognition of federal enforcement posture** in all state-level interactions
5. **Denial of Younger Abstention** on grounds of bad faith, retaliation, and procedural voidness

Key facts preserved in this motion include:

- Repeated verbal affirmations of federal supremacy
- Physical presentation of DKT113 into the court record
- Real-time jurisdictional objections and Protocol enforcement attempts

- The state's refusal to honor the perfected federal judgment
- The announcement of a **third retaliatory charge** based on **federal evidence and Rule 408-protected settlement exhibits**
- Invocation of **Younger abstention misapplication and demand for federal injunction**
- Request for judicial referral due to overt defiance of constitutional supremacy

This is not a procedural matter — it is a federal enforcement event. A state judge openly declared she was "not bound by federal law," while holding the perfected appellate judgment in her hands. The moment requires immediate recognition by the federal judiciary.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Camarda
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se
Case No. 24-3244
United States Court of Appeals – Seventh Circuit – **Enforcement Active**

Dated: April 11, 2025

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

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

Filed pursuant to:

- 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) – All Writs Act
- Rule 60(b)(4) – Relief from Void Judgments
- FRAP 8 & 27 – Emergency and Procedural Motions
- Article VI, Clause 2 – Supremacy Clause
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Civil Rights Enforcement
- 18 U.S.C. §§ 242, 1503, 1512 – Constitutional Violations Under Color of Law

Filed by:

Thomas E. Camarda
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se
Federal Enforcement Status: **ACTIVE**
Judgment Status: **Perfected – DKT113**
Supremacy Posture: **Preserved, Asserted, Unrebutted**

Dated: April 11, 2025

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

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

TO THE HONORABLE CLERK AND PANEL:

This is not a motion — it is a signal flare from the battlefield of American federalism.

Filed pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)**, **FRAP 8**, **Rule 60(b)(4)**, and the **Supremacy Clause** of the U.S. Constitution, Plaintiff-Appellant brings before this Court an *emergency event*:

A state judge, fully on notice of this Court's perfected federal judgment, held it in her hands, and **still declared aloud** in open court:

"I am a state court judge. I am not bound by federal law."

I stated for the record she was in fact bound by federal law and that's exactly why the defendants lost the case in federal court because they too thought they weren't bound by federal law.

I then asked her, **"Do you state for the record that you are not bound by federal law?"**

She replied, **"I'm a state court judge."** I then stated, **"but you are bound by federal law, do you state for the record that you are not bound by federal law?"**

She then attempted to question where I went to lawschool, a totally irrelevant and immaterial question. I am the prevailing party under federal summary judgement under 56(a) in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

This is not a legal dispute. This is a direct assault on the United States Constitution.

I. SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS PERFECTED, FINAL, AND FEDERALLY DOMINANT

On **April 2, 2025**, this Court entered a perfected **Rule 56(a)** summary judgment under **DKT113**, following total procedural default under **FRAP 31(c)**. The following are uncontested:

- No brief was filed by any Appellee.
- No rebuttal, appeal, or motion has been submitted.
- Enforcement notices from **DKT114–129** remain active.
- The ruling is now the law of the case.

This is not an "opinion." It is a **binding federal judgment**, enforceable by the Supremacy Clause.

II. APRIL 11: MCHENRY COUNTY COURT COMMITTED REAL-TIME JUDICIAL DEFIANCE

At 8:30 AM, Plaintiff-Appellant entered **22nd Judicial Circuit, McHenry County** under **Special Appearance Only**, carrying physical printouts of DKT113 and active enforcement notices. The judge — **Mary Nader** — then did the following:

A. Hijacked Procedural Protocol

- Plaintiff began **Preservation Protocols 1–3** — the legally structured sequence to assert federal jurisdiction and trigger enforcement.
- Judge Nader **cut off Plaintiff mid-protocol**, refusing to let jurisdiction be preserved.

B. Forced State Framing

- She asked: *"Which motion do you want to proceed on?"*
- Plaintiff replied: *"I am not here to pick motions. I am here to follow federal law."*
- She proceeded anyway, **coercing a Motion to Stay**, which Plaintiff **explicitly rejected.**

C. Mocked a Federal Judgment

- Plaintiff presented **DKT113** and stated:

"This is a perfected summary judgment from the United States Court of Appeals."

- Judge Nader replied:

"That's your opinion."

- Plaintiff corrected:

"It's Judge Easterbrook's opinion, actually. And if Easterbrook and his panel made the judgment, then my opinion is the correct opinion."

D. Attempted Personal Discreditation

- Judge Nader repeatedly asked:

"Where did you go to law school?"

- Plaintiff replied:

"I just prevailed in the Seventh Circuit under Rule 56(a). My standing is federally recognized under 28 U.S.C. § 1654."

E. Refused to Recognize Federal Case Law

- Plaintiff asked:

"Do you know what United States v. Sage is?"

- Judge replied:

"It's a case."

- Plaintiff followed up:

"What's the subject matter?"

- Judge replied:

"You don't get to ask me questions."

This was not a courtroom — it was a jurisdictional hostage situation.

III. ATTEMPTED PERSONAL DIMINISHMENT THROUGH IRRELEVANT QUESTIONING

During the hearing, Judge Mary Nader attempted to divert from binding federal substance by asking Plaintiff-Appellant:

"Where did you go to law school?"

This question is **irrelevant, immaterial**, and **inappropriate**, especially in light of Plaintiff-Appellant's status as a:

- **Prevailing party under Rule 56(a) summary judgment**

- **Enforcing litigant of a perfected federal record in Camarda v. Whitehorn et al., Case No. 24-3244**
- **Pro se federal litigant protected by 28 U.S.C. § 1654**

Plaintiff-Appellant responded clearly and accurately:

"I am the prevailing party under federal summary judgment in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit."

The judge's questioning — rather than upholding procedural dignity — attempted to **diminish the legitimacy** of Plaintiff-Appellant's enforcement authority **based on informal qualifications**, not legal standing.

This is not merely inappropriate — it is evidence of:

- **Judicial bias**
- **Improper personal targeting**
- **Retaliatory demeanor**
- A potential **due process violation** in violation of **14th Amendment protections**

When a litigant appears with the force of federal judgment in hand, the only proper response from the court is to **recognize that authority**, not to belittle it based on credentials irrelevant to the matter at hand.

IV. ATTEMPTED MISCHARACTERIZATION OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT ROLE

At a pivotal point in the hearing, **Judge Mary Nader attempted to challenge Plaintiff-Appellant's authority**, falsely conflating his standing as the federal enforcement party in *Camarda v. Whitehorn* with traditional courtroom roles, stating or implying that he was **not an "officer of the court."**

This was an **intentional reframing**, seemingly designed to:

- **Strip the Plaintiff of legal authority**
- Diminish his federal standing
- Recast the hearing into a conventional local proceeding, bypassing the federal record

Plaintiff-Appellant immediately clarified:

"I have been actively litigating *Camarda v. Whitehorn* for seven months in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. I have complied with every

federal procedure, filed over 100 record notices and motions, and prevailed under perfected summary judgment per Rule 56(a) and FRAP 31(c)."

"While I am not an officer of the court in the conventional sense of a licensed attorney, I am the federal enforcement party and officer of the record for Case No. 24-3244. That status is not a title — it is earned through prevailing judgment."

Only **after this clear articulation** did the court acknowledge the distinction — proving that:

- Plaintiff-Appellant was **initially subjected to mischaracterization**
- His **authority had to be defended**, rather than respected upfront
- The court required **education in real-time** to understand the federal posture of the enforcement

This exchange demonstrates the **critical importance of preserving legal identity** under Article VI Supremacy, and how even that is vulnerable to local procedural dilution when federal standing is not honored from the start.

V. FEDERAL RIGHTS WERE MOCKED AND IGNORED

Plaintiff then stated clearly:

"Federal supremacy is here. You have the judgment in your hands. You **must** dismiss this matter. Continuing is unlawful."

Judge Nader responded with further denials and ignored every assertion of federal authority.

VI. FINAL VERBAL PRESERVATION DECLARATION

"Federal supremacy has not been affirmed. The rights of the prevailing litigant were not preserved. The constitutional integrity of this court was not maintained. And I will report this hearing to the Seventh Circuit immediately."

VII. RETALIATORY CHARGE ATTEMPTED IN REAL TIME – FEDERAL OBJECTION ENTERED

Immediately following Plaintiff-Appellant's lawful enforcement declarations, jurisdictional objections, and closing preservation of the Seventh Circuit's judgment, **Assistant State's Attorney Nate** responded not with legal acknowledgment — but with **retaliatory escalation**.

He announced the intent to file a **third amended charge**, based entirely on:

- **Protected settlement communications** pursuant to **Federal Rule of Evidence 408**

- **Federal exhibits** that are part of the perfected record of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit (Case No. 24-3244)

This retaliatory amendment was announced:

- **In real time**
- **On the record**
- **While DKT113 was in the Judge's hands**
- **After Plaintiff objected to the proceeding multiple times as jurisdictionally barred**

Plaintiff's Immediate On-Record Objection:

"Blackledge, Franks, and Brady violation — that is not allowed. You're not allowed, Nate. We're done. You're done, Nate."

Plaintiff then **exited the courtroom**, having fully preserved all procedural rights, exhausted federal enforcement declarations, and lawfully disengaged after active constitutional violations were confirmed.

LEGAL VIOLATIONS TRIGGERED:

This retaliatory amendment constitutes **textbook legal retaliation** and prosecutorial misconduct under:

- **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – Retaliation for protected legal activity
- **Lozman v. Riviera Beach**, 138 S. Ct. 1945 (2018) – Retaliation against petition-based activity
- **18 U.S.C. § 242** – Deprivation of rights under color of law
- **18 U.S.C. § 1512** – Retaliation against a witness/litigant
- **Franks v. Delaware**, 438 U.S. 154 (1978) – Use of defective or deceptive charges
- **Heck v. Humphrey**, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) – Bar on prosecutions that undermine standing federal judgments
- **Blackledge v. Perry**, 417 U.S. 21 (1974) – Prosecutorial retaliation after assertion of legal rights
- **Brady v. Maryland**, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) – Withholding exculpatory evidence and repackaging lawful records as charges

VIII. ROOT JURISDICTIONAL FRAUD – VOID *Ab Initio* ORIGIN FROM TITLE IV-D

Plaintiff-Appellant further preserved into the record that the entirety of Case No. 24CM000976 is **void *ab initio***, as it **originated from an unlawful administrative process** rooted in **Title IV-D enforcement**, which itself was based on:

- **Unsigned administrative orders**
- In direct violation of **28 U.S.C. § 1691**, which mandates that **"All writs and process shall run in the name of the President of the United States, and shall be under the seal of the court, and signed by the clerk thereof."**

This violation was never corrected.

The **Title IV-D administrative orders** forming the basis for the state's prosecutorial action were:

- **Not signed by any Article III judge**
- **Issued without proper judicial authority**
- **Never filed through a constitutionally valid process**

As a result:

- **The entire chain of custody is poisoned.**
- **The downstream criminal charge is void.**
- **Jurisdiction never attached — because it never existed.**

This establishes, beyond dispute, that the **criminal case was born of an illegal Title IV-D action**, making every subsequent development:

- A **continuation of unlawful enforcement**
- A **civil rights violation at scale**
- A **federal supremacy breach with active constitutional implications**

No ruling, amendment, hearing, or charge stemming from such an origin may survive scrutiny under:

- **Marbury v. Madison**, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)
- **Franks v. Delaware**, 438 U.S. 154 (1978)
- **28 U.S.C. § 1691**

- **Rule 60(b)(4)** – Relief from void judgments

IX. WHAT THIS COURT MUST DO NOW

This Court **must** protect its own judgment and federal supremacy. Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully demands:

1. Federal Declaration

That **DKT113** is final and being ignored by a lower tribunal.

2. Immediate Federal Injunction

Stopping all further prosecution under **McHenry Case No. 24CM000976**.

3. Referral of Judge Mary Nader

To the **Judicial Inquiry Board**, **AOUSC**, and DOJ-OIG.

4. Full Recognition of Federal Enforcement Authority

Plaintiff-Appellant is not a criminal defendant. He is the federal prevailing party enforcing the law.

X. IMPERATIVE FOR IMMEDIATE FEDERAL ACTION — YOUNGER DOES NOT APPLY

The Seventh Circuit must now intervene **not as a preference, but as a duty**. This is no longer a matter of judicial deference, comity, or local administration. This is **a direct attack on the federal appellate order** of this Court, carried out under the false authority of a local tribunal that has openly rejected the Constitution.

Younger Abstention Does Not Apply

The State of Illinois is not conducting a valid, good-faith prosecution. It is executing a **retaliatory sequence** designed to **undermine a federal judgment**, obstruct its enforcement, and punish the Plaintiff-Appellant for prevailing in this very Court.

The **Younger v. Harris** doctrine is inapplicable here due to:

- **Bad faith and harassment** by state actors
- **No adequate opportunity to raise federal claims**
- **Ongoing retaliation for prior federal litigation**
- **A perfected summary judgment already issued**

See *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971); *Trainor v. Hernandez*, 431 U.S. 434 (1977); *Middlesex County Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass'n*, 457 U.S. 423

(1982). None of the Younger conditions are met. To abstain here would be to allow open constitutional violations under the cloak of state procedure.

The Gravity of the Violations Demands Enforcement

This is not a procedural dispute — this is **a constitutional confrontation** between:

- A **prevailing federal litigant** under Rule 56(a), FRAP 31(c), and Article VI
- A **state judge who declared she is not bound by federal law**
- A **prosecutor who retaliated** after receiving settlement exhibits and federal filings
- And a **local court that attempted to re-criminalize federal facts**

The federal judiciary does not exist to **watch** as its judgments are mocked. It exists to **protect** constitutional supremacy — and the time for protection is now.

The People of the United States Did Not Endow McHenry County With Veto Power Over the Constitution

Millions of Americans entrust their rights, records, and dignity to the rule of law — **not to the whims of a rogue courtroom in a local jurisdiction**. The Plaintiff-Appellant is not just defending himself — he is defending the integrity of this Court's judgment. And if this Court will not protect it, then the supremacy it represents has already been defeated.

XI. ON-THE-RECORD DEMAND FOR DISMISSAL AND DUE PROCESS INVOCATION

During the hearing, Judge Mary Nader asserted she was "trying to follow due process." Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully, but firmly, replied:

"Well you're not though — because you're not following federal law. You have a summary judgment in your hands. You know it's active — we both know it is. You know this case must be dismissed. So I ask now, for the fifth time: please dismiss this case with prejudice, so I don't have to make continued appearances under duress, spend more money, and waste everyone's time. This case must be dismissed."

Rather than address the jurisdictional issue or federal authority presented, Judge Nader stated, *"Are you done?"* — and then proceeded to set a future hearing date for Plaintiff's motion to dismiss, allowing the State 21 days to respond.

She asked Plaintiff how many days he wanted to reply, to which he responded:

"I don't want any days or any more continuances. I want this case to be dismissed today. It is my right, and I am asking you again — now for the seventh time — to please dismiss this case immediately so we don't waste time."

This sequence demonstrates that Plaintiff:

- Invoked federal due process rights under ***Rule 56(a)***, ***FRAP 31(c)***, and the ***Supremacy Clause***
- Made **five formal verbal requests** for immediate dismissal under binding federal judgment
- Was denied immediate remedy despite perfect procedural posture and judicial notice of **DKT113**
- Was placed into a continued litigation cycle under duress, despite asserting his rights as the **prevailing federal party**

XII. LEGAL COMPARISON – FEDERAL V. STATE CONFLICT

This is not a case of legal ambiguity. It is a direct legal collision:

Federal Authority	***State Action***
DKT113 – Final Summary Judgment (Rule 56(a))	Continued prosecution in 22nd Judicial Circuit
Article VI – Supremacy Clause	"I am a state court judge. I am not bound by federal law" **(on record)**
FRAP 31(c) – Default by Appellees	Third amended charge in retaliation **(Multiple violations of Lozman, Franks, Blackledge, ect.)**
28 U.S.C. § 1691 – Void Origin Orders	Title IV-D basis with no signature
FRE Rule 408 – Protected communications and transcripts of lawful communications	Used to file criminal charges

This is not a legal dispute. It is a defiance of federal supremacy in full view of the judiciary.

XIII. BINDING NATURE OF FEDERAL JUDGMENT WAS STATED CLEARLY — MULTIPLE TIMES

Throughout the hearing on April 11, 2025, **Plaintiff-Appellant repeatedly stated into the record — no fewer than three times** — that:

"This is a binding judgment."

Each time, Plaintiff held DKT113 — the perfected summary judgment issued under Rule 56(a) and FRAP 31(c) — and physically presented it to the court.

These statements were not metaphorical or argumentative. They were:

- **Verbal executions of jurisdictional supremacy**
- **Legal assertions backed by final appellate disposition**
- **Mandatory declarations requiring judicial acknowledgment**

Yet despite those affirmations, the court:

- **Continued to refer to the judgment as Plaintiff's 'opinion'**
- **Refused to acknowledge its binding effect**
- **Proceeded with a hearing in defiance of federal procedure**

By refusing to recognize a perfected federal summary judgment after it was affirmatively declared "binding" in open court, the 22nd Judicial Circuit triggered:

- **A Supremacy Clause violation** under U.S. Const. Art. VI
- **A Due Process violation** under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- **A willful act of judicial defiance** against a controlling federal order

This repetition — *"This is a binding judgment"* — now stands as both a legal sword and evidentiary shield.

Let it be formally preserved in the record that **federal authority was stated, offered, and repeated**—and yet still denied.

XIV. NOTICE OF PRESERVATION – TRANSCRIPT AND AFFIDAVIT TO FOLLOW

Plaintiff-Appellant will be submitting a sworn affidavit of the April 11, 2025 hearing events and a formal transcript request pursuant to federal preservation of the record. These documents will confirm the sequence of federal assertion, obstruction, retaliation, and state-level misconduct now documented herein.

XV. IMPACT BEYOND PLAINTIFF – WARNING AGAINST SYSTEMIC EROSION

The implications of this filing reach beyond the Plaintiff-Appellant. If a federal judgment — entered by this Court under Rule 56(a) — can be defied in open court, mocked as an "opinion," and used as grounds for retaliation, then no litigant is safe.

No precedent is secure. And the structural integrity of appellate review has been undermined at its core.

XVI. CONCLUSION: THIS IS THE LINE

No one — judge, prosecutor, or clerk — is above the **Supremacy Clause**.

"When a state court calls a **federal judgment an 'opinion,'** and treats a **pro se litigant with Rule 56(a) victory as a criminal,** we are no longer in a legal system — **we are in a constitutional crisis."**

This Court must act — or this moment becomes **precedent for federal breakdown.**

Final Closing Assertion – Reaffirmation of Federal Supremacy Against Retaliatory Escalation

Immediately following the announcement by ASA Nate to file a third retaliatory charge — stemming directly from protected federal exhibits and lawful communications already preserved under FRE Rule 408 and Seventh Circuit filings — Plaintiff-Appellant issued the following final statement into the record, with firm and deliberate tone:

"Make sure you send that stuff to me promptly so you can get a firm rebuttal. You **will** be rebutted in everything, and be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law. You are under **federal summary judgment** — and you are aware."

This was not a comment. This was a **formal preservation of federal authority**, spoken directly to an officer of the State of Illinois who had just committed **retaliation under color of law** in full view of the court.

The statement served as:

- A **final verbal notice of supremacy**
- A **trigger warning for federal consequences**
- An **active assertion of Plaintiff's legal dominance and awareness of the enforcement phase**

The **gravity** of this closing moment cannot be understated. The prosecution was directly told — on the record — that their actions would be **rebutted**, **exposed**, and **answered** not by opinion, but by the **full weight of federal law already perfected**.

This moment marks the **full cycle of confrontation between state retaliation and federal supremacy** — and history will judge not merely the filings, but the

fortitude of the Plaintiff-Appellant in defending the Constitution in the face of visible abuse.

The time for comity has ended.

The time for enforcement has arrived.

The dignity of this Court's judgment will not be **mocked, diluted, or disregarded.**

It is not an "opinion." It is the law of the United States.

And no state actor — **no matter how robed or titled** — may override it without consequence.

This Court does not issue suggestions. **It issues law.**

And that law will be upheld — not just in paper, but in practice.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Camarda
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se
Case No. 24-3244
Federal Enforcement Active – Supremacy Invoked – Judgment Perfected

Dated: April 11, 2025