

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2025 1:42 PM
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'; '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'; 'usain.civilrights@usdoj.gov'; 'AO_Ombudsman@ao.uscourts.gov'; 'usms.judicial.protection@usdoj.gov'; 'inspector.general@usdoj.gov'; 'tips@oig.hhs.gov'; 'crt.intake@usdoj.gov'; 'watchdog@pogo.org'
Cc: 'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov'
Subject: FINAL NOTICE OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY, EN BANC BARRING, AND PRECLUSION OF STATE RETALIATION
Attachments: Proof of Delivery.pdf; Request for Admissions 10-07-2024.pdf; Rule 216.pdf; Summary of Legal Grounds.pdf; Timeline of Notices.pdf; proof-of-service-Lizzy.pdf; proof-of-service-Alexi.pdf; A55 - NOTICE OF RECORD CORRECTION AND ADDENDUM TO EN BANC PETITION.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

FINAL NOTICE OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY, EN BANC BARRING, AND PRECLUSION OF STATE RETALIATION

Filed in Furtherance of DKT113–114, DKT145–146, and Pending En Banc Review

To the Seventh Circuit Clerk, all named Defendants-Appellees, and all officers of the 22nd Judicial Circuit, McHenry County:

This notice formally incorporates the full weight of the **federal record, perfected procedural posture, constitutional enforcement, and judicial obligations now in effect**, and is submitted with express intent to preclude any further **unlawful, duplicative, or retaliatory action** under the **Supremacy Clause**, **Rule 56(a)**, and **FRAP 31(c)**.

I. FEDERAL JUDGMENT IS PERFECTED — RECORD CLOSED — EN BANC PENDING

As of this filing:

- The federal appeal in **Camarda v. Whitehorn, 7th Cir. 24-3244** reached **summary judgment by operation of law** under:
 - **FRAP 31(c)** (Unanswered Appellate Brief)
 - **Rule 56(a)** (No genuine dispute of material fact)
 - **DKT113–114** (Judicial acknowledgment and uncontested final proposal)
- The **Court has since docketed over 35 post-judgment filings**, including:
 - Verified UCC enforcement notices
 - FOIA defaults confirming lack of lawful bonding or authority
 - Emergency motions documenting state retaliation under **§ 1983, § 242, § 1512**
 - DKT145–146 outlining systemic judicial obstruction and ongoing misconduct
- **En Banc Petition has been formally filed**, placing the entire panel under active review and rendering the matter **further preclusive and consolidated** under internal Rule 35(a).
- **Notice of Intent to Petition for Writ of Certiorari** to the U.S. Supreme Court has also been issued, providing a direct channel for constitutional escalation if necessary.

II. MCHENRY COUNTY'S ACTIONS REMAIN VOID — NOW EXPRESSLY PREEMPTED

Despite the uncontested nature of the federal judgment, **state officials have unlawfully continued to:**

- Advance a **retaliatory prosecution** stemming from protected First Amendment petitioning activity
- Assert jurisdiction on a **void warrant**, issued by a **non-criminal division judge** with no reassignment
- Ignore or suppress all motions filed under **Special Appearance Only**
- Tamper with court records, block i2File uploads, and interfere with lawful filings (see DKT142)

- Attempt to criminalize litigation speech protected by **FRE 408, the First Amendment, and UCC Article 9**

These acts are **jurisdictionally null, procedurally overruled**, and now preempted by:

- **En Banc Review under FRAP 35**
- **Supremacy Clause enforcement under Article VI**
- **Filing of Certiorari Intent under Rule 13, U.S. Supreme Court**

III. LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF CONTINUED STATE DEFIANCE

Any further action by the State of Illinois, McHenry County, or its agents shall now constitute:

- **Willful interference with the jurisdiction of a federal appellate court**
- **Obstruction of constitutional redress under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**
- **Federal criminal exposure under:**
 - **18 U.S.C. § 242 – Deprivation of rights under color of law**
 - **18 U.S.C. § 1512(b) – Witness and litigation retaliation**
 - **15 U.S.C. § 1692 – Unlawful debt collection and abuse of process**

These violations are **active** as of April 17, 2025, and all officers with notice will be held **personally liable** under:

- **U.S. Const. Amend. I, IV, V, VI, XIV**
- **Article VI (Federal Supremacy)**
- **UCC § 9-601, § 9-609, § 9-625**

IV. DEMAND FOR VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWAL & FINAL COMPLIANCE

Accordingly, Plaintiff-Appellant demands:

1. Immediate withdrawal of all McHenry County charges and proceedings, which are now:
 - **Retaliatory**

- **Procedurally barred**
 - **Constitutionally preempted**
2. Full acknowledgment from all state officers that the **federal judgment is binding and active**, and that no jurisdiction exists to prosecute further.
 3. A halt to all interference with filings, access to court systems, or transcript suppression — all such obstruction is now subject to **federal investigation and sanctions**.

V. YESTERDAY'S NONPRECEDENTIAL RULING DOES NOT VACATE OR SUPERSEDE SUMMARY JUDGMENT

It must be clarified on the record:

The Seventh Circuit's April 16, 2025, nonprecedential ruling (DKT140) does **not nullify, vacate, or modify** the perfected summary judgment entered through DKT113–114 under **Rule 56(a)** and **FRAP 31(c)**. The ruling is:

- **Nonprecedential** (see Fed. R. App. P. 32.1),
- Issued **without oral argument** or participation from Appellees (who remain in procedural default),
- And addresses subject matter jurisdiction in a generalized manner based on a **misread** of the relief sought.

Key Clarifications:

- Mr. Camarda **did not** seek to modify a child support order.
- The relief sought included:
 - Redress for **illegal seizures without hearing**,
 - Protection against **retaliatory prosecution**,
 - Enforcement of **commercial lien rights** under UCC,
 - And a final cessation of debt-based retaliation under **15 U.S.C. § 1692**.

These are **federal claims**, not “domestic relations.”

The panel failed to distinguish between **core domestic jurisdiction** and federal constitutional torts under **42 U.S.C. § 1983**, as clearly laid out in **Elgin v. Dept. of**

Treasury, 567 U.S. 1 (2012) and Haywood v. Drown, 556 U.S. 729 (2009). This is now subject to correction under En Banc Review and, if necessary, a Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

Until such time, the only lawful judgment remains that entered via **DKT113-114**. No rehearing, no vacatur, and no mandate to undo it has been issued.

VI. THIS CASE HIGHLIGHTS A SYSTEMIC FAILURE IN LOCAL LEGAL EDUCATION AND FEDERAL LITERACY

THE PLAINTIFF PROCEEDED PRO SE BECAUSE LOCAL ATTORNEYS WERE MORE CONCERNED WITH HIS WALLET THAN WITH JUSTICE.

Plaintiff has spent over seven months litigating in federal court, navigating constitutional procedure, federal supremacy doctrines, and civil rights enforcement. He can discern when attorneys are misleading him — and it became clear that many local practitioners lacked both the integrity and the federal competence required to protect his rights.

Legally and procedurally speaking, Plaintiff is now more capable than the local counsel who continue to violate his rights under color of law.

He stands not only as a litigant — but as a constitutional claimant, secured party, and federal enforcer of judgment. That is why he acts pro se: because no one else was willing or able to do the job with the required courage, clarity, and commitment to law.

This entire episode is a case study in what happens when local prosecutors, judges, and state attorneys act without sufficient training in federal procedure and constitutional law.

The procedural events — from McHenry County's unlawful warrant, to their retaliatory prosecution of a federal litigant, to their failure to recognize summary judgment — illustrate an alarming **disconnection from national legal standards**. It is evident that:

- Illinois legal actors remain unfamiliar with:
 - The **Supremacy Clause**,
 - Appellate procedure (FRAP),
 - Commercial lien enforcement (UCC Article 9),
 - And protected petitioning under the **First Amendment**.

- There has been no meaningful engagement with:
 - **Due process standards** under *Mathews v. Eldridge*,
 - **Civil rights enforcement** under *Monroe v. Pape* and *Hartman v. Moore*,
 - Nor any recognition of private redress frameworks supported under Bivens doctrine and § 1983.

Federal law is **not optional**.

This case should serve as a wake-up call for law schools, bar associations, and continuing legal education (CLE) providers across Illinois — and especially in McHenry County — to update their understanding of the modern constitutional framework. America is not defined by Illinois courts. The rule of law begins at the **federal level**, and all state actors are bound to it.

VII. RECORD NOTICE

This filing shall serve as **final pre-litigation notice to all individuals and agencies** continuing to defy federal supremacy.

- Any officer, judge, clerk, or prosecutor who continues to advance this now-void state prosecution will be held **individually liable**, and subject to federal investigation, formal complaint, and private right of action.
- No immunity shall apply under the **Qualified Immunity Doctrine**, as this record clearly establishes:
 - **Retaliation post-federal filing**
 - **Federal constitutional violations**
 - **Binding notices docketed across both court systems**

Any further defiance of federal supremacy, constitutional protections, or the perfected summary judgment already entered will not merely be error — it will be willful violation of clearly established federal law, exposing all participating parties to personal liability, judicial sanction, and eventual review by the highest court in the land. The line has been crossed — any further step is trespass into unlawful territory.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Camarda

Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

Federal Judgment Creditor – Rule 56(a) Summary Judgment Perfected

Constitutional Litigant under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 | UCC Secured Party | First Amendment Actor

All rights reserved, including without limitation under:

UCC §§ 1-308, 1-103.6, Article 9, and applicable federal common law

Dated: April 17, 2025