

U.S. CA - 7th Circuit
RECEIVED
APR 16 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com
Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2025 12:46 PM
To: 'CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'; 'civilrights.justice@usdoj.gov'; 'hhsaig@oig.hhs.gov'; 'oeig.general@illinois.gov'; 'information@iadc.org'; 'osc.whistleblower@osc.gov'; 'hfs.mru@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.dcsscaru@illinois.gov'; 'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov'
Cc:
Subject: NOTICE OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY ENFORCEMENT AHEAD OF APRIL 11, 2025 HEARING IN 22ND CIRCUIT
Attachments: DKT114 - A59 - Final Good Faith Proposal - DKT114.pdf; DKT126 - A14 - Emergency Notice Communication Suppression - DKT126.pdf; DKT127 - A15 - Supplemental Notice Enforcement Breach and Compliance Under Duress - DKT127.pdf; DKT128 - A16 - Notice of Delayed Docketing, Preservation Gap, and Standing Notice Regarding Non-Party Actor Michelle Bieber - DKT128.pdf; DKT129 - 2 - Judicial Awareness Addendum Reputational Inflation, Procedural Harm, and Pattern-Based Record Supplement - DKT129.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

NOTICE OF FEDERAL SUPREMACY ENFORCEMENT AHEAD OF APRIL 11, 2025 HEARING IN 22ND CIRCUIT

TO THE HONORABLE CLERK AND PANEL:

Plaintiff-Appellant hereby enters this notice in full preservation of the post-judgment federal record, and in procedural advance of the April 11, 2025 hearing. On **April 11, 2025, at 8:30 AM**, Plaintiff-Appellant will enter a hearing in **McHenry County Circuit Court – 22nd Judicial Circuit, in retaliatory Case No. 24CM000976**, initiated after federal jurisdiction had been seized by this Court and in defiance of its judgment prevailing posture under **Rule 56(a) and FRAP 31(c)**.

RESPECT IS RULE ONE.

Plaintiff-Appellant will extend full courtesy, honor, and dignity to the **22nd Judicial Circuit, its staff, and officers of the court** — and expects that the same respect shall be extended in kind to him, as a **prevailing federal litigant, secured party, and officer of the record**. **Let the record reflect:** respect is not a privilege granted by title; but a standard earned through lawful conduct. Any further deviation from that standard will be addressed accordingly through the proper channels, without malice, but without waiver.

I. PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT ENTERS AS THE ENFORCING PARTY OF THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Let the record show: **This is not a “state case,” nor is it an “underlying matter.”**

This proceeding arises under the lawful authority of the **United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit** and is an active enforcement extension of prevailing judgment in *Camarda v. Whitehorn et al.*, Case No. 24-3244.

Pursuant to:

- **The Supremacy Clause** – U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2
- **28 U.S.C. § 1331** – Federal Question Jurisdiction
- **28 U.S.C. § 1443** – Removal of civil rights actions from state court
- **28 U.S.C. § 1651(a)** – All Writs Act: authority to protect the integrity of federal judgments
- **Rule 56(a), FRCP** – Summary Judgment
- **FRAP 31(c)** – Default and waiver of appellee’s brief
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983** – Redress for constitutional violations under color of law
- **18 U.S.C. § 242** – Criminal liability for deprivation of rights

Plaintiff-Appellant enters the McHenry courtroom not as a criminal defendant, but as a **secured and prevailing federal litigant** and the **sole party with active jurisdictional authority**. He carries the force of summary judgment and the full legal authority of **federal supremacy and constitutional preemption**.

The attempt by Defendants—**Whitehorn, Freese, Gange, et al.**—to now appear as **complainants or prosecutors** constitutes a reversal of party posture and a **fraud upon the court**, as defined in *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944), and an abuse of process under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994).

To describe this case as an “underlying” matter is an affront to the binding structure of federal supremacy. This is not a subordinate or collateral proceeding.

This is **binding federal litigation**, still active in enforcement, and any **mischaracterization of parties, posture, or controlling jurisdiction** violates **Article VI of the Constitution** and **exposes all state actors to immediate civil rights liability**.

This Court's summary judgment, as formalized in **DKT113**, is the operative legal posture. The McHenry matter is fully preempted by:

- **Article VI, Clause 2 (Supremacy Clause)**
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Color of Law Deprivation)**
- **Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 154 (1978)**
- **Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)**

The Plaintiff is the federal enforcer of the binding appellate judgment — He is appearing as the **protector of a federal judgment** — *not as a defendant or the accused*.

II. PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT IS TO PROCEED FIRST — MANDATORY ORDER OF OPERATIONS

Any attempt to disrupt Plaintiff-Appellant's **opening legal remarks, foundational jurisdictional preservation, or the sequence of enforcement**, shall constitute a **due process violation** and be entered into the record for **immediate escalation**.

Let this Court be advised that:

- **No substantive motion** by the State may proceed until **federal jurisdiction is acknowledged**.
- Once **federal jurisdiction is acknowledged**, no substantive motion may proceed **except dismissal with prejudice**.
- Plaintiff will **not be confined to the podium**. As a **pro se federal litigant and secured party prevailing**, Plaintiff is entitled to the full use of the well, and will exercise that right to present evidence, bind the record, and preserve procedural history in real-time.
- Plaintiff reserves the right at all times to **immediately issue federal notice of violations of rights under color of law** (formal and official lawsuit initiation if rights are not observed) pursuant to **18 U.S.C. § 242, 18 U.S.C. § 245 and 42 U.S.C. § 1983**, should any court officer — including **bailiffs, deputies, or clerks** — attempt to obstruct, redirect, or unlawfully restrain Plaintiff's rights.

- Any attempt to enforce, revive, or proceed on a void state charge shall be construed as willful defiance of a perfected federal judgment, and may trigger immediate injunctive or criminal referral actions.
- This Court is on formal notice of record silence and procedural default under FRAP 31(c), and is bound by the Supremacy Clause to treat federal judgment as final and self-executing.
- **Let the record reflect:** Plaintiff is not here as a defendant, but as the **prevailing party in federal litigation, enforcing judgment under color of supremacy** — not subject to adjudication, but enforcing it.
- No courtroom protocol, standing order, or local custom may override federally secured rights. Any such attempt will be immediately memorialized and included in **Plaintiff's federal enforcement log**.
- **All court personnel are advised:** interference with Plaintiff's federally protected enforcement efforts may constitute obstruction under 18 U.S.C. § 1503 or 1512, and shall be treated accordingly.

III. WARNING AGAINST JUDICIAL INTERFERENCE OR SUPPRESSION

Any attempt by **Judge Mary Nader**, court officers, or prosecutorial staff to:

- Suppress the record
- Deny standing
- Restrict physical movement in the well
- **Interrupt legal presentation or attempt to intimidate the Plaintiff in any manner**
- Advance a state prosecution in defiance of federal authority

...shall be entered as **federal obstruction** under:

- 18 U.S.C. § 1503 – Obstruction of Justice
- 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – Witness Retaliation and Tampering
- 28 U.S.C. § 1443 – Federal Civil Rights Removal Jurisdiction
- 18 U.S.C. § 242 – Color of Law Deprivation

All such acts will trigger **preserved remedies** including but not limited to:

- **Immediate federal complaint filings**
- **DOJ and OIG reports**
- **Expanded 42 U.S.C. § 1983 liability**
- **Judicial oversight submission to JIB and AOUSC**

IV. THIS COURT'S AUTHORITY IS ACTIVE AND SUPREME

Pursuant to **DKT113**:

- No Appellee brief was ever filed
- Procedural default has been activated
- Summary judgment is federal law of the case
- Enforcement is now post-judgment and ongoing

The state court's authority is **constitutionally subordinate** to this outcome. The **Supremacy Clause** of Article VI prohibits any conflicting orders, charges, or restraints against a party prevailing in the United States Court of Appeals.

This Court alone holds jurisdiction.

No McHenry court may lawfully proceed, modify, or intrude upon this record.

V. RECORD PRESERVATION

A full post-hearing transcript report, with accompanying analysis, will be filed into this Court's record following **April 11, 2025**. Should obstruction or suppression occur, Plaintiff reserves the right to immediately move for emergency relief under federal authority and to activate contempt, RICO, and injunctive procedures.

This filing is submitted in good faith to maintain the integrity of the Seventh Circuit record and to ensure the Panel is fully informed of the **enforcement posture** in real time.

Compliance (or lack thereof) by the 22nd Judicial Circuit with the **Seventh Circuit's judgment authority** will be observed by the Plaintiff in great detail.

VI. NOTICE OF STANDING, SPECIAL APPEARANCE, AND TREATMENT BY COURT STAFF

Let this Court, and through it the McHenry County Circuit Court, be advised that:

Plaintiff-Appellant Thomas E. Camarda enters under special appearance, not general appearance, as a prevailing federal pro se litigant, with the full legal status of a secured party, and therefore shall not at any point be referred to, treated as, or framed as a "criminal defendant," either in words, tone, posture, or procedure,

Court personnel — including but not limited to **judicial officers, bailiffs, court security, clerks, prosecutors, and administrative agents** — are formally

instructed via this notice to afford **all dignity, respect, and procedural protections** due to an active federal litigant under the following controlling authorities:

Federal Law & U.S. Code Protections:

- 28 U.S.C. § 1654 – *All parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally in all courts of the United States.*
- 28 U.S.C. § 1443 – *Removal jurisdiction in cases interfering with civil rights.*
- 18 U.S.C. § 242 – *Criminal liability for deprivation of rights under color of law.*
- 18 U.S.C. § 1512 – *Protection against witness tampering and retaliation.*
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – *Civil action for deprivation of rights by state actors.*

Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure:

- FRCP Rule 17(a) – *A real party in interest must prosecute the action.*
- FRCP Rule 1 – *Rules shall be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action.*
- FRAP 31(c) – *Failure to file a brief constitutes default and summary judgment.*
- FRCP Rule 60(b)(4) – *Relief from void judgments based on lack of jurisdiction.*

Controlling U.S. Supreme Court and Circuit Case Law:

- *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) – *It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is.*
- *Taylor v. Riojas*, 141 S. Ct. 52 (2020) – *Qualified immunity unavailable when violation is obvious.*
- *Lozman v. Riviera Beach*, 138 S. Ct. 1945 (2018) – *Court filings and speech are protected; retaliation is unconstitutional.*
- *Owen v. City of Independence*, 445 U.S. 622 (1980) – *No immunity for municipalities that violate constitutional rights.*

- **Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232 (1974)** – *State officials are liable when actions are not objectively reasonable.*
- **Franks v. Delaware, 438 U.S. 154 (1978)** – *A proceeding based on false information is void.*

Illinois State Protections and Case Law:

- **735 ILCS 5/1-109** – *All pleadings, motions, and orders made in good faith must be respected as lawfully executed.*
- **People v. Brown, 2020 IL App (1st) 180198** – *Where federal rights are invoked, state courts must yield jurisdiction.*
- **In re M.M., 156 Ill. 2d 53 (1993)** – *Parents have constitutional protections in all state actions involving family law.*

Accordingly, **Plaintiff-Appellant SHALL be addressed as such**, and afforded full federal deference and dignity as a:

- **Pro Se Litigant under 28 U.S.C. § 1654**
- **Prevailing Party under Rule 56(a) and FRAP 31(c)**
- **Enforcing Party of a Binding Judgment**
- **Secured Party with Lawful Standing in Federal Law**

Plaintiff rejects the false narrative that these violations are isolated or procedurally unconnected. From May 2023 through the present, every act taken by McHenry County, HFS, ARDC, and associated agents — from the issuance of unsigned IV-D orders, to retaliatory garnishment, to unlawful criminal prosecution — forms a **single, continuous, and escalating civil rights violation**. These actions are not compartmentalized. They are **structurally interconnected**, thematically consistent, and factually inseparable.

The record reflects this. The judgment confirms it. The system's silence affirms it.

Any attempts to detain, interrupt, mislabel, or constrain Plaintiff-Appellant outside this lawful posture — whether by mischaracterization, physical control, or diminishment of standing — shall result in **immediate federal notice under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, issuance of Color of Law deprivation notice under 18 U.S.C. § 242, 18 U.S.C. § 245, 42 U.S.C. § 1983** which serve as the formal record for **42 U.S.C. § 1983** related violations, and escalation to **federal oversight bodies**, including but not limited to the:

- **U.S. Department of Justice**

- **Office of Inspector General (OIG)**
- **U.S. Marshals Service (Judicial Protection Division)**
- **Illinois Judicial Inquiry Board (JIB)**

Let all personnel be advised:

State actors are bound by federal law to recognize this Court's judgment and extend due respect to the Plaintiff-Appellant as the prevailing party.

This is not merely a hearing. It is the formal continuation of a federal enforcement action. **The dignity of federal authority and supremacy of this Court govern.**

The dignity and legal standing of its prevailing litigant shall be preserved.

VII. CONCLUSION

This Court's **constitutional supremacy** shall not be violated.

No local courtroom, officer, or rogue proceeding may stand against a **judgment of the United States Court of Appeals**. Plaintiff-Appellant will enforce that truth with the full force of law.

VIII. FEDERAL AUDIT COORDINATION & PUBLIC INTEREST

Plaintiff-Appellant also notes for the record that this matter is now under formal review by multiple federal agencies, including the **U.S. Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), U.S. Department of Health & Human Services – Office of Inspector General (OIG)**, in connection with Title IV-D fraud and procedural misconduct across state actors.

The McHenry County proceeding stands as a test case for enforcement integrity under federal supremacy. The outcome of this hearing may affect not only the Plaintiff, but tens of thousands of similarly situated families across the United States.

Accordingly, Plaintiff-Appellant affirms that this hearing constitutes a matter of **public interest and national importance**, and that any suppression, deviation, or misconduct shall be treated as a matter of federal consequence and judicial precedent.

IX. NOTICE OF FUTURE LITIGATION HOLD AND RECORD PRESERVATION DEMAND

Plaintiff-Appellant hereby imposes a **litigation hold** on all materials, communications, transcripts, internal messages, digital entries, and physical records related to Case No. 24CM000976 and any connected federal filings.

Destruction, concealment, or tampering with these records will be treated as spoliation, obstruction, and a willful violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1505 and 1519.

All clerks, prosecutors, and judicial staff are formally instructed to preserve all communication logs, internal memos, calendar entries, and docket history for future subpoena and oversight review.

X. NOTICE OF CONSEQUENCE TO INSURERS, BOND ISSUERS, AND TREASURY OVERSIGHT

Plaintiff-Appellant advises that surety bonds, official liability protections, and public insurance policies attached to state actors may be forfeited in the event of constitutional violations, retaliation, or judicial misconduct.

Formal notice has already been entered into the record with respect to **Elizabeth Whitehorn's surety bond**, and others shall follow as violations are logged.

Treasury oversight and Department of Financial and Professional Regulation (IDFPR) referrals are active and ongoing.

XI. NOTICE OF PROCEDURAL LOCK-IN & COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL

The operative summary judgment entered by this Court under FRAP 31(c) and Rule 56(a) now functions as a **procedural lock-in** — binding all associated parties and barring relitigation of facts, posture, or underlying issues under the doctrine of **collateral estoppel**.

Any attempt to revisit, alter, or undermine the adjudicated record from the federal case will be construed as procedural fraud and subject to emergency writ action under 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a) and immediate injunctive pursuit under the All Writs Act.

XII. CONDITIONAL NOTICE OF PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION & NOTICE OF PERSONAL LIABILITY

Plaintiff-Appellant hereby places all participating parties — including judicial officers, state attorneys, and court personnel — on notice of potential **personal**

liability for any constitutional violations, procedural obstruction, or acts under color of law which result in damages, interference, or further retaliation.

In accordance with **42 U.S.C. § 1983**, and pursuant to **Taylor v. Riojas**, **Scheuer v. Rhodes**, and **Owen v. City of Independence**, qualified immunity shall not shield knowingly unlawful behavior.

A private right of action is now reserved. Any further attempt to suppress, delay, or recharacterize Plaintiff-Appellant's federal posture will be grounds for **civil suit in the district court** with injunctive and monetary relief sought.

XIII. STANDING NOTICE OF REBUTTAL PRECLUSION

Plaintiff-Appellant reserves the procedural and constitutional right to **preclude any late-stage rebuttal** or retroactive framing by the State or its agents due to their prior default, lack of timely response, and failure to appear in the federal forum as required.

Such silence shall be treated as a **constructive admission of liability**, and no after-the-fact narrative or state-level prosecutorial reframing shall be allowed to substitute for lawful participation.

XIV. NOTICE OF MEDIA & OVERSIGHT ESCALATION

Let it be known: should unlawful suppression or defiance of federal authority be observed, Plaintiff-Appellant reserves the right to initiate **media notification, oversight body escalation, and intervention requests to the U.S. Marshals Service and Congressional Oversight Committees**.

This matter now operates at the level of institutional accountability. The next level of scrutiny will not be legal — it will be public.

Let the judiciary understand: Plaintiff is not here seeking a verdict — **the verdict already exists**. He is here to enforce it.

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***

Dated: April 10, 2025