

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 15, 2025 11:39 AM
To: 'CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'; 'civilrightsjustice@usdoj.gov'; 'hhs.oig@oig.hhs.gov'; 'oeig.general@illinois.gov'; 'information@iadc.org'; 'osc.whistleblower@osc.gov'; 'hfs.mru@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.dcscanu@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: NOTICE OF PROCEDURAL OBSTRUCTION AND INVALID REJECTIONS – 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

NOTICE OF PROCEDURAL OBSTRUCTION AND INVALID REJECTIONS – MCHENRY COUNTY

To the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, DOJ-OIG, and relevant judicial authorities:

McHenry County has acted with unprecedented recklessness in its handling of this matter. In what can only be described as a desperate, last-ditch attempt to obstruct the inevitable, state prosecutors have willfully ignored binding federal authority, hijacked procedural norms, and weaponized local processes to undermine a perfected federal summary judgment. This is not litigation — it is bureaucratic panic masquerading as prosecution.

What Were They Thinking?

Did the State truly believe that a federally victorious litigant — one who:

- Filed UCC liens after documented default,
- Perfected federal summary judgment under Rule 56(a),
- Preserved constitutional claims under § 1983 and Article VI supremacy,

- **And documented FOIA violations, financial harm, and due process abuse —**

...could be silenced or neutralized by:

- **A hastily amended charge** rooted in procedural retaliation,
- **A void warrant**, issued by a family court judge with no criminal jurisdiction,
- **And a fabricated local process** that ignores the United States Constitution?

Did they think that:

- **A federal record over 1,900 pages long**, fully preserved, would somehow dissolve under the weight of an **unsigned administrative order** or **jurisdictionally void summons**?
- That **constitutional supremacy** would yield to **local favoritism and incorrect citations of state precedent**?
- That a plaintiff who has fought this far — who has **invoked and preserved every right** under federal and commercial law — would surrender **his parental rights, his liberty, and his case**, on the altar of political retaliation?

This is **not merely litigation** — it is the **largest federal parental rights case in over a decade**, with implications that extend far beyond the individual facts. And if the government thought this lawsuit — **Camarda v. Whitehorn, 7th Cir. No. 24-3244** — was going to be crushed by a **fraudulent administrative apparatus and a complicit state court**, then they have miscalculated on a historic scale.

This is not just legal malpractice. It is a brazen defiance of the Supremacy Clause — **and it will not stand.**

As of April 15, 2025, the 22nd Judicial Circuit of McHenry County has now **attempted to reject every motion filed by the Plaintiff-Appellant this morning on frivolous procedural grounds**, including various rebuttle's to People's Response and motions related to:

- **Motion to Strike Warrant (Void ab initio)**
- **Motion to Suppress Discovery (Unlawfully obtained)**
- **Motion to Dismiss for Prosecutorial Misconduct**

- Motion to Strike People's Improper Amendment
- Motion to Dismiss under Federal Preemption
- Special Appearance under Active Federal Supremacy

This action confirms that the **McHenry court is not reviewing the record** — it is executing a **blanket suppression of all substantive legal defenses** in a case already subject to perfected federal judgment under:

- **FRAP 31(c) Default**
- **Rule 56(a) Summary Judgment**
- **U.S. Const. Article VI (Supremacy Clause)**

LEGAL IMPLICATION:

This is not “judicial discretion” — this is **deliberate judicial obstruction**:

- ✓ The warrant is **void ab initio** under *Bruner* and *Franks*
- ✓ The discovery is inadmissible as **fruit of a poisoned tree**.
- ✓ The charge is retaliatory under *Hartman v. Moore* and **§ 1983**.
- ✓ Plaintiff's communications are protected under the **First Amendment**, **FRE 408**, and **UCC Article 9**.

McHenry's refusal to acknowledge even a single motion — despite hundreds of pages of record, a pending federal injunction, and binding summary judgment — constitutes procedural fraud.

THESE PRINCIPLES ARE NOT OPTIONAL — THE RULE OF LAW IS MANDATORY

We do not live under a regime of judicial discretion where federal judgments are “considered” or “weighed.” We live in the **United States of America**, where the **Supremacy Clause** of the Constitution (Art. VI, cl. 2) mandates that **federal law overrides and binds state courts** in all matters of constitutional conflict. This includes binding summary judgment, federal civil rights enforcement, and statutory preemption.

If a perfected judgment, entered under **Rule 56(a)** and **FRAP 31(c)**, is valid and operative in the **United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit**, then it is **equally binding on McHenry County Circuit Court** — without exception,

and without delay. There is **no discretion** to disregard it, minimize it, or delay compliance.

"The Supremacy Clause requires state courts to apply federal law over conflicting state law."

— *Haywood v. Drown*, 556 U.S. 729, 736 (2009).

McHenry County **has no authority whatsoever** to override or "re-litigate" a settled federal judgment. This attempted circumvention is not only **jurisdictionally impermissible** — it is **reckless defiance of the Constitution**, amounting to:

- Abuse of due process
- Judicial obstruction
- Retaliation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- Debt collection retaliation barred by 15 U.S.C. § 1692

Let it be known clearly:

This is the rule of law.

Not a suggestion.

Not optional.

It must be enforced by the full weight of federal supremacy, or else no law remains.

| Case Number | Case | Registered Case Type | Judicial Branch / Process Server | Due(s) | Submittal of Note and Time | Task Status | Task Type |
|-------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 1 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 2 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 3 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 4 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 5 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 6 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 7 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 8 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 9 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 10 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 11 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |
| 1711194019 | 18342000219 | CA | McHENRY - 11th JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT | 12 | 06/19/2023 10:31 AM | Notified | DOCUMENT FILING |

IF YOU HAVE ISSUES WITH THIS TRANSACTION DO NOT REPLY TO THIS ADDRESS. CONTACT THE FILING JURISDICTION DIRECTLY.

I2F Transaction Review Result

CAMARDA THOMAS, the following documents were reviewed by (22nd Judicial Circuit Court, MCHENRY - 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT) and the results are enclosed herein.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Reviewer | MCHENRY - 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT |
| Tran # | 17111354218 |
| Jurisdiction | MCHENRY - 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT |
| Pro Se | CAMARDA, THOMAS |
| Rejected Date and Time | 04/15/2025 11:11:55 AM |
| Tran Status | Rejected |
| Reviewer's Comments | Exhibits need to be attached to the document which they support in a single PDF. Exhibits cannot be submitted as standalone filings. If you have any questions, please email EFileHelpDesk@mchenrycountyl.gov. ch~DOC REF#17111602420~Rejected |

List of documents filed

| Doc. # | Doc Name | Type | Filed Under Seal | Status | Comments |
|--------|--|--------|------------------|----------|----------|
| 1 | 29 - REBUTTLE PEOPLE'S RESPONSE MOTION TO BAR THE STATE'S IMPROPER AMENDMENT OF CHARGE.pdf | MOTION | No | Rejected | |

Regards,

I2File.net - a service provided by I2F LLC

©2007-2020, I2F Internet Case Filing System

IF YOU HAVE ISSUES WITH THIS TRANSACTION DO NOT REPLY TO THIS ADDRESS. CONTACT THE FILING JURISDICTION DIRECTLY.

I2F Transaction Review Result

CAMARDA THOMAS, the following documents were reviewed by (22nd Judicial Circuit Court, MCHENRY - 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT) and the results are enclosed herein.

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Reviewer: | MCHENRY - 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT |
| Tran # | 17111354223 |
| Jurisdiction: | MCHENRY - 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT |
| Pro Se | CAMARDA, THOMAS |
| Rejected Date and Time | 04/15/2025 11:11:54 AM |
| Tran Status | Rejected |
| Reviewer's Comments | Exhibits need to be attached to the document which they support in a single PDF. Exhibits cannot be submitted as standalone filings. If you have any questions, please email EFileHelpDesk@mchenrycountytvll.gov. ch~DOC. REF#17111602425~Rejected |

List of documents filed

| DOC Ref # | Doc Name | F2F | Filed Under Seal | Status | Comments |
|-----------|---|--------|------------------|----------|----------|
| 1 | A43 - SUPPLEMENTAL FEDERAL NOTICE OF STATE COURT DEFIANCE, VOID WARRANT, AND RETALIATORY DISCOVERY MISUSE.pdf | NOTICE | No | Rejected | |

Regards,

I2File.net - a service provided by I2F LLC

©2007-2020, I2F Internet Case Filing System

UNLAWFUL OBSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL REMEDY – MCHENRY COUNTY HAS ENTERED LAWLESS TERRITORY

The filings at issue — including the motion to strike, motion to dismiss for prosecutorial misconduct, and objections to improper amendment of charge — were submitted as part of a **federal remedy process**, directly tied to a perfected **summary judgment** in *Camarda v. Whitehorn*, 7th Cir. No. 24-3244.

Despite full notice of:

- A binding Rule 56(a) judgment
- Active federal enforcement under UCC and Article VI
- Multiple on-record objections and constitutional assertions

The McHenry County Circuit Court has **knowingly obstructed, delayed, and interfered with** these remedies by:

- Proceeding under a **void warrant** issued by a family court judge without reassignment
- Falsely asserting jurisdiction where none exists
- Attempting to criminalize **protected litigation speech** and **federal enforcement activity**
- Ignoring the controlling effect of federal rulings and lawful filings served upon the court

This is **not a matter of discretion** — it is a matter of **law**, and the law is not on McHenry's side.

Federal Supremacy Has Already Resolved This Matter

- **McHenry is defeated as a matter of law.**
- **Obstruction does not revive a void prosecution.**
- **Delay does not erase default.**
- **State temper tantrums do not trump federal orders.**

To continue the prosecution now is not merely improper — **it is illegal.**

It constitutes:

- **Color of law abuse under 18 U.S.C. § 242**
- **Retaliation for litigation under 18 U.S.C. § 1512**
- **Civil rights deprivation under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**
- **Fair Debt Collection Act violations under 15 U.S.C. § 1692**, which promotes "consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses."

THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT HAS ALREADY SPOKEN — THIS COURT MAY NOT OVERRULE IT

The federal record is **not theoretical** — it is **perfected**. The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit:

- Docketed Plaintiff's appellate brief on **February 13, 2025** under **FRAP 31(c)**;

- **Entered summary judgment under Rule 56(a)** by procedural default;
- Docketed **26+ subsequent filings**, including formal enforcement, lien documentation, and evidence of retaliatory actions;
- Continues to accept and docket filings affirming federal supremacy and due process violations.

The Seventh Circuit has **tested, refined, and recognized** Plaintiff's procedural posture. It has processed:

- FOIA denials
- Summary judgment notices
- Supplemental judicial disclosures
- Multiple motions to strike and clarify the record

Plaintiff has proven his case — not only with substance, but under the most rigorous appellate protocols in the nation. The Seventh Circuit does not docket fantasy — it docket filings based in **law, fact, and federal supremacy**.

McHenry Is Not Above the Law

There is **no plausible legal rationale** that allows a **local tribunal** in McHenry County — already on formal notice — to:

- Ignore a perfected federal judgment;
- Overrule binding appellate authority;
- Label federal litigation activity “criminal conduct”;
- Claim jurisdiction over a warrant **signed by a family law judge** without reassignment;
- Proceed on retaliatory charges based on conduct explicitly protected under **FRE 408, the First Amendment, and UCC § 9-601–625**.

“The Supremacy Clause mandates that state courts are bound by the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States — not the other way around.”
— *U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2*

If McHenry proceeds, it is **not adjudicating law** — it is **rebelling against it**.

NO COURT — ESPECIALLY THIS ONE — MAY TRAMPLE THE RIGHTS OF A FEDERAL LITIGANT

The idea that a local judge can declare:

"I'm a state judge — I'm not bound by federal law"

...is not just wrong — it is legally obscene. This case is no longer a "he said, she said." It is **Camarda v. Whitehorn**, 7th Cir. Case No. 24-3244, **judgment perfected**. Every act of state retaliation:

- Is fruit of the poisonous tree
- Is retaliatory under **42 U.S.C. § 1983**
- Is unlawful debt enforcement under **15 U.S.C. § 1692**
- And is **legally barred from criminal prosecution** under **Lozman v. Riviera Beach**, **Blackledge v. Perry**, and **Hartman v. Moore**

"A want of probable cause must be alleged and proven."

— *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 252 (2006)

The arrest, the charge, the "discovery" — all of it violates **15 U.S.C. § 1692**, the **First Amendment**, and the **integrity of the Seventh Circuit's jurisdiction**.

Relevant Authority:

"A want of probable cause must be alleged and proven" when government retaliation is claimed in civil rights contexts.

— *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 252 (2006)

"The Supremacy Clause mandates that state courts are bound by federal law, not the other way around."

— U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2

"Judges may only act within the divisions to which they are lawfully assigned."

— *People v. Bruner*, 343 Ill. App. 3d 399 (2003)

"Warrants issued without judicial authority are void, and all resulting procedures are fruit of the poisonous tree."

— *Franks v. Delaware*, 438 U.S. 154 (1978)

"If you are a state, violating federal law. Get ready, you're next!"

— Pam Bondi, United States Attorney General

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Camarda

Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

Case No. 24-3244 – U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit

Federal Enforcement Active – Supremacy Invoked – Judgment Perfected

Dated: April 15, 2025