

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

**From:** tcamarda@gmx.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2025 10:50 AM  
**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.dcscscaru@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'; 'R.Freese@mchenrycountyil.gov'  
**Subject:** FORMAL NOTICE OF ONGOING RETALIATION, FEDERAL PROCESS INTERFERENCE, AND LACK OF PROBABLE CAUSE UNDER HARTMAN AND FAIR DEBT COLLECTION ACT (15 U.S.C. § 1692)  
**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

### FORMAL NOTICE OF ONGOING RETALIATION, FEDERAL PROCESS INTERFERENCE, AND LACK OF PROBABLE CAUSE UNDER HARTMAN AND FAIR DEBT COLLECTION ACT (15 U.S.C. § 1692)

TO THE HONORABLE CLERK AND PANEL OF THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT:

#### I. NOTICE OF CONTINUING RETALIATION AND FEDERAL INTERFERENCE

Plaintiff-Appellant hereby provides **formal notice** that the McHenry County State's Attorney's Office continues to act in **open retaliation** for Plaintiff's success in this Court, in defiance of:

- Binding federal summary judgment (DKT113)
- Federal procedural supremacy under FRAP 31(c)
- UCC enforcement authority (DKT19, DKT20)
- First Amendment and FRE 408 protections

Despite repeated warnings and notices (four prior formal communications), **McHenry County continues to prosecute Plaintiff** under a **void warrant** (issued by a family law judge without authority), using:

- **Unlawful discovery** derived from a retaliatory complaint
- **Protected communications** under federal litigation
- **Non-existent probable cause** in violation of *Hartman v. Moore*

## **II. NO PROBABLE CAUSE EXISTS – HARTMAN v. MOORE CONTROLLING**

**“A want of probable cause must be alleged and proven.”**  
— *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 252 (2006)

McHenry County's charge is **textbook retaliatory prosecution** and fails the Hartman test:

- The communications involved were **federally protected**
- The charge arose **after federal filings, UCC enforcement, and summary judgment**
- There is **no independent probable cause** for the accusation — only procedural rage

## **III. VIOLATION OF 15 U.S.C. § 1692 – ABUSIVE COLLECTION PRACTICES**

**“To eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors.”**  
— 15 U.S.C. § 1692(e)

The original incident stems from Plaintiff receiving a **demand for over \$16,000**, and then being:

- Retaliated against for attempting to settle and object via FRE 408
- Prosecuted for exercising UCC rights against debt enforcement actors
- Subjected to criminal proceedings as a form of debt suppression

This is **illegal debt-based retaliation**, completely in violation of § 1692 and Plaintiff's federal rights.

## **IV. PRIOR PRESERVATION CALLS**

Plaintiff-Appellant has now made **four preservation phone calls** to:

**Circuit Records Division**

These calls served to:

- Preserve the federal record
- Notify of active judgment
- Warn of retaliation and retaliation liability
- Remind all parties of the active jurisdiction of the Seventh Circuit

Despite these good-faith efforts, **no course correction has occurred.**

**V. REQUEST FOR DOCKET ENTRY**

Plaintiff respectfully requests the Clerk of this Court **docket this Notice** as:

- A preservation of federal preemption
- A formal entry of ongoing retaliation
- A record of further § 1983 and § 1512 violations
- A supplemental foundation for **injunctive relief** and referral under Rule 22

**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

tcamarda@gmx.com

**From:** tcamarda@gmx.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2025 10:44 AM  
**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.dcs@caru@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'; 'CircuitClerk-MB'; 'statesattorney@mchenrycountyil.gov'; 'RLFreese@mchenrycountyil.gov'  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Formal Transcript Preservation Request – Federal Enforcement Material (April 11, 2025)  
**Importance:** High

**Subject: Formal Transcript Preservation Request – Federal Enforcement Material (April 11, 2025)**

Dear Jenny,

This communication serves as **formal notice** pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2071, Illinois Supreme Court Rule 46, and the U.S. Constitution. The transcript for the hearing on **April 11, 2025**, in McHenry County Case No. 24CM000976 is a material record required for **ongoing federal enforcement proceedings**.

You are instructed to immediately forward the matter to Court Administration at (815) 334-4385 or the assigned court reporter for preparation.

Delaying, concealing, or refusing access to this judicial record constitutes **obstruction** under both **state and federal law**, especially in light of the current **summary judgment** status under Seventh Circuit authority.

Thank you,

Thomas E. Camarda  
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se  
Camarda v. Whitehorn, 7th Cir. Case No. 24-3244

tcamarda@gmx.com

**From:** tcamarda@gmx.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 15, 2025 10:29 AM  
**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'; '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 FILING OBSTRUCTION AND DEMAND FOR CLERK'S CERTIFICATION  
**Attachments:** 27 - EMERGENCY MOTION TO STRIKE UNLAWFUL STATE RESPONSE, ASSERT FEDERAL SUPREMACY, AND DISMISS RETALIATORY PROSECUTION.pdf; 28 - REBUTTLE PEOPLE'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO STRIKE UNLAWFUL WARRANT, DEMAND FULL RECORD OF WARRANT ISSUANCE, AND IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STRIKE UNLAWFUL WARRANT AND DISMISS.pdf  
**Importance:** High

## IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE 22ND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

### MCHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,  
Plaintiff,

v.

**THOMAS E. CAMARDA,**  
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se  
(Special Appearance Only)

**Case No. 24CM000976**

**Hon. Judge Mary Nader**

### NOTICE OF FILING OBSTRUCTION AND DEMAND FOR CLERK'S CERTIFICATION

NOW COMES Defendant, **Thomas E. Camarda**, pro se, and provides formal notice to this Honorable Court that multiple filings—specifically **Motion 27** and **Motion 28**—have been submitted through the i2File system and/or attempted for submission by Defendant, yet:

- **Motion 27** has been uploaded multiple times to the i2File system with **no confirmation, docket entry, or acknowledgment of receipt**;
- **Motion 28** has been repeatedly rejected by the i2File system, with **no explanation provided**, despite being a lawful, case-related filing.

These filings contain:

- Constitutional objections under **federal supremacy**,

- Procedural due process violations,
- And are connected directly to active federal litigation in *Camarda v. Whitehorn*, 7th Cir. Case No. 24-3244.

### **DEMAND FOR CLERK'S CERTIFICATION**

Pursuant to 705 ILCS 105/12 and constitutional due process requirements, Defendant hereby **demands a written certification from the Clerk of Court** stating:

1. Whether **Motion 27** has been received and docketed;
2. Why no receipt or confirmation has been provided;
3. Why **Motion 28** has been rejected or excluded from i2File;
4. What alternative means of submission, if any, are being permitted or acknowledged for record entry.

The Defendant has made good faith efforts to comply with court rules and has a federal right to have his filings **entered on the record without obstruction, suppression, or silent denial.**

Failure to address this notice may constitute further due process violations, and this matter may be escalated to:

- The Illinois Judicial Inquiry Board,
- The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts,
- Or federal oversight bodies as required.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Thomas E. Camarda, Pro Se**

Prevailing Federal Appellant, *Camarda v. Whitehorn*, 7th Cir. No. 24-3244

tcamarda@gmx.com

(224) 279-8856

**Dated:** April 15, 2025