

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From:

tcamarda@gmx.com

Sent:

Wednesday, April 16, 2025 12:08 PM

To:

'CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'

Subject:

NOTICE OF INTENT TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Importance:

High

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH
CIRCUIT**

THOMAS E. CAMARDA,
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se,
(Secured Party Creditor, Federal Enforcement Status Active)

v.

ELIZABETH M. WHITEHORN, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Case No. **24-3244****NOTICE OF INTENT TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT**

COMES NOW Plaintiff-Appellant **Thomas E. Camarda**, Pro Se, and pursuant to U.S. Const. art. VI, Sup. Ct. R. 13.1, and 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1), hereby **notifies this Court and the Clerk of the intent to file a Petition for Writ of Certiorari** before the **Supreme Court of the United States**, arising from this Court's April 16, 2025 nonprecedential ruling and prior refusal to enforce the constitutional supremacy of federal rights asserted in the above-captioned matter.

This notice is submitted to preserve formal jurisdictional posture, prevent further judicial evasion, and alert all reviewing authorities that the Plaintiff-Appellant has invoked and will continue to invoke **binding federal supremacy, First Amendment protections, and due process guarantees** that this Court has now defied by omission.

I. BASIS FOR SUPREME COURT REVIEW

This case arises from a perfected federal constitutional action that:

- Was properly filed under **42 U.S.C. § 1983** against named state actors in their individual capacities;
- Invoked federal claims of:

- **First Amendment retaliation**
- **Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment due process violations**
- **Unlawful seizure and deprivation under color of law (18 U.S.C. § 242)**
- **Procedural retaliation under 18 U.S.C. § 1512**
- **Violation of commercial enforcement protections under UCC § 9-601-625**
- **Protected litigation communication under FRE 408**
- Resulted in procedural default by the Appellees under **FRAP 31(c)** and a perfected summary judgment posture under **Rule 56(a)**
- Triggered illegal state-level retaliation during active federal enforcement

The Court's April 16, 2025 ruling — issued without oral argument and without engagement with the procedural posture of **federal default, perfected enforcement, or retaliatory prosecution based on protected litigation** — violates core constitutional doctrine and introduces a dangerous precedent of judicial non-engagement with due process enforcement.

II. SUPREMACY CLAUSE VIOLATIONS AND RETALIATORY CONTINUANCE

This Court's ruling:

- Cites **Friedlander v. Friedlander**, 149 F.3d 739 (7th Cir. 1998) and **Struck v. Cook Cnty. Pub. Guardian**, 508 F.3d 858 (7th Cir. 2007) to bar jurisdiction under the so-called “domestic relations exception,” despite the case involving no request to modify child support, but rather seeking **federal damages and injunctive relief for unlawful seizure, void administrative orders, and due process violations**
- Fails to apply **Lozman v. Riviera Beach**, 138 S. Ct. 1945 (2018), which forbids prosecution for protected litigation activity, or **Hartman v. Moore**, 547 U.S. 250 (2006), which requires dismissal where prosecution lacks probable cause and is motivated by retaliation
- Contradicts **Ankenbrandt v. Richards**, 504 U.S. 689 (1992), which explicitly preserves § 1983 actions arising from state enforcement abuse, even in child support contexts

- Ignores the procedural consequences of **federal default**, an un rebutted **Rule 56(a)** motion, and federal enforcement filings made under active lien protection and UCC jurisdiction

The Court has effectively insulated unlawful state behavior — including the filing of **criminal charges in retaliation for federal litigation** — by misclassifying the claim and declining to engage with binding procedural and constitutional authority.

III. IMPENDING PETITION AND PRESERVATION OF FEDERAL RIGHTS

Petitioner fully intends to submit a **Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States** pursuant to:

- **Supreme Court Rule 13.1** (90-day window following final judgment)
- **28 U.S.C. § 1254(1)** (review of cases by writ from courts of appeals)
- **U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2** (Supremacy Clause)
- **U.S. Const. amend. I, IV, V, XIV** (civil rights basis of retaliation and deprivation claims)
- **Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 56(a), Rule 60(d), and Rule 8**
- **Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 31(c)** (procedural default)

The federal record — exceeding **1,900 pages** — contains conclusive evidence of:

- **A void warrant** (Bruner, Franks, 28 U.S.C. § 1691)
- **Procedurally uncontested federal judgment**
- **An ongoing state prosecution designed solely to retaliate for federal enforcement**
- **Abuse of administrative authority through fabricated debt, void child support orders, and sealed financial levies without due process**

The Court's failure to address any of these substantive issues, and instead reduce the case to “domestic relations,” is a **judicial dereliction of federal supremacy**.

IV. DEMAND FOR HISTORICAL RECORD ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Let this record reflect:

- Plaintiff-Appellant **did not lose this case** — he was ignored.

- The federal judiciary was put on notice of constitutional violations and **refused to rule on them.**
- The next phase — before the **Supreme Court of the United States** — will expose this breakdown for what it is: **a systemic evasion of federal duty to protect litigants from state retaliation.**

V. CONCLUSION

This notice serves to formally advise the Court and all judicial personnel that **no ruling will go unanswered**, and that **failure to address federal retaliation, procedural perfection, and ongoing constitutional harm** will be appealed to the highest court in the land.

Let the record be corrected by force of law — or by the voice of the people through higher review.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas E. Camarda

Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

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

Email: tcamarda@gmx.com

Phone: (224) 279-8856

Dated: April 16, 2025