

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2025 10:20 AM
To: 'CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'
Subject: SUPPLEMENTAL ENFORCEMENT NOTICE REGARDING UNLAWFUL DENIAL OF EMERGENCY STATUTORY EXEMPTION MOTION – MAY 2024 INCIDENT IN COOK COUNTY (ZOOM HEARING)
Attachments: Emergency_Motion.pdf
Importance: High

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

THOMAS E. CAMARDA,
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

v.

ELIZABETH WHITEHORN, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

**SUPPLEMENTAL ENFORCEMENT NOTICE REGARDING UNLAWFUL
DENIAL OF EMERGENCY STATUTORY EXEMPTION MOTION – MAY 2024
INCIDENT IN COOK COUNTY (ZOOM HEARING)**

To the Clerk of the Court, Panel Judges, and All Relevant Authorities:

Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully submits this supplemental enforcement notice to clarify the factual and procedural record regarding a key incident that occurred in **May 2024**, which **predates the filing of the federal appeal** but directly supports Plaintiff's current constitutional, procedural, and equitable claims now under *en banc* review.

**I. APRIL 2024 – EMERGENCY MOTION TO CLAIM STATUTORY
EXEMPTION WAS STRUCK WITHOUT HEARING**

In **May 2024**, following the illegal seizure of \$7,924 (On April 29, 2024) from Plaintiff's bank account without prior notice, court order, or opportunity to be heard, Plaintiff filed an **Emergency Motion to Claim Statutory Exemption** under:

- **735 ILCS 5/12-1001(b)** and **5/12-1006** – Illinois personal and income protections;
- **42 U.S.C. § 407(a)** – Federal exemption for protected income sources;
- Standardized Illinois **Supreme Court-approved forms**.

This filing, submitted via i2File, was **automatically served upon the parties**, including relevant state officials, as per procedural rules.

A Title IV-D administrator, without any hearing or valid order, summarily **struck the motion**, offering no legal basis and providing no opportunity to present evidence. At no point was Plaintiff permitted to invoke his statutory exemptions, which included:

- Federal protections for wages and property,
- Lack of underlying lawful court judgment,
- No due process under the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments.

II. WHY THIS MATTERS --EARLY INDICATOR OF THE SYSTEMIC RETALIATION THAT FOLLOWED

Though this event predates the federal appeal (*Camarda v. Whitehorn* was initiated on **November 15, 2024**), it serves as a **critical foundation** for the current record because:

- It marked the **first documented violation of Plaintiff's exemption rights** under state and federal law;
- It set in motion the financial collapse and deprivation detailed throughout the record;
- It showed early-onset procedural suppression in retaliation for Plaintiff asserting his rights;
- And it **correlates directly** to Plaintiff's documented FOIA requests and due process challenges from **August–November 2024**, as now docketed in the Seventh Circuit.

III. RELEVANCE TO FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT – PATTERN ESTABLISHED

This April 2024 levy and suppression form part of a **larger continuum of misconduct**, including:

- **Repeated unconstitutional levies and garnishments** documented in DKT58, DKT113, and supporting affidavits;
- **The loss of employment, business opportunities**, and unlawful targeting of Plaintiff's litigation activity;

- And the **retaliatory prosecution** currently pending in McHenry County (*People v. Camarda*, 24CM000976), which evolved directly from the same institutional actors and enforcement chain.

This incident was not an outlier — it was the **beginning of a now-proven federal tort sequence**.

IV. JUDICIAL MISREPRESENTATION AND PLAINTIFF'S REASONABLE APPREHENSION OF ABUSE

During the ~~April 2024~~ ^{May 2024} hearing on Plaintiff's Emergency Motion to Claim Statutory Exemption, **the administrator** engaged in procedurally improper conduct that must now be corrected for the record.

Despite the i2File system confirming automatic service to the opposing parties — who were also the initiating Plaintiffs in the case and had designated the matter for **email-based service** — the Title IV-D administrator **falsely suggested or implied that they had not been served**, thereby justifying a summary strike of the motion.

(Seemingly a common theme of procedural fraud in court these days with *pro se litigants* and I for one am tired of it. **Service is service, default is default, due process is not optional**)

This assertion was factually incorrect and procedurally impossible:

- The opposing parties initiated the enforcement and had already executed the levy;
- They had expressly consented to service via the i2File system;
- The system had generated **automated service receipts** to those parties;
- The case was already in **active collection** mode — indicating full awareness and participation by the opposing parties.

Despite all this, **the Title IV-D administrator struck the Emergency Motion without hearing**, denied Plaintiff the opportunity to argue or present his rights under state and federal law, and then arbitrarily **placed the case back "off call"** — effectively sweeping the unlawful seizure under the rug.

At the time, Plaintiff did not press further during the hearing, due to a **genuine and well-founded fear of further abuse or retaliatory conduct by the Court**. This chilling effect on Plaintiff's willingness to assert his legal rights forms part of

the emotional and procedural damage now detailed in the Victim Impact Statement already docketed.

This behavior constitutes:

- A **misrepresentation of service status** to justify a procedural denial;
- A **violation of Plaintiffs due process rights**;
- And the **early exercise of judicial overreach** under color of law — long before the retaliatory criminal charge and federal litigation that followed.

This filing serves to formally correct that portion of the record and place all parties on notice that **this abuse is now part of the federal enforcement narrative**, with all rights reserved for future redress.

V. NOTICE TO PANEL – RECORD IS ENTIRELY CONSISTENT, UNREBUTTED, AND SUPPORTS FINAL RELIEF

Plaintiff-Appellant requests that the Court formally recognize:

- This ^{May 2024}~~April 2024~~ motion and denial as a **precursor to the federal litigation**, and
- That this incident further validates the **constitutional, procedural, and commercial enforcement arguments** currently under *en banc* consideration.

This notice is submitted for record clarity and enforcement accuracy.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Thomas E. Camarda

Thomas E. Camarda

Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

Prevailing Party under FRAP 31(c) Default

Summary Judgment Perfected under Rule 56(a)

Enforcement Phase Active – U.S. Const. art. VI (Supremacy Invoked)

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

tcamarda@gmx.com

(224) 279-8856

Dated: April 18, 2025

Filed in support of: DKT113, DKT114, DKT146

STATE OF ILLINOIS, CIRCUIT COURT Cook COUNTY	EMERGENCY MOTION TO CLAIM EXEMPTION	<i>For Court Use Only</i> 2022D051802 Case Number
Instructions ▼ Enter above the county name where the <i>Citation to Discover Assets to Debtor's Bank</i> was filed. Fill in the rest of the information by copying it from the <i>Citation</i> .	Michelle Bieber Plaintiff (<i>First, middle, last name</i>) v. Thomas Camarda Defendant (<i>First, middle, last name</i>) Chase Bank Respondent (<i>Bank's name</i>)	

In 2, enter the name of your bank.

In 3, check all that apply.

1. I am the debtor.
2. My accounts at Chase Bank have been frozen.
Name of bank
3. My accounts contain money from the following sources: (*check all that apply*)
 - ☐ Social Security, SSI benefits, and disability
 - ☐ Pension and retirement benefits and refunds
 - ☐ Public assistance benefits
 - ☐ Child support
 - ☐ Unemployment compensation benefits
 - ☐ Workers' compensation benefits
 - ☐ Veterans' benefits
 - ☐ Circuit breaker property tax relief benefits
 - ☒ Any other source, up to \$4,000 ("wildcard exemption")

4. This money is exempt under these laws: 42 USC § 407(a); 735 ILCS 5/12-1001; and 735 ILCS 5/12-1006.

In 5, enter the amount of money you are claiming as exempt.

5. I claim \$ 7,924.00 as exempt.
Amount of money in account

I ask for the following:

- Declare my funds to be exempt.
- Order the bank to remove the hold on my accounts.
- Dismiss the *Citation to Discover Assets to a Debtor's Bank*.
- Grant any other relief that is fair.

Under the Code of Civil Procedure, 735 ILCS 5/1-109, making a statement on this form that you know to be false is perjury, a Class 3 Felony.

If you are completing this form on a computer, sign your name by typing it. If you are completing it by hand, sign and print your name.

I certify that everything in the *Emergency Motion to Claim Exemption* is true and correct. I understand that making a false statement on this form is perjury and has penalties provided by law under 735 ILCS 5/1-109.

/s/
Your Signature

500 Cunat Blvd 2B
Street Address

Thomas Camarda
Your Name

Richmond, IL 60071
City, State, ZIP

(224) 279-8856
Telephone