

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com
Sent: Friday, April 18, 2025 4:34 AM
To: 'Torres, Maelene'; 'Simmons, Grant'
Cc: 'CA07_pro_se_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'
Subject: NOTICE OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT STATUS AND PERSONAL LIABILITY EXPOSURE
Importance: High

NOTICE OF FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT STATUS AND PERSONAL LIABILITY EXPOSURE

TO: International Services, Inc

FROM: Thomas E. Camarda, Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se

DATE: April 18, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:

This notice is issued pursuant to active federal appellate enforcement in *Camarda v. Whitehorn*, 7th Cir. Case No. 24-3244. Please be advised of the following:

I. CLARIFICATION: THIS CASE IS NOT CLOSED

Despite recent activity, **Camarda v. Whitehorn**, Case No. 24-3244 remains an open federal appellate matter currently under:

- **Active en banc review** pending full panel response,
- **Post-judgment enforcement** stemming from un rebutted procedural default under FRAP 31(c),
- **Supplemental filings** correcting record errors and invoking constitutional convergence claims.

The Seventh Circuit has **not issued a mandate** or final disposition that would render the case closed. Moreover, Plaintiff's filings under **Rule 56(a)**, **UCC Article 9**, and **42 U.S.C. § 1983** remain un rebutted and judicially noticed.

Any statement or assumption that the case is "over" is premature, inaccurate, and potentially misleading in light of the evolving federal record.

II. EN BANC REVIEW REINFORCES ORIGINAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Far from closing the case, the current posture **re-validates** Plaintiff-Appellant's standing under the original summary judgment doctrine:

- The **Opening Brief (DKT58)** remains unrebutted.
- The **Record Correction & Addendum (filed April 17, 2025)** now clarifies lawful service and proper party notification.
- The **Motion to Enter Final Judgment** (filed April 18, 2025) reinstates the original Rule 56(a) argument with over 1,900 pages of verified constitutional, procedural, and administrative filings.
- The **Supplemental Victim Impact Statement** and convergence theory assert a **four-axis judgment**: Constitutional, Procedural, Commercial, and Administrative.

En banc review now operates **on top of an existing default** under FRAP 31(c).
This means:

The record is still unrebutted.

The procedural and evidentiary grounds for final judgment remain intact.

The federal posture is strengthened, not weakened.

As such, Plaintiff-Appellant is not merely "back to square one" — he remains in a post-summary judgment enforcement position, now with a fully corrected record and the benefit of circuit-wide scrutiny.

III. NOTICE OF ONGOING RETALIATORY COLLECTION EVENT – \$237.23 WAGES RECIEVED

On or around **April 18, 2025**, Plaintiff-Appellant suffered yet another unlawful seizure receiving wages in the amount of **\$237.23** — a collection event that occurred **after** the termination of his employment with International Services Inc. The timing, method, and underlying circumstances of this event confirm that Plaintiff remains the target of a retaliatory financial campaign waged under **color of law** in violation of the United States Constitution and federal statutes.

This latest act of state retaliation:

- **Occurred after Plaintiff was terminated** by his employer, in what appears to be a separation related to mounting legal pressures surrounding this case and the illegal enforcement of a **defaulted Title IV-D order**;
- **Destroyed a valuable and career-defining business relationship** that had taken years to build. Plaintiff served as a top-producing national closer and strategic consultant with a proven income track record exceeding

\$187,000 annually — a role grounded in field-tested consulting, elite high-ticket sales, and regional territory development across over **25 states** and **150,000 miles** of direct executive engagement;

- **Would still be intact** if not for the unlawful garnishments, illegal bank levies, employer pressure, and reputational harm caused by the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services (HFS) and its agents. Had this unconstitutional interference not occurred, Plaintiff's earnings potential for **2024–2025** was realistically projected to exceed **\$500,000** per year. That future was taken — not by market failure or incompetence — but by **government retaliation** against a successful, law-abiding, and outspoken citizen who dared to invoke his rights;
- **Was executed with no valid court order, no prior notice, and no due process**, violating the most fundamental tenets of fair adjudication under **the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments** to the United States Constitution;
- **Represents a direct violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983**, as it punishes the Plaintiff for the protected exercise of First Amendment rights, including litigation, protest, and redress of grievances;
- **Violates 15 U.S.C. § 1692**, which forbids deceptive and abusive collection tactics and demands consistent state-level compliance with federally guaranteed consumer protections;
- **Defies this Court's jurisdiction**, occurring while a **pending en banc petition and final judgment motion** remain active and unresolved in this very appellate proceeding. The collection event therefore constitutes a rogue state action **in the shadow of perfected federal supremacy**, and its illegality compounds the existing record of constitutional and commercial violations.

Plaintiff is not a passive victim — he is a federally recognized secured party, a prevailing party under Rule 56(a), and one of the most experienced and battle-tested executive consultants operating in North America. This retaliation is not just unlawful. It is outrageous.

This seizure confirms Plaintiff's legal claim that Defendants — under a now-defaulted Title IV-D apparatus — continue to exploit unlawful administrative machinery to inflict economic harm. Each collection attempt serves as new evidence of **systemic abuse**, even as Plaintiff-Appellant stands before this Court in a position of **unrebutted federal supremacy**.

This event is being formally noticed to the Court as additional **material support** for final judgment and federal relief. Any further action will be pursued under established UCC and federal redress procedures, including potential expansion of the § 1983 retaliation claim.

IV. FEDERAL PROTECTION IN EFFECT

You are formally notified that I am the **prevailing party in a federal civil rights action** now under **Rule 56(a) summary judgment enforcement**.

The record includes:

- Constitutional claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- Due process violations regarding wage seizures
- Supremacy Clause preemption under U.S. Const. art. VI
- Secured party notices under UCC Article 9, perfected and filed
- Documented FOIA defaults and ongoing government retaliation

Any **collection action**, wage deduction, or cooperation with state administrative orders **after federal notice was given** constitutes a potential **civil rights violation and complicity in unlawful takings**.

V. NOTICE OF INTERNAL LIABILITY REVIEW

This notice should be shared with your executive, HR, and legal compliance personnel.

Further actions taken after the date of this notice — particularly any actions in reliance upon void state instruments — will be construed as **knowingly ignoring active federal supremacy**.

It is assumed that all parties giving internal legal advice are fully credentialed, licensed, and familiar with the limits of lawful authority under active federal litigation. No party should act beyond their capacity, understanding of the law (i.e. Title IV-D and consumer protection limits) or outside recognized professional boundaries.

VI. NO FURTHER DEDUCTIONS AUTHORIZED

As of this notice, any attempt to execute garnishment, levy, or collection against Plaintiff is explicitly unlawful. You are **in possession of federal record**

materials confirming the lack of valid jurisdiction by the underlying state agency and the preemptive effect of Plaintiff's filings and status.

All rights are reserved under:

- U.S. Const. Amend. I, V, and XIV
- U.S. Const. Article VI, § 2
- 42 U.S.C. § 1983
- UCC § 9-601 through § 9-625
- 15 U.S.C. § 1673 (maximum wage garnishment protection)

VII. PRESERVATION OF EVIDENCE

Please preserve all internal communications and instructions relating to Plaintiff's employment status, payroll adjustments, and legal compliance responses to this matter.

A record of prior notice, including oral and written attempts to resolve this issue amicably, is maintained.

If you have any questions, they should be directed in writing to:

Thomas E. Camarda
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se
tcamarda@gmx.com
(224) 279-8856

Respectfully,

/s/ Thomas E. Camarda
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se
Seventh Circuit – Case No. 24-3244
All rights reserved under UCC 1-308, 1-103.6