

APR 21 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

From: tcamarda@gmx.com  
Sent: Thursday, April 17, 2025 12:11 PM  
To: 'CA07\_pro\_se\_filings@ca7.uscourts.gov'  
Subject: NOTICE OF RECORD CORRECTION AND ADDENDUM TO EN BANC PETITION  
Attachments: proof-of-service-Lizzy.pdf; proof-of-service-Alexi.pdf; Proof of Delivery.pdf; Request for Admissions 10-07-2024.pdf; Rule 216.pdf; Summary of Legal Grounds.pdf; Timeline of Notices.pdf

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 RECORD CORRECTION AND ADDENDUM TO EN BANC PETITION

Plaintiff-Appellant Thomas E. Camarda respectfully submits this Notice of Record Correction and Addendum to his pending Petition for Rehearing En Banc, to clarify a critical factual and procedural point misrepresented or omitted in the Court's ruling of April 16, 2025 (DKT 140).

#### I. SUMMARY OF ISSUE: NO SUMMONS WAS EVER ISSUED

The District Court **never issued a summons** under Rule 4(b), despite the filing of a valid complaint, as required by law:

"If the summons is in proper form, the clerk must sign, seal, and issue it to the plaintiff."

— Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(b)

This is not a discretionary act — it is a **mandatory ministerial duty**. The Court's failure to issue summons precluded the standard 90-day Rule 4(m) service clock from ever beginning, and no directive, notice, or opportunity to cure was provided.

#### II. APPELLANT NONETHELESS EFFECTED SERVICE

Despite the District Court's omission, Appellant:

- **Served all Defendants via certified mail**, confirmed with tracking and signed receipts;
- Provided **UCC Notices of Default, FOIA service, and constitutional process**;
- Sent materials directly to **legal counsel** and named officers acting under color of state law;
- Received **no objection to service or motion to dismiss for defective process**.

“Actual notice and deliberate inaction weigh heavily against a finding of defective service.”

— *Jones v. Flowers*, 547 U.S. 220 (2006)

Furthermore, the **Defendants failed to file a single responsive brief**, thereby triggering default under **FRAP 31(c)** — effectively waiving all defenses, including personal jurisdiction.

### III. MISSTATEMENT IN DKT 140

The Court stated that “appellees were not served,” but failed to note:

1. **Summons was never issued**;
2. Appellant was **never informed** of a defect in process;
3. Service was **effected through alternative, constitutionally valid methods**;
4. Defendants **were aware**, acknowledged the filings, and **chose silence**.

This omission gives the false impression of procedural abandonment. The opposite is true: Appellant **outperformed typical pro se duty**, navigating federal process under severe adversity.

### IV. IMPACT ON EN BANC REVIEW

This correction supports rehearing on two fronts:

- **Procedural fairness**: The Appellant was denied standard issuance of summons and forced to act independently, with no instruction or opportunity to cure.

- **Substantive validity:** The Appellees had actual notice, received filings, and still chose **not to respond**, thus confirming default under **FRAP 31(c)**.

The Court's current ruling risks creating precedent where **a clerk's failure to issue summons can be used against a civil rights plaintiff**, even after **federal default has been perfected and constitutional harm is proven**.

## V. REQUESTED ACTION

Plaintiff-Appellant respectfully requests:

1. That the Court take **judicial notice** of the failure to issue summons;
2. That the statement "appellees were not served" be corrected or clarified in the record;
3. That the en banc panel consider this correction in support of Appellant's Petition for Rehearing En Banc.

Respectfully submitted,

**Thomas E. Camarda**  
Plaintiff-Appellant, Pro Se  
Case No. 24-3244

Dated: April 17, 2025

tcamarda@gmx.com

---

## **Proof of Delivery**

**Date:** 11/18/2024

**From:** Thomas E. Camarda

**Address:** 500 Cunat Blvd #2B, Richmond, IL 60071

**To:** Relevant Recipients (HFS, Illinois Attorney General)

This document serves as a formal proof of delivery for various notices sent to the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services (HFS), the Illinois Attorney General's Office, and other relevant parties, detailing specific legal notices including Color of Law warnings, UCC Notices, and the UCC-1 Financing Statement. The tracking details are listed below for verification of each item's delivery status.

### **HFS (Delivered)**

1. **Color of Law Warning Form, UCC Notices, and UCC-1 Financing Statement (two out of three delivered)**
  - o **Tracking Number:** 70221670000207362995  
**Status:** Delivered
  - o **Tracking Number:** 70221670000207362988  
**Status:** Delivered

### **HFS Springfield (Undelivered)**

1. **Undelivered Notice in Springfield**
  - o **Tracking Number:** 70221670000207362971  
**Status:** Undelivered

### **Illinois Attorney General's Office, Chicago (Delivered)**

1. **Formal Notice of Violations**
  - o **Tracking Number:** 70221670000207362964  
**Status:** Delivered

### **Summary of Deliveries:**

- Two of the three notices sent to HFS are confirmed delivered.
- The notice addressed to Springfield remains undelivered.

- The Illinois Attorney General's office in Chicago has received the Formal Notice of Violations.

Please retain this document for your records as formal proof of compliance with delivery requirements. If there are any questions or additional verifications needed, do not hesitate to contact me at (224) 279-8856 or via email at [tcamarda@gmx.com](mailto:tcamarda@gmx.com).

**Respectfully,**

Thomas E. Camarda  
Secured Party

tcamarda@gmx.com

**From:** tcamarda@gmx.com  
**Sent:** Monday, October 7, 2024 2:47 AM  
**To:** 'lizzy.whitehorn@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.dcsscaru@illinois.gov'; 'hfs.mru@illinois.gov'  
**Subject:** REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS

## REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS

**To:**

Elizabeth Whitehorn  
Director  
Illinois Department of Health and Family Services  
201 S Grand Ave  
East Springfield, IL 62763  
lizzy.whitehorn@illinois.gov

**From:**

Thomas Camarda  
PRO SE LITIGANT

**Date:** October 7th, 2024

**Subject: Request for Admissions Pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 216**

Dear Ms. Whitehorn,

Pursuant to the relevant rules of civil procedure, you are hereby requested to admit the truth of the following facts within **30 days** from the date of service. Should you fail to respond within the allotted time, each matter will be deemed conclusively admitted for the purposes of this case. For any denial, please provide a clear and detailed explanation, supported by any applicable facts or documents.

### Definitions:

- **"Admit"** means to agree that a statement is accurate without qualification or reservation.
- **"Deny"** means a complete and unqualified disagreement with the statement of fact, supported by evidence to the contrary.
- **"Document"** refers to any written, recorded, or electronic material, including emails, correspondence, and internal records.
- **"Agency"** refers to the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, its directors, officers, employees, and any other representative acting on its behalf.

---

**REQUEST FOR ADMISSIONS:**

- 1. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services levied \$8,400 from Thomas Camarda's bank account on or about 04/29/2024.**
- 2. Admit that the levy referenced in Admission Request #1 was performed without prior notice to Thomas Camarda.**
- 3. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services did not issue a hearing or due process proceedings prior to the levy of \$8,400.**
- 4. Admit that Illinois law mandates notice to be provided to an individual before initiating a levy.**
- 5. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services did not provide notice to Thomas Camarda, in violation of the Illinois Constitution and Due Process Clauses of the U.S. Constitution.**
- 6. Admit that Illinois statutes governing levies and enforcement actions require compliance with certain procedural safeguards to protect individuals from improper asset seizure.**
- 7. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services has no valid documentation justifying the levy taken from Thomas Camarda's account under the lawful procedural guidelines.**
- 8. Admit that Illinois law requires a bondholder to act in good faith when pursuing enforcement actions, including asset seizures.**
- 9. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services possesses knowledge of the agency's surety bond information, including the bond number, pursuant to Illinois state bonding requirements, and is obligated to disclose such information upon request under the Illinois Public Bond Act (30 ILCS 550/1).**
- 10. Admit that any unlawful enforcement actions, including unlawful levies, subject the agency to claims against the surety bond.**
- 11. Admit that Elizabeth Whitehorn, in her role as director of the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, is aware of her obligations to ensure lawful enforcement actions under the Illinois Public Bond Act (30 ILCS 550/1).**
- 12. Admit that Elizabeth Whitehorn failed to intervene or correct the improper enforcement actions taken against Thomas Camarda, resulting in financial harm.**
- 13. Admit that failure to comply with lawful processes opens the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services to legal claims for damages, including but not limited to refunding the unlawfully seized amount.**

14. Admit that the agency's failure to comply with 5 ILCS 430/50 will result in mandatory restitution, penalties, and potential disciplinary action under Illinois state law.
  15. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services was notified of the alleged wrongful levy by Thomas Camarda on or about 04/29/2024.
  16. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services failed to respond to Thomas Camarda's demand for explanation or clarification within the statutory timeframe.
  17. Admit that Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services has been in possession of written complaints from Thomas Camarda regarding the unlawful levy for more than 160 days as of 10/06/2024.
  18. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services acknowledges that restitution is owed to Thomas Camarda if the actions of the levy were performed unlawfully.
  19. Admit that Illinois law provides for penalties against the agency in cases of bad faith enforcement actions, including recovery of attorneys' fees and statutory damages.
  20. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services has received previous complaints of improper enforcement actions similar to those taken against Thomas Camarda.
  21. Admit that as of the date of this Request for Admissions, the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services has failed to correct the improper levy actions against Thomas Camarda.
  22. Admit that the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services has not offered any settlement, restitution, or correction to the improper levy made against Thomas Camarda.
  23. Admit that continuing enforcement actions without correction of past mistakes constitutes a violation of Illinois law and ethical obligations owed by the agency to citizens.
- 

#### **Instructions for Responses:**

For each Request for Admission, you are to either admit or deny the statement in writing. If you deny any request, you are required to provide specific details, including any documents or evidence that support your denial. Failure to respond in the appropriate manner within the statutory time limit will result in the statements being deemed admitted as fact for all purposes in this legal matter.

Should you wish to discuss this matter prior to providing responses, please contact me in writing at [tcamarda@gmx.com](mailto:tcamarda@gmx.com).

---



Sincerely,

**Thomas Camarda**  
**PRO SE LITIGANT**

---

## **Illinois Supreme Court Rule 216 – Request for Admission of Facts or of Genuineness of Documents**

### **(a) Request for Admission of Facts or Genuineness of Documents**

A party may serve on any other party a written request for the admission by the latter of the truth of any specified relevant fact set forth in the request, or for the admission of the genuineness of any relevant documents described in or exhibited with the request. Copies of the documents shall be served with the request unless copies have already been furnished.

### **(b) Admission in the Absence of Denial**

Each of the matters of fact and the genuineness of each document of which admission is requested is admitted unless, within 28 days after service thereof, the party to whom the request is directed serves upon the party requesting the admission either:

1. A sworn statement denying specifically the matters of which admission is requested or setting forth in detail the reasons why the party cannot truthfully admit or deny those matters; or
2. Written objections on the ground that some or all of the requested admissions are privileged, irrelevant, or otherwise improper, with a notice of hearing the objections at the earliest practicable time.

### **(c) Effect of Admission**

Any admission made by a party under this rule is for the purpose of the pending action only and is not an admission by that party for any other purpose, nor may it be used against the party in any other proceeding.

### **(d) Time for Filing Requests and Responses**

Requests for admissions may be served no later than 30 days before the close of discovery. Responses or objections must be served within 28 days after service of the request unless the court shortens or extends the time.

### **(e) Fees and Costs for Failure to Admit**

If a party fails to admit the truth of any matter or the genuineness of any document requested under this rule, and the requesting party thereafter proves the matter or the genuineness of the document, the requesting party may apply to the court for an order requiring the other party to pay the reasonable expenses incurred in making that proof, including reasonable attorney's fees. The court shall make the order unless it finds that:

1. The request was held objectionable under subsection (b);
2. The admission sought was of no substantial importance;
3. The party failing to admit had reasonable ground to believe that it might prevail on the matter; or
4. There was other good reason for the failure to admit.

## Summary of Legal Grounds and Statutory Citations

### 1. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Violations

- **Statutes Invoked:**

- **5 ILCS 140/1 et seq. (Illinois FOIA)**
- **5 ILCS 140/9.5(c)** - Provision for review of denied FOIA requests by the Illinois Attorney General's Public Access Counselor.

- **Legal Basis:**

- The Illinois FOIA mandates that public records maintained by a public body be disclosed upon request, subject only to specific exemptions. Under FOIA, HFS was required to respond promptly and provide access to requested records, including information on surety bonds related to its officials.

- **Violations Documented:**

- Defendants failed to produce records or even engage in a reasonable search for documents. The Illinois Attorney General's Office confirmed in response to the appeal (PAC Case #2024 PAC 83756) that the requested records were not available and closed the file, effectively denying access. This failure is in direct violation of FOIA's mandate for transparency and public accountability.

### 2. Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) Default and Enforcement Rights

- **Statutes Invoked:**

- **UCC § 9-601(a)** - Rights upon default, enabling a secured party to pursue remedies.
- **UCC § 9-609** - Entitlement of a secured party to enforce compliance and take possession.

- **UCC § 9-625** - Remedies for non-compliance, including potential damages.
- **Legal Basis:**
  - The plaintiff holds a perfected UCC-1 lien against HFS, establishing secured party status and entitling the plaintiff to enforce specific rights under the UCC. These rights include demanding compliance and enforcing remedies due to the defendants' defaults.
- **Violations Documented:**
  - Despite multiple demands and notices, defendants failed to address these defaults or provide documentation regarding financial accountability through surety bonds, violating secured party rights and obstructing lawful enforcement efforts.

### 3. Due Process Violations (Constitutional Claims)

- **Statutes and Case Law Invoked:**
  - **42 U.S.C. § 1983** - Civil action for deprivation of rights.
  - **Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution** - Protection against deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process.
  - **Key Case Law:**
    - **Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976)** - Requirement of due process in government actions impacting individual rights.
    - **Goldberg v. Kelly, 397 U.S. 254 (1970)** - Mandate for procedural due process in the deprivation of benefits.
- **Legal Basis:**
  - The due process clause mandates fair procedures before the government can deprive an individual of property or liberty. Defendants' refusal to provide requested information and their imposition of financial levies without adequate notice or opportunity to contest them constitute violations of procedural due process.

- **Violations Documented:**

- The plaintiff suffered financial harm due to unwarranted levies executed without proper legal basis or procedural safeguards, depriving him of rights under color of state law. These actions are actionable under § 1983 as violations of due process.

#### **4. Surety Bond and Public Accountability Requirements**

- **Statutes Invoked:**

- **State Surety Bond Requirements** (Specific statutes vary by state; however, Illinois generally requires public officials to be bonded to ensure accountability).

- **Legal Basis:**

- Surety bonds are required for public officials to safeguard against misconduct and to ensure that officials are held financially accountable. Failure to disclose surety bond information upon request raises questions about compliance with financial accountability standards.

- **Violations Documented:**

- Defendants failed to produce or confirm the existence of surety bonds covering HFS officials, obstructing transparency and financial accountability mechanisms. This failure not only violates FOIA but also undermines the essential purpose of public surety bonds as a form of risk management and public trust.

#### **5. Final Demand and Debt Collection Violations**

- **Statutes Invoked:**

- **Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) Provisions** where applicable to state-level enforcement.

- **Legal Basis:**

- The demand for financial restitution, coupled with debt collection notices sent to defendants, highlights the plaintiff's right to collect damages incurred due to procedural violations and non-compliance by

the defendants.

- **Violations Documented:**

- Defendants ignored final debt collection notices and demands for restitution for financial harm caused by the unauthorized levies and procedural failures, thus obstructing lawful debt collection processes and compounding financial damages.

## **6. Retaliation and Anti-Retaliation Protections**

- **Statutes Invoked:**

- **Federal and State Anti-Retaliation Protections** applicable to individuals asserting legal rights against state entities.

- **Legal Basis:**

- Laws against retaliation protect individuals who lawfully assert their rights from any retaliatory actions by public bodies. Warnings regarding anti-retaliation were issued to deter any potential retaliatory measures by HFS or its officials.

- **Violations Documented:**

- While no retaliatory actions have yet been recorded, formal notices were issued preemptively to safeguard the plaintiff's right to pursue lawful remedies without interference.

## **7. Enforcement of Secured Party Rights and Damages for Continued Non-Compliance**

- **Statutes Invoked:**

- **UCC Article 9, §§ 9-601(a), 9-609, and 9-625** - Enforcement rights of a secured party, rights to possession, and damages for non-compliance.

- **Legal Basis:**

- As a secured party, the plaintiff holds enforceable rights over the defendants' compliance under UCC. Continued defaults allow the plaintiff to seek possession of collateral and damages for ongoing non-compliance, solidifying the grounds for pursuing damages in this

litigation.

- **Violations Documented:**

- The defendants' refusal to meet demands under UCC and FOIA has compounded damages owed to the plaintiff, establishing further grounds for seeking financial compensation.

## **Conclusion**

The legal grounds presented are built on clear statutory and constitutional violations by the defendants, backed by extensive documentation of notices and demands from September 12, 2024, through November 15, 2024. The defendants' continued non-compliance with FOIA, UCC, due process, and financial accountability requirements has necessitated the filing of *Camarda v. Whitehorn et al.*, Case No. 24-50466. Each claim is meticulously substantiated through statutory citations and case law, underscoring the strength and legitimacy of the plaintiff's legal standing and the comprehensive efforts to seek redress prior to litigation.

tcamarda@gmx.com

---

## Timeline of Notices and Communications

### September 12, 2024

- **Notice of Cease and Desist**

Initial notice was sent, demanding an immediate cease and desist of actions violating my rights and outlining preliminary legal arguments for the case.

### September 20, 2024

- **Formal Cease and Desist, Demand, and Intent Notice**

A second, more formal cease and desist notice was sent, also serving as a demand and notice of intent to pursue legal action if compliance was not achieved. This notice emphasized legal obligations and consequences for continued non-compliance.

### October 1, 2024

- **Public Records Request under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)**

FOIA request formally submitted to obtain public records related to surety bonds and accountability measures. Also included notice of intent to sue, signaling the escalation of the matter and outlining specific information sought for transparency and accountability.

### October 4, 2024

- **Notice of UCC Violations and Intent to File Surety Bond Claim**

Issued formal notice of Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) violations, asserting secured party status and intending to file a claim on the surety bond. This notice reinforced the legal grounds for the case under UCC provisions and demanded immediate compliance.

### October 9, 2024

- **Formal Notice of Violations and Default Notification**

This notice reiterated violations, including FOIA non-compliance, UCC defaults, and due process concerns. It notified the defendants of their default status and highlighted the legal ramifications of their ongoing non-compliance.



**October 13, 2024**

- **UCC-1 Financing Statement Filed**

Filed the UCC-1 Financing Statement to formalize secured party status and protect rights under UCC. This filing solidified the standing for pursuing claims under UCC and was a critical legal step to enforce compliance.

**October 14, 2024**

- **Final Notice of Default and Demand for Compliance**

Official notice declaring the defendants in full default under FOIA and UCC. The notice reiterated previous demands, specified compliance expectations, and included a summary of legal grounds for enforcing compliance under state and federal law.

**October 24, 2024**

- **Final Demand for Compliance and Notice of Pending Litigation**

Sent a final demand and notice of the intention to pursue litigation if immediate compliance was not achieved. This notice summarized all previous notices, documented the non-compliance, and indicated that further legal actions were imminent without immediate resolution.

**October 28, 2024**

- **Final Legal Notice and Demand for Disclosure and Settlement**

This final legal notice served as a last opportunity for settlement before filing suit. It included a demand for disclosure of all outstanding information and compliance under FOIA, UCC, and due process statutes.

**October 30, 2024**

- **Official Debt Collection Notice and Final Demand**

Sent an official debt collection notice in response to the financial damages caused by the defendants' actions. This notice demanded payment for incurred damages and outlined the financial accountability owed due to the levies and procedural failures.

**October 31, 2024**

- **Anti-Retaliation and Personal Financial Liability Notice**

Notice of anti-retaliation protections and personal liability under surety bonds was issued, warning of legal consequences for any retaliatory actions.

This notice ensured the defendants were fully aware of the repercussions of further obstruction or retaliation.

#### **November 1, 2024**

- **Final Escalation Notice and Daily Accrued Interest on Damages**  
The escalation notice informed defendants of accruing financial damages due to ongoing non-compliance, emphasizing the growing liability for daily interest on owed amounts. This notice also served as a final warning before taking federal action.

#### **November 4, 2024**

- **Final Pre-Litigation Notice and Notice of Imminent Legal Action**  
The pre-litigation notice warned of imminent filing and outlined the legal claims prepared for litigation. This included summaries of the primary causes of action and an invitation to resolve the matter prior to court intervention.

#### **November 6, 2024**

- **Deadline Expiration for Settlement Offers**  
Final settlement offers expired without resolution, confirming the decision to move forward with litigation. This established a concrete end to pre-litigation negotiations.

#### **November 15, 2024**

- **Case Filed: *Camarda v. Whitehorn et al.*, Case No. 24-50466**  
Filed the lawsuit in the Western District, formally initiating legal action after exhaustive pre-litigation efforts. The suit includes claims under FOIA, UCC, due process, and constitutional rights violations.

tcamarda@gmx.com

---

## PROOF OF SERVICE

**Date:** December 16, 2024

**From:**

Thomas E. Camarda  
Secured Party, Pro Se Plaintiff  
500 Cunat Blvd #2B  
Richmond, IL 60071  
(224) 279-8856  
tcamarda@gmx.com

**To:**

Elizabeth Whitehorn, Acting Director  
Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services  
201 S. Grand Ave  
Springfield, IL 62704

**CC:**

Dana Kelly  
Kiran Mehta

**Subject: Proof of Service of Notices – December 11, 2024**

I, **Thomas E. Camarda**, hereby **certify and affirm** that on December 11, 2024, I served the following documents upon the Defendant, Elizabeth M. Whitehorn, Acting Director of the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, by **Certified U.S. Mail** with the following tracking numbers:

**1. Tracking Number 7022 1670 0002 0736 4326**

- Document Served: *Notice of Identification of John Doe Defendants*

**2. Tracking Number 7022 1670 0002 0736 4050**

- Document Served: *Notice of Appellate Intent*

The service was made to the following address:

**Elizabeth M. Whitehorn**

Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services  
201 S. Grand Ave  
Springfield, IL 62704

## **Verification of Delivery**

As of the date of this filing, **In Transit** for both documents has been confirmed and recorded by the United States Postal Service (USPS). The tracking records are attached hereto for verification of delivery and compliance with service requirements.

## **Declaration**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

**Executed on this 16th day of December, 2024.**

**Thomas E. Camarda**  
**Secured Party, Pro Se Plaintiff**

500 Cunat Blvd #2B  
Richmond, IL 60071  
(224) 279-8856  
tcamarda@gmx.com

### **Attachments:**

1. USPS Tracking Confirmation for 7022 1670 0002 0736 4326
2. USPS Tracking Confirmation for 7022 1670 0002 0736 4050

tcamarda@gmx.com

---

## **ATTACHMENT: PROOF OF SERVICE VIA CERTIFIED MAIL**

**Date:** December 16, 2024

**To:**

Alexi Giannouloupis

Secretary of State

Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation

Uniform Commercial Code Division

**Subject:** Confirmation of Certified Mail Delivery – Compliance with Judicial and Statutory Obligations

### **Overview:**

This document serves as proof of service for the correspondence sent to your office via certified mail regarding the matter of **Thomas E. Camarda v. Elizabeth Whitehorn et al.**, to reiterate the mandatory compliance obligations of your office in fulfilling its ministerial role.

### **Certified Mail Tracking Details:**

- **USPS Tracking Number:** 70221670000207364043
- **Current Status:** In Transit
- **Date and Time of Delivery:** Estimated Delivery Saturday 14, 2024 through the early work week.
- **Recipient Location:** Springfield, IL

As indicated in the tracking record, the documents have been successfully delivered to your office. This establishes official receipt of the legal notices provided to ensure your compliance with the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and all other relevant legal obligations.

### **Action Required:**

Your office is hereby reminded of its statutory role as a **ministerial agent** in recording and maintaining accurate filings under the UCC. Any continued delay,

obstruction, or deviation from these duties constitutes a violation of federal and state law, including but not limited to the UCC and related statutes. You are required to confirm receipt of these documents in writing and provide immediate compliance with all outlined demands. Failure to do so will result in further legal action and enforcement measures.

### **Attached Documents:**

1. Certified Mail Tracking Confirmation (Exhibit A)
2. Notice of Compliance Demand

With the full power vested in me under the Constitution and laws of the United States,

**Thomas E. Camarda**  
**Secured Party, Pro Se Plaintiff**

500 Cunat Blvd #2B  
Richmond, IL 60071  
(224) 279-8856  
tcamarda@gmx.com