

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

In the Matter of:	}	
	}	
	}	CIVIL ACTION
TERRY LEE HINDS,	}	FILE NUMBER: 4:17 - CV – 750JMB
<i>Pro se</i> ,	}	
	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
-Vs-	}	
	}	
"UNITED STATES" GOVERNMENT,	}	
	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	
	}	

**PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE OF OBJECTIONS AND OPPOSITION TO
The Court’s Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (ECF No. 8)**

Plaintiff TERRY LEE HINDS, appearing *Pro se* in a *civil action* for rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the U.S. Constitution and the Rule of Law, submit the following objections and opposition to The Court’s Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (ECF No. 8) and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 46. Objecting to a Ruling or Order, states the following:

PROCEDURAL POSTURE

- 1). Filed on February 16, 2017: Original Verified Complaint for Declaratory Judgment, Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief in This Petition for Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment, (“[OVC]”). The [OVC] was presented with a 16 page Brief in support thereof, with an Exhibit List establishing 518 Exhibits attached thereto. Plaintiff [believes] he met *the duties* of law and liberty.
- 2). Plaintiff’s [OVC] was established with seven Causes of Action pertaining to First Amendment Challenges and *free exercise* violations involving facts and controversies set forth in 547 pages with 4,451 paragraphs. The [OVC] has seven *germane* Claims for Relief seeking Declaratory

Judgment, Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief to secure, protect and defend Plaintiff's *free exercise of unalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.*

3). The Plaintiff represents to the Court that a Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (ECF No. 8) entered by the above-named Court where it is hereby Ordered (1) “*that Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint in conformity with the requirement of Rule 8 no later than March 20, 2017*” and it is further Ordered (2) “*that Plaintiff Request for Leave to Amend Summons as to Listing Plaintiff's Name and Address on Summons (ECF No. 6) is DENIED AS MOOT.*”

4). Plaintiff received the Court Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (ECF No. 8) (hereinafter “[M&O No. 8]”) on Saturday, February 25th. A review of this **instant** Order to strike the *entire breath and merits* of [OVC] defeats an adversarial system of justice and does not advance a defining and distinctive feature of the United States' legal system.

5). Plaintiff's opposition to the Court's *sua sponte* decisionmaking, and the Court acting on its own initiative has manifested injustice and reversible error.

6). Plaintiff's opposition to the Court's entering a finding and Order was done without notice or a hearing date, *totally defeating* a belief in *due process* or Plaintiff's sincerely held religious beliefs.

7). Plaintiff satisfies the legal requirements of providing not only ‘*fair notice*’ of the nature of the claims, but also ‘*grounds*’ on which his claims rests. Plaintiff's averments and allegations are simple, concise and direct. Plaintiff avers the [OVC] is a confirmation of Plaintiff's faith and belief.

8). Plaintiff's objections are based on the following reasons, including but not limited to:

(a). This Court violated its discretion by striking the [OVC] without prior notice or an opportunity to be heard. This Order is based on a bias of the *nature driven prejudices* with *Pro se* complaints. Plaintiff issued a NOTICE TO THE NATURE OF SUIT IN OPPOSITION TO CIVIL COVER SHEET, filed on February 24th, 2017 as to this *nature driven prejudices* with *Pro se*

complaints. A *nature driven prejudice* in this case was commanded by *pro se lawyer(s)* of the Clerk Office and/or the Court, **defacing** Plaintiff's [OVC] as a Civil Rights action, under code 440.

(b). The short and plain statements of Plaintiff's seven Claims for Relief and seven Causes of Action titled as Count #1 through Count #7 are held as self-evident and within the strictures of Rule 8. A ***due process*** extends well beyond law and into the realm or relief known as **Justice**.

(c). The Court makes no mention within its [M&O No. 8] concerning Plaintiff's Brief in Support of [OVC] or that Seven Causes of Action with Seven Claims for Relief are listed in [OVC], of which were ***construed so as to do justice*** pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(e).

(d). The Court's legal theories concerning a review of the [OVC] and its findings or rulings are based on and/or existing under the **Old** Edition 1999-2000 of the Fed. R. Civ. P, as well as, apparently under the current edition of the Fed. R. Civ. P. simply because of the language in the [M&O No. 8] of page 1, in 3rd paragraph and on page 3. Plaintiff is lost in the world of legalism.

(e). Plaintiff has properly pleaded the germane controversies and facts of this case with Plaintiff's [OVC] (ECF No. 1). Establishing in ¶ ¶ 4363 through 4451 are seven CLAIMS FOR RELIEF, showing Plaintiff is entitled to relief and are established as a demand for relief sought.

(f). The Court, has manifested injustice when Justice is substituted for ***just-a-system*** and is self-evident when the Presiding Judge in this case acts or serves as the lead or co-counsel for the Defendants, which is the "UNITED STATES" GOVERNMENT.

(g). The Court's findings, review and Order are based on violations of due process of law. Plaintiff lawful questions the ***brevity*** of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) or in 8(d)(1) and the ***generality*** of its terms, that left the judiciary with the not inconsiderable tasks of fashioning the procedures by which the Courts and parties shall operate and/or of giving content to Fed. R. Civ. P. indefinite adjectives. When, Fed. R. Civ. P. are used as ***a source of unbridled power*** is [To LIVE as EVIL].

(h) Court misapplied the law applicable to the facts averred in this case and to its vast controversies. This is a *case of first impression* and its controversies are beyond all contestation.

(i). In a complex case of religion and law, involving hybrid rights, with the IRC consisting of over 9,000 pages, and with over 90,000 documents written and rely upon by citizen, the Plaintiff, as well as, the IRS and Tax Court, including the germane facts and controversies in [OVC], against those truths we shall hold to be self-evident under the rule of law, has created and/or advances manifested injustices and reversible error when presented in a court of law.

9). Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates, when Presiding Judge John H. Bodenhausen based his *legal review, findings and Order* of Plaintiff's case and its controversies on the facts and controversies as declared in **a case over 10 years ago**, concerning in part, a class action "*asserting federal claims under the Sherman Act and four claims under RICO*" the Court has manifested injustices with the Presiding Judge John H. Bodenhausen abusing his discretion and our blind faith in the rule of law, including the Trust of the Plaintiff, knowing this case is headed to the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals. I pray that God grant this Plaintiff the *absolute power of Justice* in the Court system and with the *entire breath* of our governmental system, the wisdom to know the difference.

10). The Court decrees in [M&O No. 8]: "*Accordingly, finding the Complaint violates Rule 8(a) and (e) to the extent that a great deal of judicial energy and resources would have to be devoted to restructuring the pleading and streamlining the unnecessary matter, the Court will strike the Complaint.*" Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates, this is a *conformity* with [A Complacent Policy of Indifference to Evil] *per se* as ("[To LIVE as EVIL]"). This policy I cannot but hate; but is defeated and conquered in the Name of J.E.S.U.S. more particularly described in the [OVC] and now adding Exhibit T #10; attached hereto and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

11). Plaintiff relies upon, the *legal grounds* or the Court's reasoning in MEMORANDUM AND

ORDER DATED 6th DAY OF JUNE 2006 PURSUANT TO CIVIL ACTION No. 4:05 CV 1108
ERW, more particularly described as Exhibit U #8 and is attached hereto and incorporated by
reference as if fully set forth herein.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, Plaintiff respectfully request that the Court advance The U.S. Supreme
Court Doctrine of *due process of law* and respectfully requests a hearing before May 19, 2017 to
make a *proper legal defense* to [M&O No. 8] or for such other relief as the Court deems proper.

Respectfully Submitted,

TERRY LEE HINDS, *pro se Plaintiff*
438 Leicester Square Drive
Ballwin, Missouri 63021
PH (636) 675-0028
Email address: quest76@att.net

Dated this 7th day of March, 2017

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 7th day of March, 2017 and served upon
Defendants and its U.S. Attorney, by the Plaintiff, hand delivery and by First class postage prepaid,
U.S. Certified mail # 7009-0960-0000-0249-6910 at the following address:

U.S. Attorney Richard Callahan
The United States Attorney's Office
Eastern District of Missouri
Thomas Eagleton U.S. Courthouse
111 S. 10th Street, 20th Floor, St. Louis, MO 63102

Initials _____

Signatures of

Date: March 7th, 2017

TERRY LEE HINDS, *Pro se*
438 Leicester Square Drive
Ballwin, Missouri 63021
636-675-0028
quest76@att.net