

**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 – 750 JMB
<i>Pro se,</i>	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
-Vs-	}	
	}	
“UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT,	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	

**THIRD NOTICE OF UNJUST BURDENS ON FREE EXERCISE PRINCIPLES AND
ON PLAINTIFF’S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT
AND, IN THE ASSESSMENT OF TRUTH FOR
*Rule 8(d)(1) pleading requirement that “each allegation must be simple, concise and direct”***

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE OF SAID COURT AND DEFENDANTS:

Please take notice that the undersigned, Plaintiff TERRY LEE HINDS, (“Plaintiff”) appearing *Pro se* in support of his *civil action* for **rights, privileges, or immunities** secured by the U.S. Constitution and the Rule of Law, thereby to *secure, protect and defend* Plaintiff’s *free exercise of unalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness*, hereby declares and submits the following notice and pursuant to Plaintiff’s **constitutional protected free exercise right** to petition the U.S. government and to protest U.S. government activities through this civil action and its pleadings, and in so doing providing formal Notice to all interested parties and the Court:

PROCEDURAL POSTURE

1). Plaintiff *lawfully* filed on February 16, 2017 with the Court an [ORIGINAL VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF IN THIS PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, presented with a 16 page

Brief in Support, with an Exhibit List consisting of 26 pages instituting 510 Exhibits attached thereto; a case & its controversies listed on 549 pages] (“[OVC/Petition]”). Plaintiff is *engaged in peaceful expressive activity* pursuant to *fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment.

2). Pursuant to the Court’s previous Orders (see “[Doc. Nos. 8, 18 & 29]”) (“[ORDERS]”) that Plaintiff shall file an *amended complaint in conformity* with the *requirements* of Rule 8, is a *unjust burden* manifested on *free exercise principles* of Plaintiff’s *religious belief* (Thou Shall Not Bear False Witness) & diminishes Plaintiff’s *secular belief*; in the First Amendment and Rule 8(e) “CONSTRUING PLEADINGS. Pleadings must be construed so as to do justice.”

3). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition], as well as, his *legal conduct* and *pure speech* is under the full protection of *free exercise principles* of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Furthermore, Plaintiff’s *constitutional rights* to *formulate a legal protest* and *precisely assemble* an [OVC/Petition] is in the *right to petition* the government, “*showing that the pleader is entitled to relief*” under Rule 8(a)(1) and of declaratory and prospective injunctive relief.

4). The preceding [Court’s Presiding Judge, the Honorable John M. Bodenhausen] (“[Judge]”) made a *review, finding, and Order* (Doc. No. 8) thereby imposed unconstitutional *viewpoint-based restrictions* on Plaintiff’s free, pure, or [Protected Speech]. The Order engaged in *viewpoint-driven conduct* and regulating speech based on its content against Plaintiff’s right of [conscience] affirmed content in [OVC/Petition]. This was the result when attempting to *redress grievances* with Defendants and to protest unconstitutional activities. “*The First Amendment, our precedent makes plain, disfavors viewpoint-based discrimination.*” See *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of Univ. of Va.*, 515 U. S. 819, 828 (1995) quoting *Wood v. Moss*, 572 U.S. ____ (2014).

5). FOR THE RECORD, the [Judge] did not provide any prior verbal or written notice or a hearing, prior to issuing an instant Order striking the entire breath and merits of [OVC/Petition]

which defeats an adversarial system of justice and does not advance a defining and distinctive feature of the United States' legal system. [RFRA] affords the Plaintiff adjudicatory procedures.

6). Pursuant to Local Rule 2.08, and Plaintiff's anxieties about a fair hearing, due process of law and the [Judge] total lack of concern with Plaintiff's *free exercise rights* and establishment challenges, and in addition to, burdens placed upon a *pro se* Plaintiff and the First Amendment, Plaintiff requested and received a reassignment of this case to a District Judge. (Doc. No. 16). "IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the above styled cause is randomly reassigned from Magistrate Judge H. Bodenhausen to District Judge John A. Ross." 03/7/17. (Hereinafter "[Judge Ross]").

7). The Court issued Memorandum and Order dated 10th day of March, 2017 (Doc. No. 18). [Judge Ross] declared upon *further review* of a "547-page Complaint, with 4,451 paragraphs, the Court finds it clearly does not comply with Rule 8", which requires a "short and plain statement of the claim(s)" and that "[e]ach averment of a pleading shall be simple, concise, and direct."

8). FOR THE RECORD, and for unknown reason(s) [Judge Ross] made no reference that Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] had established *seven claims for relief* with *seven causes of action* involving the U.S. Constitution, *germane* U. S. Supreme Court doctrines, *establishment challenges* and *free exercise clause* violations of the First Amendment. An act of *legal prejudice* to Plaintiff.

9). [Judge Ross] "ORDERED that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in *conformity* with the *requirements* of Rule 8 no later than Friday, May 19, 2017. Failure to do so may result in dismissal of this action." (Doc. No. 18). Furthermore, [Judge Ross] *instant Order* (Doc. No. 29) decrees: "Even if the Court were to liberally construe Plaintiff's Notice as an amended complaint, the Court would nevertheless finds that the Notice does not comply with the Court's previous Orders (see Doc. No. 8, 18)." However, this Notice and others filed seeks *conformity* with *the law*.

10). The U.S. Supreme Court has held this broader concept of *individual freedom of mind*:

There is certainly some difference between compelled speech and compelled silence, but, in the context of protected speech, the difference is without constitutional significance, for the First Amendment guarantees "freedom of speech," a term necessarily **comprising the decision of both what to say and what not to say**. In reaching our conclusion, we relied on the principle that "[t]he right to speak and the right to refrain from speaking are complementary components of the broader concept of '**individual freedom of mind**,'" as illustrated in *Tornillo*. 430 U.S. at 430 U. S. 714 (quoting *West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 319 U. S. 637 (1943)). See also *Pacific Gas & Electric Co. v. Public Utilities Comm'n of California*, 475 U. S. 1, 475 U. S. 9-11 (1986) (plurality opinion of Powell, J.) (characterizing *Tornillo* in terms of freedom of speech); *Harper & Row Publishers, Inc. v. Nation Enterprises*, 471 U. S. 539, 471 U. S. 559 (1985); *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, 431 U. S. 209, 431 U. S. 234-235 (1977); *West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette*, supra. These cases cannot be distinguished simply because they involved compelled statements of opinion, *while here we deal with compelled statements of "fact"*: either form of compulsion ***burdens protected speech***. Emphasis added. See *Riley v. National Fed. of the Blind of North Carolina*, 487 U.S. 781, 797, 798 (1988).

11). FOR THE RECORD, the [ORDERS] administered by the [Judge] and [Judge Ross] is an unjust burden and abuse of discretion over the free exercise principles of the Plaintiff's right to pure speech. These [ORDERS] advances compelled speech of the Plaintiff, in a limited Forum (Courthouse) concerning his free, pure and [Protected Speech] exercised as [OVC/Petition]. This unbridled brevity in the requirements with Rule 8 or in the generality of what should constitute conformity has manifested a lack of due process of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

12). FOR THE RECORD, [ORDERS] 'grounds' are based on the ***brevity*** of Fed. R. Civ. P. RULE 8(a)(2) and in RULE 8(d)(1) or for the ***generality*** of its terms; thus exhibiting a lack of compliance with the *void for vagueness doctrine* or allowing a *substantial due process* violation.

13). FOR THE RECORD, A judge's sua sponte decisionmaking, and/or with the Court acting on its own initiative, on the basis of formalities of Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] and/or "A document filed pro se is 'to be liberally construed,' *Estelle*, 429 U.S., at 106, 97 S.Ct. 285, and 'a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers,' *ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted). Cf. Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8(f) ("All pleadings shall be so construed as to do substantial justice")" under the Federal Rules of

Procedures (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”) *present or past*. See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 127 S.Ct. 2197 (2007).

14). FOR THE RECORD, the Defendants have not currently filed any motion(s) to dismiss the [OVC/Petition], raised any defenses, admissions or denials, or plead affirmative defenses, including making any claims or exercise certain rights under Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8.

15). FOR THE RECORD, The Court [ORDERS] has unjustly placed numerous burdens on Plaintiff’s *fundamental free exercise rights*. These legalized [ORDERS] has created a legal prejudice and profound hardships manifesting a large range of encroachments to infringements, involving Plaintiff’s religious beliefs, right of [conscience], and personal constitution and on his unalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

16). **IN THE RECORD**, as to Plaintiff’s *free exercise right to formulate a protest and precisely assemble* an [OVC/Petition] with each averment of a pleading shall be simple, concise, and direct; upholding the highest *secular belief* that pleadings must be construed so as to do justice:

VI. THE CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT III

VIOLATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION
Establishment Clause Violation – Establishment/Endorsement of an Internal Religious Service
Free Exercise Clause Violation of Plaintiff’s Quintessential Right of [conscience], *inter alia*

¶ 4276. Plaintiff hereby re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation, fact or averment in this [OVC], as though fully set forth herein.

¶ 4277. The Establishment/Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution proclaims, decrees and guarantees: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

¶ 4278. Plaintiff seeks to prevent Defendants from interfering with his constitutional protected rights in the most sacred precincts of private & domestic life as the mind is a sacred place with the human heart (emotions) being a sacred space as alleged or averred supra.

¶ 4279. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra; it is evident Defendants have established and endorsed an Internal Religious Service per se as the IRS clothed with authority & "that in which one trusts".

¶ 4280. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra; it is evident Defendants have established viewpoint discrimination as thought crimes & influence of Intellectual Tithing.

¶ 4281. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra; it is evident Defendants have established and endorsed a IRS House of Worship & IRS Pilgrimage- Knowing the Unknowable Answers Exist.

¶ 4282. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra; it is evident Defendants have established [Tax Credits] in violation of the Establishment Clause, and are substantively unlawful under the Constitution.

¶ 4283. Plaintiff challenge the validity of Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra, in violation of the U.S. Constitution, Establishment/Free Exercise Clause, U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines and his [CLP] as set forth herein this [OVC].

¶ 4284. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendants over Defendants' duty to comply with the Establishment Clause of First Amendment to the United States Constitution thus causing personal, and threatened or unwelcomed contact.

¶ 4285. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra; it is evident Plaintiff does not have the free exercise right in the freedom of [conscience] or the right in the most sacred precincts of private & domestic life as the mind is a sacred place with the human heart (emotions) being a

sacred space.

¶ 4286. By Plaintiff's free exercise in the [Commanding Heights] & [CLP] as an Artful Blend, it is evident Plaintiff manifested a Quintessential right of [conscience], granted under the protection or protocols of the First Amendment and as guaranteed by the Ninth Amendment to United States Constitution for his [LLP].

¶ 4287. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendants as to their respective legal rights and duties pursuit to a Quintessential right of [conscience] as a free exercise right as guaranteed by the First Amendments to the United States Constitution.

¶ 4288. For reasons as set forth above Defendants violated the Establishment Clause.

¶ 4289. For reasons as set forth above free exercise clause violations are endorsed by the Defendants regarding Plaintiff's declared dictates of [conscience] herein, causing Plaintiff to suffer irreparable harm for which there is no adequate remedy at law.

¶ 4290. Plaintiff is uncertain as to declare rights and legal remedies promulgated under the U.S. Constitution and [CLP] because of Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged supra.

¶ 4291. Declaratory relief is, therefore, appropriate to resolve this controversy.

17). FOR THE RECORD, "To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Iqbal*, 129 S. Ct. at 1949 (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). This pleading standard is satisfied if the complaint's "factual content . . . allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Id.*

18). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Specific facts are not necessary; the statement need only "give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds

upon which it rests." *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. ___, ___, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007) (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957)).

19). FOR THE RECORD, In reviewing the sufficiency of a complaint, the court determines whether the plaintiff is entitled to offer evidence to support his claims—not whether the plaintiff will ultimately prevail. *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236 (1974), *overruled on other grounds by Davis v. Scherer*, 468 U.S. 183 (1984).

BACKGROUND AND FACTS

20). Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates the Internal Revenue Code aka [THE CODE] is not “simple”, “concise” and “direct” because is it law respecting an establishment of religion.

21). Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates his [OVC/Petition], a lawsuit as complex litigation, involving the complexities of religion, human reason, liberty, law, God’s purposes & Government policies & practices, including but not limited to, Plaintiff’s sincerely held religious beliefs of which are not of a “simple”, “concise” and “direct” subject matters, because the content of these matters involves the essence of Plaintiff’s liberty under law and is the assessment of truth.

22). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] the Internal Religious Service, aka IRS (“[IRS]”), & its [Mega Church] is utilizing the prestige, power, and influence of a public institution. The practice of [Form 1040] is a covenant, petition & viewpoint, inter alia, a forum of expressive activity. This establishment or endorsements of IRS’ religious effects converts taxpayers into taxprayers.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 8.

23). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ conduct as seen through the actions of the IRS “reemphasizing the ‘service’ in the IRS name” has endorsed an Internal Religious Service, currently seen as the IRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 684.

24). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] these three capitalized letters, “IRS”; stand for the

Internal Religious Service being a religious organization, order and a religious assembly and service.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 685.

25). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ Internal Revenue Service is aware of the religious concept or established criteria for an Internal Religious Service.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1025.

26). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants stated activities have assembled the establishment/endorsement of an “[Internal Religious Service aka IRS]” per se as (“[IRS]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1357.

27). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants’ IRS has established a continuing practice and history of indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through an endorsement of an Internal Religious Service aka IRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1637.

28). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] the Doctrine of Exchange is a central tenet of Taxology, which dictates that for spiritual well-being, anytime a person makes a return to the IRS way of life, a person pays something back when you fail to balance "income" with "payments".” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 336.

29). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers in Taxology, there is a strong belief in seeking a return from the IRS where as in Christianity there is a strong belief in seeking a return of Jesus Christ.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 394.

30). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants’ IRS are the “creator” of an entity known as “Taxprayer”.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 417.

31). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates taxation without representation is an evil against the U.S. Constitution.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 718.

32). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates that Plaintiff should not have to

establish any goals of the IRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 727.

33). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates IRS’ vision is not his vision for him or a Nation to be governed by the U.S. Constitution and its Amendments.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 735.

34). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates [WHATEVER] endorses a stream of consciousness so Defendants can manifest “[Crudely Crafted Burdens of Law, Belief and Practice]” per se as (“[Burdens]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 753.

35). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are forming a “[U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, Form 1040]” per se as (“[Form 1040]”), for the establishments and/or endorsements of its religious effects.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 902.

36). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Ghost tax returns is a common form of IRS indoctrination.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 926.

37). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] Ghost tax returns creates compelled associations.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 927.

38). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Ghost tax returns supports [To LIVE as EVIL].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 928.

39). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] Ghost tax returns principles, its compelled associations, and religious composition of government-sponsored speech, or its displays violates his First Amendment rights of religion, speech, conscience, association, protest or petition.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 929.

40). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers the IRS determines what is truly valuable involving a person’s life, or personal liberty such as right of [conscience] concerning an exemption for your child if you meet all of the listed requirements.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 972.

41). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates a court order should be able to

supersede Federal tax law.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 992.

42). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants Temple of Taxism make religious decisions.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1227.

43). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants’ IRS are compelling the spiritual surrender of one’s own [conscience].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1236.

44). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates we are “dealing” with the IRS as a yielding condition; when the term applies to the buying and selling of something, creating a review of personality or behavior, not of a proper review of tax procedures.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1238.

45). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants’ [Creed] has not nothing to do with the secular power to lay and collect taxes on incomes. [OVC/Petition].” ¶ 1244.

46). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are proselytizing [Purpose-Driven Life] serving/aiding as religious subsidies for the semblances of an organized religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1273.

47). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are entangling the synthesis of law and religious syncretism through IRS indoctrination.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1297.

48). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are generating and advancing the Sindustry of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1302.

49). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates [THE CODE] are [Burdens] on free exercise right of expression of the Plaintiff.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1308.

50). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are authorizing numerous forms for Worship by manifesting “[Worship of Argumentative Wealth, Words & Wants of Materialism]” per se as (“[Worthship]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1310.

51). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are manifesting and mandating [Worship] that touch the heart of the existing order and this seems to be a visible aim of many, if not most religions.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1311.

52). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates there is no legitimate, compelling interest, or clear secular purpose on the subject matter of [Worship].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1312.

53). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are creating “[IRS Refunds of Income Taxes Collected]” per se as (“[Refunds]”) as a Mode for [Worship].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1313.

54). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are endorsing religious messages, objectives or desires for a religious experience through [Refunds], or other Modes for [Worship].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1314.

55). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates there is no legitimate, compelling interest, or clear secular purpose on the subject matter of [Refunds].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1315.

56). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are authorizing [Refunds] in excess of U.S. Constitutional taxing and spending limits and restrictions.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1319.

57). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are violating the [CLP] in *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 304 (1940) – where “freedom to believe” is absolute.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1323.

58). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are endorsing an “[IRS Pilgrimage - Knowing the Unknowable Answers Exist]” per se as (“[IRS Pilgrimage]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1361.

59). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are crafting the payment

of tithes & tribute vs. lay & collect taxes on incomes.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1366.

60). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are displaying on Federal property “[An IRS Deific & Divinity of THEIRS as THE GREAT WHATEVER]” per se as (“[WHATEVER]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1398.

61). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are creating and forming surreal religious beliefs in [WHATEVER].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1399.

62). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants’ activities sanctioning Modes of [Worship] manifested by their “[God of Gold]” (“[GOG]”) as the [WHATEVER].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1402.

63). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] a cardinal principle of his religion is not to believe in [GOG].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1402.

64). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants’ [GOG] is not a god he wants to have faith in or profess [Worship] in a façade of core values, tax administration, and strategic plans.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1404.

65). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are permitting [THE CODE] to compel forced associations with the IRS and their [GOG].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1405.

66). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants have brought into existence an “[Incarnate Spirit of [THE CODE] being the Encoded Syntax Messiah of THEIRS]” per se as (“[Syntax Messiah]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1406.

67). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are approving an IRS entity clothed with authority as "that in which one trusts" for “[The Worship of Money and Egregious Wealth]” *per se* as (“[Mammon]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1407.

68). FOR THE RECORD, the [ORDERS] ***has compelled the Plaintiff to make a choice.*** A

continuing of the harm inflicted upon Plaintiff by the challenged law, conduct and activity of the Defendants, as well as accept *diminished fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment. This compared to the *conformity with the requirements of Rule 8* to obtain a governmental benefit of court sanctioned relief involving Defendants' beliefs, activities, conduct or from enjoining IRS enforcement of the [THE CODE] specified herein. A choice creating heartfelt burdens on Plaintiff.

69). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff shall remained uncertain as to declare rights and legal remedies promulgated under the U.S. Constitution and [CLP] because of Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*, and now compromised by the insipid thoughts and actions of the Court unjust [ORDERS] weighed upon First Amendment *free exercise principles*, because declaratory relief is, therefore, appropriate to resolve these controversies of constitutionally protected interest.

70). FOR THE RECORD, The U.S. Supreme Court has held that Federal or State Government may not deny a benefit to a person on a basis that infringes his constitutionally protected interest, especially his interest in freedom of speech. For if the government could deny a benefit to a person because of his constitutionally protected speech or associations, his exercise of those freedoms would in effect be penalized and inhibited. This would allow the government to "produce a result which [it] could not command directly." *Speiser v. Randall*, 357 U. S. 513, 357 U. S. 526. Such interference with constitutional rights is impermissible. Emphasis added.

71). FOR THE RECORD, This civil action docket sheet should properly represent this case **“Cause: 28:2201 Injunction”** with the “Nature of Suit” as First Amendment challenges/violations seeking declaratory and other appropriate relief. Currently the record does not reflect this fact.

Wherefore premises considered, and relief sought, this Notice touches the letters & spirit of the Court's [ORDERS] with Plaintiff seeking a remedy in *statutory* and *constitutional relief* through an “ORIGINAL VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF IN THIS PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST

AMENDMENT". However, the [Judge] and [Judge Ross] of the Court are attempting to exclude from a public place (U.S. District Courthouse) a person, (in this case the Plaintiff) engaged in *peaceful expressive activity* solely because the government actors fears, dislikes, or disagrees with the views expressed. Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] and his *notice pleadings* seeks a *measure of justice and law*.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: May 8, 2017

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

VERIFICATION OF NOTICE

I, Terry Lee Hinds of lawful age is the Plaintiff in this civil action. I verify that I read this verification and Notice filed in this case: FILE NUMBER: 4:17 – CV – 750 JMB on May 8, 2017, and declare under penalty of perjury and under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing facts in the Notice are correct and true to the best of my knowledge, information and my sincerely held religious beliefs.

Respectfully submitted,

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

Executed this 8th day of May, 2017

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 8th day of May, 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 # 7009-0960-0000-0249-6866 at the following address:

U.S. Attorney or Acting U.S. Attorney Costantin
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: May 8th, 2017

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

LEGAL NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING:

Plaintiff mailed a copy to Gregory L. Mokodean not because of any assume legal right and/or reasonability or responsibility of the Plaintiff, rather for my respect for the U.S. Justice Department

Gregory L. Mokodean
Trial Attorney, Tax Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7238
Washington, D.C. 20044
First Class U.S. Mail & Non-Certified

Signatures of

Date: May 8th, 2017

TERRY LEE HINDS, *Pro se*
438 Leicester Square Drive
Ballwin, Missouri 63021
636-675-0028