

**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 A SHORT AND PLAIN STATEMENT OF THE CLAIM SHOWING
THE PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO RELIEF UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT
AND, IN THE ASSESSMENT OF TRUTH FOR A
*fact-based pleading and Rule 8 entitlement; giving rise to plausibility of “entitlement to relief”***

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). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s suit is not *groundless* or *meritless* within a *system of justice*. However, at present this case and its controversies are being adjudicated by *just-a-system of justifications* and becomes *self-evident* when the Court issued Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (Doc. No. 8). A review of this *instant* Order *to strike the entire breath and merits* of [OVC/Petition] defeats an adversarial *system of justice* and does not advance a defining and distinctive feature of the United States’ legal system.

3). FOR THE RECORD, at present, this case and its controversies are based on the Court’s lack of endorsement of Plaintiff’s sacred right of [conscience] and becomes *self-evident* when the Court issued Memorandum and Orders (see Doc. Nos. 8 & 18). This [OVC/Petition] is not about liability, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, civil rights, the conformity with the requirements of Rule 8 or any other surreal or quasi legal idea in (Doc. No. 8 & 18). Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates this case and its controversies is about *liberty under law* and religion as law *versus* legal reason of law.

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 pure speech of [Protected Conduct]. 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). The Court & [Judge] Ordered, in part: “that Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8 no later than March 20, 2017.” This Order infringes on Plaintiff’s sacred right of [conscience], *as well as*, Plaintiff’s most sacred precincts of private & domestic life. This Order manifesting stealthy encroachments on ***fundamental free exercise principles*** of the First Amendment, when Orders forces Plaintiff ***to deliver a different message under exactly the same circumstances.***

6). Pursuant to Local Rule 2.08, and Plaintiff’s anxieties about a fair hearing and due process requested and received a random 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.” (hereinafter “[Judge Ross]”).

7). FOR THE RECORD, the Court’s adjudication of Plaintiff’s case and its controversies exist in *conditional law* not *constitutional law*. The three existing Court’s Orders [Doc. Nos. 8, 18 & 29] (“[ORDERS]”) manifesting apprehensions or uncertainties are of ***conditional values*** of the [Judge] vs. ***constitutional values*** of the Plaintiff’s *life, liberty and pursuit of happiness*, as well as, Plaintiff’s righteousness claim in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

8). 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."

9). 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.

10). [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*.

11). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s “[sincerely held religious beliefs]” (“[believes]”); are not an *assumption of truth*. Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates his [OVC/Petition] is in the *assessment of truth* for a fact-based pleading and Rule 8 entitlement; giving rise to plausibility of “*entitlement to relief*” versus a *compulsory production* of an amended complaint, Plaintiff’s private thoughts, or any record and account to be in *conformity with the requirements* of Rule 8.

12). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [conscience] dictates and personal constitution demand that Plaintiff’s *fundamental free exercise rights* shall not be limited to the surreal conformity with the requirements of Rule 8. Furthermore, *any conformity* with the requirements of Rule 8, does not prevail over the First Amendment or shall infringe on the Plaintiff’s Quintessential Rights of [Controlling Legal Principle] (“[CLP]”) being more particularly described in Exhibits C #1 through C #96; attached to [OVC/Petition] and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

13). FOR THE RECORD, any court that would allow, support or continue to advance this case and its controversies listed as: “Applicable Law: 42 U.S.C. § 1981” and “Cause: 42 U.S.C. § 1981 Civil Rights” and as “Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other” including but not limited to other surreal acts or a *doctrine of legalisms* is not demanded by Plaintiff’s right [conscience] or U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines, *free exercise rights* or Plaintiff’s establishment clause challenges.

14). FOR THE RECORD, the Court sanctioned a case and “COMPLAINT FOR PERMANENT

INJUNCTION AND OTHER RELIEF” filed by the Defendants ON 11/02/2010 case #1:10-cv-07068 that has noticeable pleading defectives and a lack of conformity with the requirements of Rule 8. This complaint of **74 pages** involves only 3 federal taxing statutes, whereas Plaintiff’s 549 pages [OVC/Petition] involves over 2000 federal taxing statutes as a *subject matter* of religion, or as law respecting an establishment of religion using stealthy encroachments. A [OVC/Petition] by way of *fundamental free exercise rights*, with violations of the U.S. Constitution, *due process* and U.S. Supreme Court doctrines and tests, including but not limited to a PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, with Plaintiff seeking a proper DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF.

15). The United States Supreme Court in *Boyd v. United States*, 116 U.S. 616 (1886) gave *insight* to a proper *governmental objective* involving a *compulsory production* of the private books and papers using stealthy encroachments: “It may be that it is the obnoxious thing in its mildest and least repulsive form; but illegitimate and unconstitutional practices get their first footing in that way, namely, by silent approaches and slight deviations from legal modes of procedure. This can only be obviated by adhering to the rule that constitutional provisions for the security of person and property should be liberally construed. A close and literal construction deprives them of half their efficacy, and leads to gradual depreciation of the right, as if it consisted more in sound than in substance. It is the duty of courts to be watchful for the constitutional rights of the citizen, and against any stealthy encroachments thereon. Their motto should be *obsta principiis*.” (*Withstand the beginnings — that is, resist the first insidious approaches of anything dangerous or evil.*)

16). FOR THE RECORD, A judge’s *sua sponte* decisionmaking, and/or with the Court acting on its own initiative, on the matters 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 Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8; ***present or past.*** See *Erickson v. Pardus*, 127 S.Ct. 2197 (2007).

17). 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.

18). **IN THE RECORD**, as to Plaintiff's ***free exercise right*** to *petition constitutional claims seeking court sanctioned and statutory relief* pleaded SHORT AND PLAIN STATEMENTS OF THE CLAIM in an [OVC/Petition] as set forth herein:

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the Free Exercise Clause in the Right of Conscience, *inter alia*
Violations of Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution
Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and other Appropriate Relief

¶ 4385. Plaintiff hereby re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation, fact or averment in this [OVC], as though fully set forth herein.

¶ 4386. The Plaintiff wishes to engage in activities and conduct protected under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and a righteousness in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. upholding the most sacred precincts of private & domestic life as the mind is a sacred place with the human heart (emotions) being a sacred space.

¶ 4387. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have violated, and are continuing to violate, Plaintiff's right of [conscience] or in most sacred precincts of private & domestic life as the mind is a sacred place with the human heart (emotions) being a sacred space conduct and activities guaranteed or protected under the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

¶ 4388. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants

establishment and endorsement of an Internal Religious Service, aka IRS is in violation of the constitutional purpose driven fruits set forth in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4389. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have stigmatized the Plaintiff and others similarly situated with the legal status as Non-filers existing as Non-Believers of THEIRS infringing on Plaintiff right of [conscience].

¶ 4390. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Refunds] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4391. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Exemptions] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4392. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Tax Credits] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4393. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Tax Deductions] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4394. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Enumerations] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4395. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Form 1040] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause

1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4396. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Abatements] in violation of the enumerated power in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4397. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendant has violated, and is continuing to violate, Plaintiff's rights, privileges or immunities as well as Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

¶ 4398. The laws, customs, practices, and policies established by Defendants are the cause in fact of the constitutional violations or the redressable injury by a message of endorsement.

¶ 4399. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to subject Plaintiff to these unconstitutional laws, customs, policies, and practices, causing Plaintiff irreparable harm by denying him fundamental constitutional rights.

¶ 4400. Plaintiff has a right to have this Court declare his free exercise rights under the First Amendment as those rights are restricted and infringed by Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*.

¶ 4401. Plaintiff is uncertain as to his declare rights and legal remedies promulgated by Plaintiff's [Q.U.E.S.T.] that manifested a Quintessential Right as to one's [conscience], an unenumerated right of which warrants enforcement or judgment by this court.

¶ 4402. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendants as to their respective legal rights and duties as set forth in Count III and Plaintiff's Third Claim for Relief, thereby warrants Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and other Appropriate Relief.

19). 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)).

20). The U.S. Supreme Court has interpreted the term "liberty" in the due process clauses broadly: "Although the Court has not assumed to define "liberty" with any great precision, that term is not confined to mere freedom from bodily restraint. Liberty under law extends to the full range of conduct which the individual is free to pursue, and it cannot be restricted except for a proper governmental objective." See *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497, 500 (1954).

BACKGROUND AND FACTS

21). Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants' establishment/endorsement of an "[Internal Religious Service aka IRS]" ("IRS") is a religious Orthodoxy and powerful entity which has published an "IRS Historical Fact Book: A Chronology 1646 -1992"- An Orthodoxy's 'Promised Land'. A viewpoint and its discrimination of the IRS existence created in the year 1646. Defendants' viewpoint discrimination manifesting itself as a facility tax on the mind and abilities of people within their pursuit of happiness or within the liberty of labor and life in the New World.

22). FOR THE RECORD, Defendants' viewpoint discrimination manifesting "[The human mind, a sacred place becoming the scene of a thought crime]" *per se* ("thought crimes") advanced by *undue influences* of "[the giving of new and useful information to the IRS' Tree of Knowledge of good beliefs and evil practices]" *per se* ("Intellectual Tithing") taxing the human spirit and soul. Plaintiff [believes] that tax credits are the model day Temple currency of Defendants' IRS.

23). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates, as well as, has averred Defendants' establishment/endorsement of an [IRS] or Internal Revenue Service violates the *free exercise clause rights and principles* of the First Amendment. The [IRS] or Internal Revenue Service

exhibiting viewpoint discrimination as [thought crimes] through the undue influence of [Intellectual Tithing] and offerings.

24). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff's [believes] that "[IRS Pilgrimage - Knowing the Unknowable Answers Exist]" *per se* as ("[IRS Pilgrimage]") offers real redemption through [Refunds] & [Exemptions], and surreal salvation through a "[14 Points of Policy or Criteria of an IRS' Church]" *per se* as ("[IRS House of Worship]"). These and other activities of Defendants converts taxpayers into taxprayers.

25). Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants' establishment/endorsement of [IRS] or Internal Revenue Service has generated substantive issues against Plaintiff's [CLP], *free exercise rights* of religion and religious beliefs and with his establishment challenges relating to the advancement of religion and religious conversion, *as a distinct & palpable injury in fact*.

26). Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates Defendants' establishment/endorsement of an [IRS] manifested an [IRS House of Worship]. Plaintiff averred Defendants' [IRS Pilgrimage] advances a Systematic Theology of **THEIRS** that formulates an orderly, rational and coherent account of the IRS, or Internal Revenue Service *usurping activities, inter alia*.

27). Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates Defendants' [IRS] or an Internal Revenue Service violates the letters and spirit of the First Amendment, as well as, U.S. Supreme decision or doctrines, and Plaintiff's personal constitution as set forth and described in the [OVC/Petition].

28). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to the Lemon Test Purpose Prong, such as a separation between church and state influences, *inter alia*.

29). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to the Lemon Test Primary Effect Prong, such as,

Defendants granting unbridled power to the Internal Revenue Service or IRS in defining & approving a church or its status, *inter alia*.

30). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to Lemon Test Entanglement Prong, such as Defendants' usurping conduct and IRS activities are clothed with authority and "that in which one trusts".

31). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain *free exercise clause* violations of the right of conscience, *inter alia* and with his fundamental free exercise principles and personal constitution as an artful blend for his life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

32). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] germane violations of the Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine, such as "[Refundable/Nonrefundable Tax Credits]" *per se* ("[Tax Credits]") existing as Defendants' Temple Currency of the [IRS] and Internal Revenue Service.

33.) IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates free exercise principles do not cause a man to sacrifice his integrity, his rights, the freedom of his convictions, the honesty of his feelings, or the independence of his thoughts. These are Mankind's supreme possessions. These are not the objects of sacrifice. Plaintiff [believes] the mind is a sacred place with the human heart (emotions) being a sacred space found within us all. Within these most sacred precincts of private & domestic life, religious experiences are created for many people or this Plaintiff." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3.

34). IN THE RECORD, this case and its controversies pertains to, in part: the Internal Religious Service *per se* as the IRS and "[The Church of Taxology - Internal Revenue Service]" *per se* as ("[House of Worship]") and [IRS Pilgrimage - Knowing the Unknowable Answers Exist]" *per se* ("[IRS Pilgrimage]"), being more particularly described in **Sections J, K, L, M, N, O, & P** in the [OVC/Petition] and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

35). 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.

36). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates [THE CODE] induces a form of a spiritual abortion, as a stillborn plan of escape from laying and collecting taxes on incomes from whatever sources derived. Over 19 trillion dollars in a national debt confirms this stillborn plan of escape being ineffectual, abortive or fruitless from the creation of its very inception.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 15.

37). In THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates “[Enactments of Law &/or Application of Internal Revenue Laws]” *per se* (“[THE CODE]”) is the establishment and endorsement of law respecting an establishment of religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 215

38). IN THE RECORD, a self-evident truth and “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are establishing “**Your Voice at the IRS**” for a [Theology Forum] of **THEIRS** for Church of What’s Happening Now.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 612.

39). IN THE RECORD, “This functions as [To LIVE as EVIL] in one’s life, as evidenced by, a genuine nexus occurs with tax refunds, exemptions, exclusions, credits, deductions, adjustments, and abatements as dutiful. This serves as evidence of an organized religion, its endeavors or its expressive activities in the various forms of salvation offered and redemption provided by Taxology. Such *dealings* with the IRS transforms legal status as citizens into customers of **THEIRS**. [OVC/Petition] ¶ 21.

40). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants producing clear deprivations of, or use conduct

impermissibly infringes upon Plaintiff's free exercise rights of his [LLP] & [CLP], using evils, incursions or invasions on Fundamental Liberty Interests and Property Interests of the First Amendment. Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates his Liberty of Labor is a most sacred property & Individual Freedom of Mind – a sacred place. Such matters are beyond “Service + Enforcement = Compliance” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 23.

41). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff has a right to decline to foster such IRS religious, political, and ideological beliefs while exercising his Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment, its penumbral, as an unenumerated right of his. The Establishment/Free Exercise Clauses were to prevent such a fusion of governmental and religious functions; when so permeated by religion that the secular side cannot be separated from the sectarian, seeing taxpayers per se as taxprayers.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 24.

42). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff has a First Amendment *free exercise right* of religious beliefs; thereby [believes] in Taxology and [Taxism]; but conversely has a First Amendment Establishment right not to practice, partake or advance these established religions. Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates: **I am** an architect of my [LLP]. I know what is to come by the principle on which it is built. Freedom is the light of all sentient beings with the right to exist as **I Am**, not as *any person*.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 34.

43). IN THE RECORD, Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] recognized that his claims such as the one's presented therein are not based on allegations of "bad faith" or averments of "mere pretext." The Court gave Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] *no careful consideration*, concerning his *free exercise right to petition for constitutional relief* or in the right to protest Defendants' actions and activities of the IRS; born of *animus* towards this U.S. Citizen's rights of religious belief, protected speech, [conscience] or associational rights in general.

44). IN THE RECORD, “This Court, has manifested injustice when Trial by Ordeal is used against the Plaintiff to test his sincerely held religious belief by compelling him that he shall file an “Amended Complaint in conformity with the requirement of Rule 8”. This [OVC] are my *sincerely held religious beliefs.*” ([First Decl. HINDS] ¶7).

45). IN THE RECORD, against Defendants’ inequalities and injustices: “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates [CODE-1] and [CODE-2] and [CODE-3] and [26CFR] or the wording “Internal Revenue Code” in any existing Federal Statutes At Large for an income tax or its Amendments, collectively existing as [THE CODE] herein.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 220.

46). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s case and its controversies, “on the merits” decides claims by the most efficient means and captures this most basic aspiration of an ideal civil justice system. Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition] based upon the facts presented in evidence and the law applied to that evidence, advances a constitutional resolution that can be justified by the *exercise of reason.*

47). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s case and its controversies, when justly judged “on the merits” reveals *violations of the free exercise clause in the right of conscience*, that Defendants’ IRS activities are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting *taxpayers* into *taxprayers* with the establishment and/or endorsement of an *Internal Religious Service per se* as the IRS, being more particularly described in Exhibits G #1 through G#18; attached to [OVC/Petition] and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

48). IN THE RECORD, against Defendants’ inequalities or injustices: “Plaintiff [conscience] dictates the U. S. Constitution never granted any powers of taxation to allow the Defendants the power to destroy any person or citizen.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 425.

49). FOR THE RECORD, as to Plaintiff’s free exercise right of his “sincerely held religious belief” (“[believes]”) or the dictates of his [conscience] are not assumptions of Truth, rather in the

assessment of Truth for a *fact-based pleading* and Rule 8 entitlements *in this moral & legal battle*.

50). **FOR THE RECORD**, the prevalent formula, rule and focus of evil in the modern age is Mankind accepting “[A Complacent Policy of Indifference to Evil]” per se (“[To LIVE as EVIL]”). If the Court allows the interpretation or implementation in a “*conformity with the requirements of 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’*” to govern, dictate or define **First Amendment free exercise principles and rights**, our Nation will witness war, as written in The Book of Revelation.

51). Reagan declared over 50 years ago with the focus of evil in the modern age: “There is a price we will not pay. There is a point beyond which they must not advance”... *in any moral battle or legal battle* where simple, concise and direct thoughts or short and plain statements of expressive activity or speech governs, dictates or defines First Amendment free exercise/establishment rights.

Wherefore premises considered, and relief sought, this Notice touches the letters & spirit of the Court’s [ORDERS] with Plaintiff seeking a remedy in court sanction *legal 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