

**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: <b>4:17 – CV – 750 JMB</b>
<i>Pro se,</i>	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
-Vs-	}	
	}	
“UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT,	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	

---

**FIFTH 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 without the verbal vanguard of due process striking [OVC/Petition] without notice, *self-evident* when the Court issued Memorandum and Order dated 23<sup>rd</sup> 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, Plaintiff’s case, its controversies and [OVC/Petition] involves, in part, Plaintiff’s *free exercise rights* to protests Defendants’ acts and usurping activities, *inter alia*, with the *free exercise right or privilege* to protest a Court ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8.

4). IN THE RECORD, “A *review of the Complaint shows that it fails to comply with the strictures of Rule 8(a)*” as written in the Court’s order (Doc. No. 8). However Rule 8(a) concerns more than “*short and plain statement of the claim(s)*” leaving the Plaintiff to search for directions based on the *application of law* within the Court’s order (Doc. No. 8). However, this Court’s order (Doc. No. 8) decreed the *application of the law* from Case: 4:05-cv-01853-ERW Doc. #: 37 Filed: 06/06/06, having liability cases to RICO claims. The case law cited by the Court provides no real guidance or legal framework what constitutes a lack of conformity with the vague and ambiguous requirements of Rule 8 or “*strictures of Rule 8(a)*”.

5). The preceding [Court’s Presiding Judge, the Honorable John M. Bodenhausen] (“[Judge]”) made a *review, finding, and Order* thereby imposed a judge’s content, viewpoint

based, and subject matter restrictions on Plaintiff's *pure speech* communicated and expressed as and within [OVC/Petition]. Pure speech which involves the use of written or oral words alone that is necessary to convey the subject matter or the content of the communication, message or knowledge presented. "If the First Amendment means anything, it means that regulating speech must be a last—not first—resort." *Thompson v. W. States Med. Ctr.*, 535 U. S. 357, 373 (2002).

6). The Court is a forum for pure speech, by articulating one's position and the expression of one's conduct, presenting a public exhibit as evidence, with the fundamental right to protest, make objections, and make official complaints or petition the government for issues or subject matter under the Court's jurisdiction. When the government creates a limited forum (designated forum) for speech, certain restrictions may be necessary to define the limits and purposes of the program. "[I]f the government [can] achieve its interests in a manner that does not restrict speech or that restricts speech less, it must do so." *Thompson*, 535 U. S. at 371.

7). The [Judge] in this case speaks for the government, and when the government speaks; for instance to promote its own policies, rules or to advance a particular idea, it is, in the end, accountable to not creating crudely crafted burdens of law or enforcing decisions that are the least restrictive means to accomplish any unyielding government purposes sought to be served by their actions. This case the [Judge] evoked the **2006 Edition** of the Federal Rules of Procedures ("Fed. R. Civ. P."). However the Court in other jurisdiction are evoking **2016 Edition** Fed. R. Civ. P. manifesting crudely crafted burden of law on the Plaintiff.

8). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff, acting as *pro se* and without the advice or legal skills or experiences of a lawyer to be able to amend a complaint "*in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8 no later than March 20, 2017*" manifests a crudely crafted burden of law on the Plaintiff. This is particularly true, in this case as Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] has used allegations, assertions,

and averments. “Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rulemaking or legislation which would abrogate them.” see *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)

9). FOR THE RECORD, in this case the [Judge] is creating insiders and outsiders through the unbridled power of Rule 8(d)(1) that “In General. Each **allegation** must be simple, concise, and direct.”) as under **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. However, it should be noted **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P (e)(1) concerns that “Each **averment** of a pleading shall be simple, concise, and direct.”). The words **allegation** and **averment** have different meanings according to Black’s Law Dictionary 7<sup>th</sup> Edition.

10). IN THE RECORD, *a work of injustice* becomes self-evident when the [Judge]’s order (Doc. No. 8) dictating a surreal *inequality*: “***Taken together, Rules 8(a) and 8(e)(1) underscore the emphasis placed on clarity and brevity by the federal pleading rules***”. This is because **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(e)(1) concerns: “*Pleading to Concise and Direct; Consistency*” whereas **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(e) concerns: “*Construing Pleadings. Pleadings must be construed so as to do justice.*”

11). FOR THE RECORD, *a work of injustice* becomes self-evident when the [Judge] *sua sponte* decisionmaking, issued Memo & Order (Doc. No. 8) decreeing with a surreal liberty the ***application of the law in this case is exactly the same as***, a case **11 years** ago, utilizing a Memo & Order, ***word for word*** for a ***class action*** lawsuit, having over **260 counts** and **four RICO claims**.

12). FOR THE RECORD, That case, involving many defendants, consolidated cases or Plaintiffs about certain violations of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act. A Master Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint that ***defendants filed a responsive pleading in opposition, and Plaintiffs filed a reply thereto***. No such activities, issues or legal matters exist in Plaintiff’s case, but burdens free exercise principles of the First Amendment.

13). FOR THE RECORD, *a work of injustice* becomes self-evident when one's unbridled discretion has the absolute force to burden *fundamental rights*, or worst, a judicial rule (Rule 8 conformity) having the power *banning speech*, as now existing in this case and its controversies. Indeed, "the 'distinction between laws burdening and laws banning speech is but a matter of degree.'" *Sorrell v. IMS Health, Inc.*, 131 S. Ct. 2653, 2664 (2011) (quoting *United States v. Playboy Entm't Grp., Inc.*, 529 U.S. 803, 812 (2000)).

14). Furthermore, Federal Rules of Procedures ("Fed. R. Civ. P.") or descriptive matter relating to the contents of Rule 8 is not enacted as *positive law*. Fed. R. Civ. P exists as *prima facie* evidence of the law only. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the Statute at Large to determine the "legal evidence" of the Law. When challenged in a court of law, Rule 8 does not prevail over Statutes at Large when the two are inconsistent as held in *In Stephan v. United States*, 319 U.S. 423, 426 (1943): "By 1 U.S.C. § 54(a), the Code establishes 'prima facie' the laws of the United States. But the very meaning of "prima facie" is that the Code cannot prevail over the Statutes at Large when the two are inconsistent."

15). 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).

16). 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.

17). **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:

### **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

Violation of the Free Exercise Clause in the Right of Protest Activities, *inter alia*  
Violation of limitations in the Sixteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution  
***Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and other Appropriate Relief***

¶ 4414. Plaintiff hereby re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation, fact or averment in this [OVC], as though fully set forth herein.

¶ 4415. The Plaintiff wishes to engage in free exercise activities and conduct protected under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and not as any person in a personal stake or having a Taxpayer's status as an invasion of one's [Constitutionally Protected Interests].

¶ 4416. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have violated, and are continuing to violate, Plaintiff's right of Protest Activities, through his right to be left alone, to think, to privacy, to work, in effect as undisputed activities protected under the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

¶ 4417. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established The [Govspel] [Body of Rites] [Peter to Paul Mandates] as [THE WORDS] of THEIRS transforming the census of citizens into itemized lists of sanctified customers in violation of the Sixteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

¶ 4418. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Refunds] in violation of expressed powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4419. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have

established [Exemptions] in violation of expressed powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4420. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Tax Credits] in violation of expressed powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4421. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Tax Deductions] in violation of said powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4422. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Enumerations] in violation of expressed powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4423. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Form 1040] in violation of expressed powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4424. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have established [Abatements] in violation of expressed powers in the Sixteenth Amendment.

¶ 4425. 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 the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

¶ 4426. 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.

¶ 4427. Unless restrained by this Court, Defendants will continue to subject Plaintiff to these by denying him fundamental constitutional rights.

¶ 4428. 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*.

¶ 4429. 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 [Constitutionally Protected Interests],

an unenumerated right of which warrants enforcement or judgment by this court.

¶ 4430. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendants as to their respective legal rights and duties as set forth in Count V and Plaintiff's Fifth Claim for Relief, thereby warrants Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and other Appropriate Relief.

18). FOR THE RECORD, "If there is a bedrock principle underlying the First Amendment, it is that the government may not prohibit the expression of an idea simply because society finds the idea itself offensive or disagreeable." See *Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397, 414 (1989).

19). FOR THE RECORD, "No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives." *United States v. Lee*, 106 U.S. 196 (1882).

### **BACKGROUND AND FACTS**

20). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' establishment/endorsement of The [Govspel] [Body of Rites] [Peter to Paul Mandates] as [THE WORDS] of THEIRS permits the Plaintiff the right to protests such religious activities, *inter alia*, Defendants violating the limitations in the Sixteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

21). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates and has averred Defendants' establishment/endorsement of the "[Taxpayers Advocate Service]" *de facto* as "[Church of What's Happening Now]" *per se* as "[Church]" manifesting and advancing "[Your Voice at the IRS]" *per se* as a ("[Theology Forum]").



22). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates, as well as, has averred Defendants' establishment/endorsement of a marriage & dichotomy between the sacred & profane through or as Plaintiff [believes] manifested by "[Taxology & Taxism Theologies of THEIRS]" *per se* as ("[Theologies]").

23). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants' IRS acts, beliefs and behaviors with "[Government Speech creating spirituality, assessment & empowering Body/Mind/Spirit]" *per se* as ("[Government Speech]").

24). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to the Lemon Test Purpose Prong, such as Defendants activities compelling Plaintiff or forces a person "to profess a belief or disbelief in a religion".

25). 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 activities are making a person's religious beliefs relevant to his or her standing in the political community by conveying a message that religion or a particular religious belief is preferred.

26). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to Lemon Test Entanglement Prong, such as Defendants' actions and IRS activities are tantamount to a relationship pregnant with involvement within the realms of religious activity and of religion.

27). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to Lemon Test Entanglement Prong such as creating Stealthy Seamless Intrusions of [Interfaith], *inter alia*.

28). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain *free exercise clause violations* with

*fundamental free exercise principles* in [The right to be left alone, to think, to privacy and to work as Constitutionally Protected Interests] *per se* as (“[Constitutionally Protected Interests]”)

29). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain *free exercise clause violations* with governmental compulsion of a particular religious or ideological message advancing IRS’ activities manifesting compelled speech and compulsory unification of opinions with *income tax by our confession*.

30). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] germane violations of the Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine, such as with “[IRS Tax Tables, Brackets & Rates, or exclusions, inter alia]” (“[Enumerations]”).

31). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain free exercise clause rights and fundamental liberty principles such as [Constitutionally Protected Interests].

32). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] the wisdom or light of law in “[Controlling Legal Principles]” (“[CLP]”) Plaintiff relies on for secular/religious beliefs and practices such as with *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943) – *a touchstone of liberty under law*.

33). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants have established and endorsed the “[Force and Effect of Law Respecting an Establishment of Religion]” *per se* as (“[THE WORDS]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 222.

34). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] an IRS’ Alternative Worship Service is in **Belief-O-Matic**.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 882.

35). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ actions in Belief-O-Matic – IRS Written Determinations advances [THE WORDS] of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2797.

36). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ actions in Belief-O-Matic – Private Letter

Rulings advances [THE WORDS] of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2798.

37). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ actions in Belief-O-Matic – Cross References as beliefs rooted in religion advances [THE WORDS] of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2799.

38). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants’ Belief-O-Matic advances an official religion of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2924.

39). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] that Defendants’ Belief-O-Matic exist as IRS Written Determinations.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2925.

40). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] that Defendants’ Belief-O-Matic exist as Private Letter Rulings.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2926.

41). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] that Defendants’ Belief-O-Matic exist as Cross References beliefs are rooted in religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2927.

42). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause requires that Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, shall have a secular purpose with a person’s [Constitutionally Protected Interests].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1816.

43). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s avers [The Policy] converts Plaintiff’s free exercise of unalienable rights to Life, Liberties and the Pursuant of Happiness in [Constitutionally Protected Interests] as described herein into a crime, offense or code violation.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3569.

44). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ [THE CODE] [THE WORDS] and [The Policy], as an artful blend works in opposition of Plaintiff’s personal constitution creating a sacrifice of his [Constitutionally Protected Interests].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3577.

45). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants IRS’ activities described herein, manifested a personal stake existing as [To LIVE as EVIL] in effect, in direct opposition to Plaintiff’s [Constitutionally

Protected Interests].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 4007.

46). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers his Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment guarantees him the right to the “Circle of Life” existing as [Constitutionally Protected Interests].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 4069.

47). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers he has [The right to be left alone, to think, to privacy and to work as Constitutionally Protected Interests] per se (“[Constitutionally Protected Interests]”) being Protected conduct and of liberty interests under the free exercise of the First Amendment.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 4070.

48). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [Q.U.E.S.T.] is a free exercise of [Constitutionally Protected Interests].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 4239.

49). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff seeks to prevent Defendants from interfering with his constitutional protected conduct and activity in [Constitutionally Protected Interests] averred *supra*.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 4310.

50). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants omnipotence in [THE WORDS] of THEIRS harvests the fruits of this spiritual miscarriage, or in time, yields a physical miscarriage of justice. These religious exercises of THEIRS are elevated or embodied in a spiritual marriage with any person who practices [THE CODE] through a poetic license revealed in [THE WORDS] of THEIRS. Such acts confirm or advocates confess ecclesiastical supremacy of the IRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 16.

51). IN THE RECORD, “Advocates of this embodied/spiritual marriage participate or have conviction in “voluntary compliance”, an essential religious discipline, as written in [THE WORDS] of THEIRS. Plaintiff [believes] Defendants’ Creed [“Our core values guide our path to achieving our vision”] *per se* (“[Creed]”) accomplishes a religious bondage, shaping the core

values of a person. This religious [Creed] converts taxpayers into taxprayers for an organized religion. [OVC/Petition] ¶ 17.

52). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' establishment/endorsement of The [Govspel] [Body of Rites] [Peter to Paul Mandates] as [THE WORDS] of THEIRS, advanced by the IRS and its [Church] through a [Theology Forum] in support of Defendants' [Theologies] has manifested [Government Speech] 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.

53). 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 supported by evidence and the law applied to that evidence, advancing constitutional resolutions that can be justified by the *exercise of reason*.

54). 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 to protest* concerning any of Defendants' IRS activities in indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting *taxpayers* into *taxprayers* with the establishment and/or endorsement of religion in the Collective Experience of THEIRS for "[The fusion of religion, revenue & returns into an Orthodoxy of THEIRS]" *per se* as ("[Orthodoxy of THEIRS]"); being more particularly described in Exhibits I #1 through I #53; attached to [OVC/Petition] and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

55). IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are establishing or endorsing "[Publications, Instructions & Forms of THEIRS or to "see" their stepping stones of enlightenment values]" *per se* ("[Govspel]")." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1437.

56). IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are approving "[The policies, rules, guidelines & mandates created to rob Peter to pay Paul]" *per se* as

("[Peter to Paul Mandates]")." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1457.

57). IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates [Peter to Paul Mandates] is for the advancement of a religion and religious belief." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1458.

58). IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are establishing, endorsing or prescribing form or manner governing the words or actions for a ceremony as "[Benefits or privileges offered & provided when making a [proper return] to a system of [Worship]]" per se as ("[Body of Rites]")." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1443.

59). IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are creating "The Taxpayer Bill of Rights" as the [Body of Rites] for Taxology." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1444.

60). IN THE RECORD, "Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates there is no legitimate, compelling interest, or clear secular purpose on the subject matter of [Body of Rites]." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1445.

61). 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.

62). 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*.

63). **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.

64). 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 8<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2017



**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY**

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup>, 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 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017

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