

**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.	}	

**SIXTH 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 23rd day of February, 2017 (Doc. No. 8).

3). FOR THE RECORD, 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. The preceding [Court’s Presiding Judge, the Honorable John M. Bodenhausen] (“[Judge]”) review, finding, and Order imposed on Plaintiff content, viewpoint based, and subject matter restrictions on Plaintiff who is *engaged in peaceful expressive activity* pursuant to *fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment and is expressed as and precisely assemble as Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition].

4). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s right to petition and protest, brings this action as a U.S. Citizen, not to define him as a Plaintiff or as “*any person*” “*dealing*” with the Internal Revenue Service or the Defendants, or the Court or its Judges; thereby to compel him to *file an Amended Complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8*. Any *conformity with the requirements of Rule 8* or [THE CODE] when based upon the *unbridled power* of a governmental actor(s) in connection with a complaint, petition or [Form 1040] opens the threshold of tranny over the minds of men, defeating the liberty within ones individual freedom of mind.

5). FOR THE RECORD, a complaint, petition or [Form 1040] inception begins within the freedom to think. [THE CODE] and Rule 8(d)(1) is premised on the Defendants desirability of

controlling a person's private thoughts. What make something “simple” is a matter of personal abilities or a person’s opinions. How is “concise” determined without the *free exercise rights* to petition ones’ complaints of Defendants’ activities? When does “direct” become the right answer or what direction or path is a correct one. Why would any human being of God or a creature of the government accept three words, “simple”, “concise” and “direct” as a legal factor concerning the *fundamental free exercise principles* set forth or described in the [OVC/Petition] is beyond reason.

6). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] the words we live by defines us, not to makes us as a tool, but as the creator of our life, liberty and the pursuits of happiness. The Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition] is not just words on some special paper, because it has become the body and spirit of what Plaintiff seeks to *secure, protect and defend* against the constitutional evils of this world.

7). IN THE RECORD, “The government ‘*cannot constitutionally premise legislation on the desirability of controlling a person's private thoughts.*’ Stanley v. Georgia, 394 U. S. 557, 566 (1969). First Amendment freedoms are most in danger when the government seeks to control thought or to justify its laws for that impermissible end. The right to think is the beginning of freedom, and speech must be protected from the government because speech is the beginning of thought.” See Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition, 535 U.S. 234 (2002). [OVC/Petition] ¶¶ 172 & 4145 and as Exhibit C- #90.

8). FOR THE RECORD, a person’s legal complaint, court petition or a [Form 1040] is the touchstone of peaceful expressive activity pursuant to *fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment. However, present day reality manifests “[The human mind, a sacred place becoming the scene of a thought crime]” *per se* (“[thought crimes]”). Plaintiff [believes] Defendants’ IRS, and currently the [Judge] are using religious means to serve governmental ends, the tombstone for liberty under law when pains, punishments or penalties prevails over U.S. Supreme doctrines, test

and a legal system that was to manifest Court of Justice, not *just-a-system of justification* for a *court of law*.

9). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] concerns Plaintiff's revelations in [Q.U.E.S.T.] that warrants one's *Quintessential Rights* with the *prospective relief* in a right to exist as 'I Am' versus a *personal stake as defined, designed, driven, devalued, degraded, deprived*, or fearful to be *destroyed* by law respecting an establishment of religion in a matrix of religious *dealings*.

10). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff has the lawfully right to petition the Defendants pursuant to the *legal arguments* as presented in [OVC/Petition]; however existing legal arguments have been altered, changed or manifests into Rule 8 violations and other manifested injustices:

a). "Cause of Action: 42:1981"

b). "440 Civil Rights, Other"

c). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) "a great deal of judicial energy and resources would have to be devoted to restructuring the pleading and streamlining the unnecessary matter"

d). 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".

e). a *personal stake* created as *defined, designed, or driven*, by or in government conformity with the requirement of Rule 8.

f). invoking Federal Rules of Procedures only to evoked, misapply, misused or to exploit the **2006** Edition of Fed. R. Civ. P. RULE 8 as a precedent or a current rule in this case.

g). no notice given or a hearing date provided prior to [Judge] order striking Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition]

h. The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) made no mention of *seven causes of actions* with *seven claims for relief* established within Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition]

i). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) decrees: "As a matter of prudent case management, the Court directs Plaintiff to file a streamlined and reorganized Amended Complaint removing unnecessary and redundant allegations as required by Rule 8 thereby clarifying and expediting all further proceedings in the case to the advantage of the litigants, counsel, and the Court."

j). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) made no mention or officially recognizing this is as "Original Verified Complaint" only "Plaintiff purports to allege numerous constitutional violations in the 547-page Complaint with 4,451 paragraphs. A review of the Complaint shows that it fails to comply with the strictures of Rule 8(a)."

k). the court sanctioned PACER system, of which the Plaintiff not a part of, revealed to the Plaintiff "**549** pages" of his Complaint, not "**547**-page Complaint" as declared by the [Judge].

l). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) decrees: "Taken together, Rules 8(a) and 8(e)(1) underscore the emphasis placed on clarity and brevity by the federal pleading rules" with the [Judge] knowing Rules 8(a) has three (3) sections.

m). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) is practically *word for word* in a case of 11 years ago, with the *application of law* used from a liability case with the Appliance Act to a class action lawsuit, having over 260 counts and four RICO claims.

n). Plaintiff case is surrounded by the tainted water and environment or within natural driven prejudices with Pro Se complaints manifesting a lack of due process and a sense of Justice with this case.

o). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) made no mention that Plaintiff's case and its controversies, concerns of First Amendment *fundamental 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.

p). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) made *no mention* Plaintiff's case and its controversies, are in *conformity* with the requirements of "religion and what is central to one's sincerely held religious beliefs, its expressive activities, the nature of the relevant forums or the rule of law used, primarily aimed at protecting non-economic interests of a spiritual and religious nature as opposed to a physical or pecuniary nature." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1

q). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) made *no mention* that Plaintiff's case and its controversies, is an "action arising under the Establishment/Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution." [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1

r). The Court Memo/Order (Doc. No. 8) failed to mention or properly address that Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] was in fact a case, in part, of *first impression*, as well as existing as a "PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT".

t). reversible error occurred by deciding to reach the merits, or is "clearly wrong," or not an "interest of justice"; rather just-a-system of justifications or the tainted water of legalism.

11). FOR THE RECORD, "an unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords no protection; it creates no office; it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed." Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1886).

12). Manifest injustice means something which is 'obviously unfair' or 'shocking to the conscience.' It refers to an unfairness that is direct, obvious, and observable. Manifest injustice is essentially a violation of due process. The reversible error occurred by deciding to reach the merits in this case and its controversies or a review that is "clearly wrong," or not an "interest of justice". The Court Order does not service justice rather *just-a-system of justifications* for a court of law or

manifested as the tainted water of legalism crafted by the hidden hand of the great “WHATEVER” advanced by [Institutionalized Faith of THEIRS]” per se as (“[FAITH]”).

13). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s *free exercise of unalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness* is in the balance of the outcome of this case, with the scales of justice either with the foul mouth seen in a IRS logo or held by the lady of justice. The unfettered interchange of ideas for the bringing about legal and lawfully changes is possible with the due process of law.

14). 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).

15). 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.

16). **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:

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violation of the Free Exercise Clause in a Right to Petition for grievances, *inter alia*
Violations of the Supremacy Clause, Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution
Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and other Appropriate Relief

¶ 4431. Plaintiff hereby re-allege and incorporate by reference each and every allegation, fact or

avertment in this [OVC], as though fully set forth herein.

¶ 4432. The Plaintiff wishes to engage in activities and conduct protected under the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution with U.S. taxation laws made in pursuance thereof.

¶ 4433. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have violated, and are continuing to violate, Plaintiff's right in the freedom to petition for grievances or a petition seeking redress for an infringement or for satisfaction sought or gained by [Mankind's Supreme Possessions] conduct and activities protected under the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

¶ 4434. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have violated, and are continuing to violate, [Mankind's Supreme Possessions].

¶ 4435. By Defendants' law, conduct and activity alleged *supra*; it is evident Defendants have violated, and are continuing to violate, Supremacy Clause Article VI, Clause 2 concerning:

a.) The Establishment/Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment, and b.) The Rule of Law in Due Process of Law, Court applied tests and Public Forum Doctrine, and c.) The Sixteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution, and d.) Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and e.) The Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine, and f.) The Doctrine of Stare Decisis of the U.S. Supreme Court, and g.) Plaintiff's [CLP] that are germane to his secular belief and devout convictions as set forth or alleged *supra*.

¶ 4436. 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.

¶ 4437. 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.

¶ 4438. 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.

¶ 4439. 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*.

¶ 4440. 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 [Mankind's Supreme Possessions], an unenumerated right of which warrants enforcement or judgment by this court.

¶ 4441. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendants as to their respective legal rights and duties as set forth in Count VI and Plaintiff's Sixth Claim for Relief, thereby warrants Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and other Appropriate Relief.

17). FOR THE RECORD, When “[a]n intent to convey a particularized message [is] present, and in the surrounding circumstances the likelihood [is] great that the message would be understood by those who viewed it,” it is protected speech. *See Spence v. State of Wash.*, 418 U.S. 405, 410-11 (1974).

18). FOR THE RECORD, the First Amendment, specifically the *free exercise right* of the petition clause, establishes potential ***prospective relief***, and with civil or criminal case(s) involving *violations* of a person's ***constitutional rights, privileges, or immunities*** promulgates ***constitutional relief for First Amendment freedoms irreparable injury(s)***. As a threshold issue, the “loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” citing *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 374 (1976). see *New York Times Co. v. United States*, 403 U. S. 713, (1971).

19). FOR THE RECORD, the Court held in *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976) in part: Where First Amendment rights are involved, an even "greater degree of specificity" is required. *Smith v. Goguen*, 415 U.S. at 415 U. S. 573. See *Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U. S. 104, 408 U. S. 109 (1972); *Kunz v. New York*, 340 U. S. 290 (1951).

20). FOR THE RECORD, The same philosophy governs the approach of citizens or groups of them to administrative agencies (which are both creatures of the legislature, and arms of the executive) and to courts, the third branch of Government. Certainly the right to petition extends to all departments of the Government. The right of access to the courts is indeed but one aspect of the right of petition. See *Johnson v. Avery*, 393 U.S. 483, 485; *Ex parte Hull*, 312 U.S. 546, 549. See *California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited*, 404 U.S. 508 (1972).

BACKGROUND AND FACTS

21). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' establishment/endorsement of The Church Without Walls Ministries & The [Collective Experience] of THEIRS is in violation of the First Amendment and U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines.

22). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' establishment/endorsement within three powers of an "[IRS existing as "The Bureau" + "The Agency" = "The Service"]" *per se* as ("[Taxing Trinity]") is faith in action exercised as "*knowing how to know*".

23). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' activities are instituting "[Where a Religious Belief and Practice Exist as a Dichotomous Key of Confession]" *per se* ("[Voluntary Compliance]") and that Defendants is advancing Taxology through [Voluntary Compliance] = [Confession].

24). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] an IRS [Confession] is equivalent one's voluntary compliance advancing [A New Covenant and Special Dispensation Theology of THEIRS] *per se*

as [Dispensation].

25). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' establishment/endorsement with the Internal Revenue Service and the [IRS] or [It's a church being organized on corporal & corporate logic seen as a collective experience of religious phenomenon]" *per se* ("[Mega Church]") are utilizing the prestige, power, and influence of a public institution.

26). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff [believes] Defendants' establishment/endorsement the dutiful and expressive activities with [Form 1040] is a [covenant], petition & viewpoint, *inter alia*, forum of expressive activity.

27). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to the Lemon Test Purpose Prong, such as [THE WORDS] as a means to an unconstitutional end.

28). 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' conduct and activities complained of are making adherence to a religion relevant, *inter alia*.

29). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain establishment/endorsement clause challenges in relation to Lemon Test Entanglement Prong, such as Defendants are using religious means to serve governmental ends.

30). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain *free exercise clause violations* with *fundamental free exercise principles* evolving as Plaintiff's Rights to Petition for a redress of grievances.

31). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain *free exercise clause violations* with *fundamental free exercise principles* "[Tax Anti-Injunction Act 26 U.S.C. §7421(a) – the essence

of censorship/sacrilege]” per se as (“[Prior Restraint]”).

32). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] germane violations of the Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine, such as with The Federal Tax Return Filing Status/Badge as [Protected Speech].

33). Plaintiff averred within his [OVC/Petition] certain free exercise clause rights and fundamental liberty principles in [RFRA] vs. making a [proper return] existing as *an invasion of a legally protected interest*.

34). IN THE RECORD, this case and its controversies pertains to, in part: Church Without Walls Ministries & The [Collective Experience] of THEIRS, advanced by [Confession] and [Dispensation] and [Taxing Trinity] establishing [Mega Church] utilizing the prestige, power, and influence of a public institution; 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, “Defendants’ Internal Revenue Service has collected taxes or attempted to collect taxes through The Church Without Walls Ministries, its enumeration of its publications and such actions supports religious decision-making taking the place of public legislative authority.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1002.

36). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are surreptitiously sanctioning “[The Church Without Walls Ministries]” per se as (“[Ministries]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1489.

37). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants manifests no secular purposes because Defendants’ [The Church Without Walls Ministries]” per se as (“[Ministries]”) transfigures taxpayers as taxprayers and transforms U.S. citizens into customers of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1793.

38). IN THE RECORD, “[THE CODE] has no clear secular purpose but legislative outcomes of Defendants [Tax Credits] by believing in The Church Without Walls Ministries.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1885.

39). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause requires that Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, shall have a clear secular effect or a predominant secular effect by prohibiting TAX EXPENDITURES existing as The Church Without Walls Ministries making adherence to a religion relevant, inter alia.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1968.

40). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] the “[IRS existing as “The Bureau” + “The Agency” = “The Service”]” per se as (“[Taxing Trinity]”) is Defendants’ institutionalized faith of three powers in one body, being one substance, essence and nature of a usurping body of law for law respecting an establishment for organized religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 678.

41). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants’ [Taxing Trinity] is faith in action exercised as “knowing how to know”.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1499.

42). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are empowering a [Taxing Trinity] as having “One Look. One Voice. One IRS.”.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1500.

43). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause prohibits Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, from manifesting the [Taxing Trinity] for the foundation of an organized religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1695.

44). IN THE RECORD, “[THE CODE] has no clear secular purpose but legislative outcomes of Defendants endorsing a [Taxing Trinity].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1887.

45). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident

Defendants' IRS fosters, promotes or advances an excessive government entanglement by indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through a [Taxing Trinity].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2045.

46). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ law, conduct and activities listed herein are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through Defendants’ [Taxing Trinity].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2964.

47). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ [Taxing Trinity] is in reality religious institution manifesting [To LIVE as EVIL].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3443.

48). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] organized religion and its Mega Churches are being organized on corporal & corporate logic seen as a collective experience of religious phenomenon.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 276(c).

49). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants are creating a physical church body with shared religious values as “[It's a church being organized on corporal & corporate logic seen as a Collective Experience of religious phenomenon]” per se as (“[Mega Church]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1494.

50). IN THE RECORD, “[Mega Church] being manifested or endorsed by [THE WORDS].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1495.

51). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are building and establishing a [Mega Church] through IRS Worthship Ministries.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1496.

52). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause prohibits Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, from manifesting Mega Church as the religious underpinnings of belief and practice.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1693.

53). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident

Defendants have manifested Mega Church as the religious underpinnings of belief and practice.”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 1694.

54). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants’ IRS fosters, promotes or advances an excessive government entanglement by indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through Defendants’ [Mega Church].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2044.

55). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ IRS are compelling the Plaintiff to profess, practice or accept [Mega Church] as set forth herein existing as an invasion of a legally protected interest.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2890.

56). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ law, conduct and activities listed herein are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through Defendants’ [Ministries] and [Mega Church].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2963.

57). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ [Mega Church] is endorsed by [THE CODE].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3953.

58). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ [Mega Church] is manifested by Taxology.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3954.

59). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ [Mega Church] is preserved, protected and defended by Taxism.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3955.

60). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] an IRS [Confession] is equivalent one’s voluntary compliance.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 865.

61). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause prohibits Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, from manifesting [Confession] for the advancement and establishment of religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1691.

62). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants have manifested [Confession] for the advancement and establishment of religion.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1692.

63). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ IRS are compelling the Plaintiff to profess, practice or accept [Confession] as set forth herein existing as an invasion of a legally protected interest.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2892.

64). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ law, conduct and activities listed herein are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through [Confession] as [Voluntary Compliance].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2965.

65). IN THE RECORD, “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.

66). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ beliefs, activities and conduct herein created or is operating forums in a particular manner such as an expression of ideas or as a forum of expressive activity, such as in [Form 1040], one’s labor, law, online discussion, and correspondence.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 611.

67). 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.

68). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] an IRS’ Covenant is [Form 1040]” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 903.

69). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers that [Form 1040] is properly classified as private speech in a public forum.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 905.

70). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] that [Form 1040] is properly classified as private speech creating or allowing [Theology Forum].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 906.

71). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers that [Form 1040] is properly classified as [Protected Speech] for purposes of this case creating or allowing [Theology Forum].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 907.

72). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] that [Form 1040] is properly classified as religious speech and belief for purposes of this case creating or allowing [Theology Forum].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 908.

73). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates there is no legitimate, compelling interest, or clear secular purpose on the subject matter of [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1501.

74). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are advancing [Form 1040] as a covenant, petition & viewpoint, inter alia, a hybrid forum of expressive ideas or activity.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1502.

75). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are using [Form 1040] as content-based restrictions to regulate speech based on its subject matter or viewpoint.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1503.

76). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are forming a prenuptial agreement beyond all human understanding or reason through [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1504.

77). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are manifesting [Form 1040] as viewpoint based restrictions on protected speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1512.

78). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are manifesting [Form 1040] as Content-based restrictions regulating speech based on its viewpoint or subject matter of the speech at issue.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1513.

79). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates Defendants are manifesting [Form 1040] as an IRS Covenant to convert taxpayers into taxprayers.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1514.

80). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants are manifesting [Form 1040] as a religious covenant.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1515.

81). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are manifesting [Form 1040] as a petition from those seeking a redress for an infringement or for satisfaction sought or gained.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1516.

82). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are manifesting [Form 1040] as a forum of expressive activity.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1517.

83). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates [Form 1040] is used to redress of grievances.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1521.

84). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates Defendants are violating Plaintiff’s Rights to a petition for a redress of grievances when seeking redress for an infringement or for satisfaction sought or gained when compelled use a [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1522.

85). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause requires that Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, shall have a secular purpose with [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1801.

86). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants manifests no secular purpose because [Form 1040] transfigures taxpayers as taxprayers and transforms U.S. citizens into customers of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1802.

87). IN THE RECORD, “[THE CODE] has no clear secular purpose but a legislative outcome of Defendants endorsing and believing in [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1889.

88). IN THE RECORD, “[THE CODE] has no clear secular purpose but a legislative outcome

of Defendants endorsing and believing in [Form 1040] for Defendants Newest Covenant and Dispensation Theology of THEIRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1890.

89). IN THE RECORD, “The Establishment Clause prohibits Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, from manifesting [Form 1040] with a primary effect of substituting public legislative or policy authority for religious decision-making.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1977.

90). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants have established [Form 1040] with a primary effect of substituting public legislative authority for religious decision-making.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1978.

91). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein; it is evident Defendants’ IRS fosters, promotes or advances an excessive government entanglement by indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through [Form 1040] on its face and as applied to Plaintiff or others similarly situated under the First Amendment.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2050.

92). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers second-class citizenship status as a taxpayers makes it almost impossible to acquire business insurance without [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2111.

93). IN THE RECORD, “A person is asked on [Form 1040] “Do you want \$3 of your federal tax to go to the Presidential Election Campaign”.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2586.

94). IN THE RECORD, “As a U.S. taxpayer, a person is asked to make a political choice when filing out their [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2587.

95). IN THE RECORD, “Before a person can exercise that political choice and one’s free exercise of speech, that person must fill out and complete a [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2588.

96). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers during each of the last five years, approximately 33 million taxpayers have checked the "yes" box.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2589.

97). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] creates benefits granted or given by the Defendants.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2590.

98). IN THE RECORD, “As a matter of equity Plaintiff refuses to accept Defendants’ legal opinions or its policy decisions involving [Form 1040] for reasons as set forth herein.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2671.

99). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers a statutory or codified system of taxation by confession; with every rebate from a tax when conditioned upon conduct is in some measure a devout practice by taxing a person’s core values into a total submission in a [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2675.

100). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants have established [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2694.

101). IN THE RECORD, “Congress was not granted the power in the U.S. Constitution to establish [Form 1040] with regards to census and enumeration.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2695.

102). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] advanced by [Refunds] are government's displays of power with religious significance.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2724

103). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] provide information about the identity of the “speaker”.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2726.

104). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, Form 1040] per se [Form 1040] is a forum that encompasses or focus on the access sought by the speaker.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2727.

105). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers communication by [Form 1040] is essentially persuasive speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2742.

106). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers communication by [Form 1040] is religious or proselytizing speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2744.

107). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers communication by [Form 1040] is predictive speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2746.

108). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] begins as private speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2748.

109). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers communication by [Form 1040] is of private speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2749.

110). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] private speech is subject to content based restrictions by the Defendants.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2751.

111). IN THE RECORD, Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] private speech is transformed by Defendants’ law, conduct and activity alleged herein.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2752.

112). IN THE RECORD, “The private speech in [Form 1040] expresses information and is reflections of protected speech and Frist Amendment freedoms.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2753.

113). IN THE RECORD, “The private speech in [Form 1040] expresses communications, self-guidance, and self-regulation of behavior; Plaintiff merely seeks equal access to this forum to express his nonreligious viewpoint.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2754.

114). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers his private speech with IRS demands in the use of a [Form 1040] infringes on, limits or encroached on Plaintiff’s free exercise rights of the First Amendment.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2755.

115). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as a covenant violates the First Amendment clause.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2756.

116). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as a petition violates the First Amendment clause.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2757.

117). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] reveals a person or the Plaintiff’s

viewpoint with restrictions on protected speech which violates the First Amendment clause.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2758.

118). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] is a hybrid forum of government speech which violates the First Amendment clause.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2759.

119). IN THE RECORD, “[Form 1040] speech and practice exists as defining access sought by the speaker.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2760.

120). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] restricted speech and the practices of the Plaintiff which violates the First Amendment clause. [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1002. [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2761.

121). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ IRS are compelling the Plaintiff to profess, practice or accept [Form 1040] as set forth herein existing as an invasion of a legally protected interest.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2893.

122). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers IRS’ symbolism of submission is best witness in a taxpayer submitting there [Form 1040] each year.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2917.

123). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff’s [conscience] dictates IRS’ symbolism of submission as seen in [Form 1040] violates First Amendment freedoms of [Protected Speech] and [Protected Conduct] of the Plaintiff.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2919.

124). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] is censorship of Plaintiff’s protected speech.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2921.

125). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] manifests violence in Plaintiff’s words he lives by.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2922.

126). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ law, conduct and activities listed herein are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through [Form 1040].”

are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through [Form 1040].”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 2966.

127). IN THE RECORD, “The filing status one’s home address is on a [Form 1040].”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 3031.

128). IN THE RECORD, “The filing status of one’s home address is a U.S. census question.”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 3032.

129). IN THE RECORD, “The filing status of a first and last name is on a [Form 1040].”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 3033.

130). IN THE RECORD, “The filing status of a first and last name is a U.S. census question.”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 3034.

131). IN THE RECORD, “The information on how one person is related to another person is
on a [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3035.

133). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants sanctioning [Form 1040] generates a legalized effect
that not a Consequence of Appropriations made by Law.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3134.

134). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants authorizing [Form 1040] usurps the constitutional
provision of Art. I, Sec. 9, Clause 7, of the U.S. Constitution.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3135.

135). IN THE RECORD, “[THE CODE] forced Plaintiff to choose between surrendering First
Amendment rights and losing federal tax exempt status for himself under [Form 1040].”
[OVC/Petition] ¶ 3190.

136). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ legislative purpose of [Form 1040] is aimed at
establishing, sponsoring, or supporting an organized religion of THEIRS. [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3373.

137). IN THE RECORD, “A [Form 1040] infringes on Plaintiff ability to be a speaker who has
the autonomy to choose the content of his own message to the IRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3384.

138). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] is of religious beliefs, practices and conviction manifesting [To LIVE as EVIL].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3441.

139). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers that any person as a taxpayer that declares oneself on a [Form 1040] is in reality a 3/5 of a person.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3489.

140). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendants’ IRS compels or induces a person to declare one’s child or spouse as a property having an established value on [Form 1040] as tax deduction or credit.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3494.

141). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ activities, conduct and documentation with [Refunds] [Exemptions] [Tax Credits] [Tax Deductions] [Enumerations] [Form 1040] [Abatements] manifesting per se [The Policy].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3549.

142). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power to qualify a person or make eligible, as a taxpayer to receive a benefit or privilege.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3698.

143). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping powers of providing [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3699.

144). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power of increasing the burdens on taxprayers through [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3700.

145). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power by increasing the burdens on taxpayers to read and understand what shall constitute [Form 1040].”

[OVC/Petition] ¶ 3701.

146). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Refunds] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power in [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3702.

147). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power of [Form 1040] as tax law.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3703.

148). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power of increasing the burdens on the religious beliefs and practices of the Defendants’ IRS.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3704.

149). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power in converting a taxpayer into a taxprayer through [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3705.

150). IN THE RECORD, “By Defendants’ law, conduct and activities alleged herein, it is evident Defendants sanctioning [Form 1040] manifests on its face no application(s) in [THE CODE] that would be constitutional.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3706.

151). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as-applied to him are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping powers to inform him of or to control his core values.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3708.

152). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as-applied to him are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping powers to deprived him of guaranteed rights.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3709.

153). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as-applied to him are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of usurping powers of Defendants to be able, or to allow for or to provide [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3710..

154). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as-applied to him are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power of increasing the burdens on Plaintiff to read and understand what shall constitute a tax liability or an obligation.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3711.

155). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] as-applied to him are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power of increasing the burdens on the religious beliefs and practices of the Plaintiff.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3712.

156). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face and as-applied are in direct conflict with Congress powers to lay and collect taxes on incomes because of Defendants’ usurping power in converting the Plaintiff into a taxprayer with [Form 1040].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3711.

157). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face and as-applied to Plaintiff and others similar situated establish burdens.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3714.

158). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers [Form 1040] on its face and as-applied to Plaintiff and others similar situated have defined, designed, driven, devalued, degraded, or deprived Plaintiff his core values.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3715.

159). IN THE RECORD, “[The Policy], on its face and as applied, is not the least restrictive encroachment on First Amendment freedoms of belief involving [Form 1040] or in achieving those ends, and the benefit gained, if any failed to outweigh the loss of constitutionally protected rights.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3754.

160). IN THE RECORD, “There is no compelling governmental interest sufficient to justify [Form 1040] or Defendants’ differential treatment of Plaintiff from others similarly situated.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3889.

161). IN THE RECORD, “[Form 1040] on its face and as applied, is not narrowly tailored.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3890.

162). IN THE RECORD, “Any person making a proper return to the IRS by way of [Form 1040] only the Defendants’ IRS can subsequently file [Form 1040] represented as the symbolism of submission.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3892.

163). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants are permitting and investing in the “[Newest Covenant and Dispensation Theology of THEIRS]” per se as (“[Dispensation]”).” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1518.

164). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff [believes] Defendants are expressing an adaptation of being Left Behind or a religious viewpoint of the Rapture, through Wall Street bailouts.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 1519.

165). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ IRS are compelling the Plaintiff to profess, practice or accept [Dispensation] as set forth herein existing as an invasion of a legally protected interest.” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2896.

166). IN THE RECORD, “Defendants’ law, conduct and activities listed herein are indoctrinating, proselytizing or converting taxpayers into taxprayers through activities listed herein of [Dispensation].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 2969.

167). IN THE RECORD, “Plaintiff avers Defendant’s Newest Covenant and Dispensation Theology of THEIRS is the reality of religious doctrine manifesting [To LIVE as EVIL].” [OVC/Petition] ¶ 3442.

168). 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*.

169). 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 petition for grievances, inter alia*, that Defendants activities are violations of the Supremacy Clause, Article VI, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution; being more particularly described in Exhibits J #1 through J #23; attached to [OVC/Petition] and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

170). 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.

171). 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*.

172). **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.

173). 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