

RECEIVED
MAY 19 2017
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MO
ST. LOUIS

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

In the Matter of:

TERRY LEE HINDS,
Pro se,

Plaintiff,

-Vs-

“UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT,

Defendants.

}
}
} CIVIL ACTION
} FILE NUMBER: 4:17 – CV – 750 AGF
}
}
}
}
}
}
}
}

**PLAINTIFF’S FIRST MOTION TO REVIEW, ALTER, AMEND, OR VACATE ORDERS
PURSUANT TO PLAINTIFF’S FREE EXERCISE OF PURE SPEECH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS
AND/OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
FOR RELIEF FROM ORDERS PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 60(b)(6)
“any other reason that justifies relief”**

COMES NOW, 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 move this Court under the First Amendment to the U. S. Constitution, in the *right to petition*, PLAINTIFF’S FIRST MOTION TO REVIEW, ALTER, AMEND, OR VACATE ORDERS PURSUANT TO PLAINTIFF’S FREE EXERCISE OF PURE SPEECH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, AND/OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR RELIEF FROM AN ORDERS PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 60(b)(6) **“any other reason that justifies relief”**. In support of this motion, the Plaintiff relies on the accompanying Memorandum of Law and Brief, Declaration, Judicial Notice, and exhibits, the files and records in this case, and such further evidence and argument as the Court may permit. This motion concerns (**Doc. Nos. 8, 18 & 29**) to wit, Plaintiff seeks relief and states:

The undersigned respectfully moves this Court TO REVIEW, ALTER, AMEND, OR VACATE ORDERS pursuant to or concerning:

- I). Exhibit Z- #1: Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (**Doc. No. 8**).
- II). Exhibit Z- #2: Memorandum and Order dated 10th day of March, 2017 (**Doc. No. 18**).
- III). Exhibit Z- #3: ORDER, dated 11th day of April, 2017 (**Doc. No. 29**).

A motion and request made in connection with and PURSUANT TO PLAINTIFF'S FREE EXERCISE OF PURE SPEECH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS, AND/OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR RELIEF FROM AN ORDERS PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 60(b)(6) "*any other reason that justifies relief*".

PROCEDURAL POSTURE

Magistrate Judge H. Bodenhausen

I.) Exhibit Z- #1: Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (Doc. No. 8).

Plaintiff request concerns legal matters, particularities and/or irregularities of the following:

I-A). REVIEW:

1). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] exercising Court power and sanctions beyond Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 12(f) which allows only: "The court may strike *from a pleading*" regarding "*any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.*" This Rule grants *no power to strikes* Plaintiff's entire [OVC/Petition] or for violating "*Rule 8(a) and (e) to the extent that a great deal of judicial energy and resources would have to be devoted to restructuring the pleading and streamlining the unnecessary matter*".

2). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] using **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8 for guidance and using *case law* relied on or cited in the [Judge] Memo & Order which amounts to a *misapplication of the law* and restrictions triggered by the communicative effects of speech.

3). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] striking without prior warning or notice the entire breath and merits of the [OVC/Petition] and its evidence of 510 exhibits previously entered into the record, as content-based restrictions are dangerous because they risk broadly suppressing certain viewpoints or facts or manifest an injustice. See Exhibit Z #4, Exhibit List instituting 510 Exhibits as evidence & the merits of this case.

4). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] striking the breath and merits of the [OVC/Petition] because his action is not narrowly drawn or defeats an adversarial system of justice and does not advance a defining and distinctive feature of the United States' legal system. Furthermore striking the entire breath and merits of the [OVC/Petition] defeats due process of Time, Place, and Manner Restrictions and infringes on First Amendment rights or free exercise principles established by the rule of law.

5). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] ordering ambiguous conformity with Rule 8, as this act is not narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest, and it caused Plaintiff's right to religious freedom of belief and expression to be substantially damaged and curtailed as a result of the conduct of the [Judge], specifically the impairment of his ability to communicate his religious beliefs.

6). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] for the animus toward the ideas, facts and the content of religious beliefs contained in the [OVC/Petition] or because of [Judge]'s disagreement with the vast message the pure speech conveys by declaring: "Plaintiff purports to allege numerous constitutional violations in the 547-page Complaint with 4,451 paragraphs."

7). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by the [Judge] when he failed legally mention or applies the "strict scrutiny" standard, which means that the Court, will uphold

a content-based restriction only if it is necessary “to promote a compelling interest,” and is “the least restrictive means to further the articulated interest.

I-B). ALTER:

1). The Memo & Order alters a *long standing* custom in a **Standard of Review**; as a Motion to Strike is similar to a Demurrer, in that it challenges defects in the complaint. However, the two pleadings challenge different types of defects. A Demurrer is used to challenge the legal sufficiency or clarity of the claims. A Motion to Strike is used to challenge improper or irrelevant information, or complaints not made in conformity with laws, rules, or court orders. Additionally, a Demurrer is used only to *attack entire causes of action*, while a Motion to Strike can be used to *attack portions of a cause of action*. The Memo & Order needs to be altered to comply with established legal standards and procedures consistent Fed. R. Civ. P. and prior procedural decisions of the Court concerning the Demurrer and power to strike a portions of a cause of action.

2). Alter the Memo & Order to recognize the significance of certain legal words, such “*averment*” used in **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(e)(1) and the word “*allegation*” used in the **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(d)(1). The Court Order concerns only “averment” and does not address the any legal positions of pertaining to an “allegation”. Plaintiff is confused by the Court action in using “averment” versus “allegation” or what “precise language” constructs “*conformity with the requirements of Rule 8*”. The Memo & Order needs to be alter to current law.

3). Alter the Memo & Order to redact, change or remove the word “*conformity*” used as a requirement of Rule 8, as that word is ambiguous, infringe on and is belligerent to *free exercise* of religious belief in Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition]. Furthermore the word “*conformity*” is not used in Rule 8, as well as, Plaintiff has no legal obligation to comply with the unknown or with speculation.

4). Alter the Memo & Order to *administered justice versus* the promotion and acceptance

of professional legal values of a lawyer for *just-a-system for justifications* that failed to specify *which paragraphs* have an alleged defect in the complaint or failed to mention of *seven causes of action and seven claims for relief* as set forth in [OVC/Petition].

5). Alter the [Judge]’s Memo & Order to administered justice and be consistent with First Amendment scrutiny review, as well as, Rule 8 conformity requirement and restrictions thereby triggering content-based strict scrutiny review.

6). Alter the [Judge]’s Memo & Order to administered justice by [Judge] obeying existing U.S. Supreme Court decision as to a limited public forum for First Amendment purposes.

7.) Alter the [Judge]’s Memo & Order to administered justice by removing UNJUST BURDENS ON FREE EXERCISE PRINCIPLES AND ON PLAINTIFF’S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT as set forth and described in the Notice Pleadings of (Doc. No. 33).

8). Alter the [Judge]’s Memo & Order to administered justice by removing the word “conformity” as that word limits and infringes on Plaintiff’s religious beliefs and its related claims.

I-C). AMEND:

1). Amend or modify the [Judge]’s Memo & Order to properly reflect Plaintiff filed a case & its controversies listed on 549 pages, according to the PACER system and not “547-page Complaint” as set forth in the [Judge]’s Memo & Order. The last two pages are legally necessary as it contains sworn verifications of complaint as required by law for “Verification of Complaint”.

2). Amend or modify the Memo & Order to properly allow for the exhibits filed in this case to remain in the record, as the Court or the [Judge] lack the authority at this stage of ligation to strike them from the record or without a motion by the Defendants.

3). Amend or modify [Judge]’s Order to reflect each and every paragraph of “any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter” so Plaintiff can comply with the Fed. R. Civ. P.

4). Amend or modify the [Judge]’s Memo & Order to properly reflect U.S. Supreme Court Decisions, doctrine and test as listed in Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law and Brief.

5). Amend or modify the [Judge]’s Order to properly reflect Plaintiff’s Request for Leave to Amend Summons as to Listing Plaintiff’s Name and Address on Summons is not moot.

6). Amend or modify [Judge]’s Memo & Order from imposing unconstitutional viewpoint-based restrictions on Plaintiff’s free or pure speech, as well as viewpoint-based discrimination on Plaintiff’s [Protected Speech].

7). Amend or modify [Judge]’s Memo & Order from excluding evidence which a party was entitled to have admitted, as the error was evident, obvious, and clear and materially prejudiced a substantial right, meaning that this mistake affected the outcome of the case in a significant way.

8). Amend or modify [Judge]’s Memo & Order to clarify whether the Order concerns the “Complaint” versus the claims “IN THIS PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT”.

I-D). VACATE ORDER:

1). Vacate the Memo & Order striking the complaint, as Plaintiff has a constitutional right to *formulate a legal protest* and precisely assemble an [OVC/Petition] as in the right to petition the government, “*showing that the pleader is entitled to relief*” under Rule 8(a)(1) and of the requested declaratory and prospective injunctive relief set forth and described therein.

2). Vacate the Memo & Order because of unjust restrictions are placed on PLAINTIFF’S FREE EXERCISE OF PURE SPEECH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS by imposed unconstitutional viewpoint-based restrictions on Plaintiff’s free or pure speech, as well as viewpoint-based discrimination on Plaintiff’s [Protected Speech].

3). Vacate the Memo & Order striking the complaint & its exhibits, for the reasons it

invalidates and violate the First Amendment right to petition Plaintiff's pure speech of religious beliefs, and for other reasons set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Brief.

4). Vacate the Court's Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" as the Order limits and infringes on constitutional rights, Plaintiff personal liberty of *individual freedom of mind* and for other reasons PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 60(b)(6) "*any other reason that justifies relief*" as set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Brief.

5). Vacate the Court's Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because "[A]s a general matter, 'the First Amendment means that government has no power to restrict expression because of its message, its ideas, its subject matter, or its content.'" See *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 535 U.S. 564 (2002).

6). Vacate the Court's Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because Plaintiff is engaged in peaceful expressive activity pursuant to established *fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment and the Rule of law of this Nation. [OVC/Petition] is a message as pure speech of religious beliefs.

7). Vacate the Memo & Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because the Order manifesting a penalty and stiff encroachments on *fundamental free exercise principles* of the First Amendment, when an Order forces Plaintiff to deliver a different message under exactly the same circumstances. This Order defeats the right to protests the religious activities of the Defendants set forth in [OVC/Petition].

District Judge John A. Ross

II.) Exhibit Z- #2: Memorandum and Order dated 10th day of March, 2017 (Doc. No. 18).

Plaintiff request concerns legal matters, particularities and/or irregularities of the following:

II-A). REVIEW:

1). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by [Judge Ross] endorsing the [Judge] exercising power beyond Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 12(f) which allows only: "The court may strike *from a* pleading" regarding "*any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.*" [Judge Ross] Memo & Order disregarded PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF OBJECTIONS AND OPPOSITION TO The Court's Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (ECF No. 8).

2). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by [Judge Ross] using or endorsing **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8 for guidance versus the language in **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8.

3). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by [Judge Ross] endorsing the [Judge] exercising power to strike entire breath and merits of the [OVC/Petition] and its evidence of 510 exhibits previously entered into the record or upholding Plaintiff's right to have merits of the case reviewed.

4). Review the Memo & Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by [Judge Ross] endorsing the [Judge] actions which defeats an adversarial system of justice and does not advance a defining and distinctive feature of the United States' legal system. Furthermore striking the entire breath and merits of the [OVC/Petition] defeats due process and infringes on First Amendment rights and free exercise principles established by the rule of law.

II-B). ALTER:

1). The Memo & Order requires Plaintiff change his religious message to "short and plain statement of the claim(s)" and that "[e]ach averment of a pleading shall be simple, concise, and

direct." This court order instruction is not the same as: "(a)(2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and" "(d)(1) In General. Each allegation must be simple, concise, and direct. No technical form is required." [Judge Ross] Memo & Order needs to be altered or modify to the current **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. RULE 8 if lawful to do so.

2). Alter the Memo & Order to recognize the significance of certain legal words, such "**averment**" used in **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(e)(1) and the word "**allegation**" used in the **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(d)(1). The Court Order concerns only "averment" and does not address the any legal positions of pertaining to an "allegation". Plaintiff is confused by the Court action in using "averment" versus "allegation" or what "precise language" constructs "*conformity with the requirements of Rule 8*".

3). Alter the Memo & Order to *administered justice versus* the promotion and acceptance of professional legal values of a lawyer for *just-a-system for justifications* that failed to specify *which paragraphs* have an alleged defect in the complaint or failed to mention of *seven causes of action and seven claims for relief* as set forth in [OVC/Petition].

II-C). AMEND:

1). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Memo & Order to properly reflect Plaintiff filed a case & its controversies listed on 549 pages, according to the PACER system and not "547-page Complaint" as set forth in his Memo & Order.

2). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Memo & Order to properly reflect which paragraphs of the 4,451 paragraphs does not comply with Rule 8.

3). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Memo & Order to properly reflect which paragraphs of the 4,451 paragraphs are "simple" versus not "concise" or "direct".

4). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Memo & Order from imposing unconstitutional

viewpoint-based restrictions on Plaintiff's free or pure speech, as well as viewpoint-based discrimination on Plaintiff's [Protected Speech].

II-D). VACATE ORDER:

1). Vacate the Memo & Order endorsement of striking the complaint, as Plaintiff has a constitutional right to *formulate a legal protest* and precisely assemble an [OVC/Petition] as in the right to petition the government, "*showing that the pleader is entitled to relief*" under Rule 8(a)(1) and of the requested declaratory and prospective injunctive relief set forth and described therein.

2). Vacate the Memo & Order because of unjust restrictions are placed on PLAINTIFF'S FREE EXERCISE OF PURE SPEECH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS by imposed unconstitutional viewpoint-based restrictions on Plaintiff's free or pure speech, as well as viewpoint-based discrimination on Plaintiff's [Protected Speech].

3). Vacate the Memo & Order endorsement of striking the complaint & its exhibits, for the reasons it invalidates and violate the First Amendment right to petition Plaintiff's pure speech of religious beliefs, and for other reasons set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Brief.

4). Vacate the Court's Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" as the Order limits and infringes on constitutional rights, Plaintiff personal liberty of *individual freedom of mind* and for other reasons PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 60(b)(6) "*any other reason that justifies relief*" as set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Brief.

5). Vacate the Court's Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because "[A]s a general matter, 'the First Amendment means that government has no power to restrict expression because of its message, its ideas, its

subject matter, or its content.” See *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 535 U.S. 564 (2002).

6). Vacate the Court’s Order demanding “that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8” because Plaintiff is engaged in peaceful expressive activity pursuant to established *fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment and the Rule of law of this Nation. [OVC/Petition] is a message as pure speech of religious beliefs.

7). Vacate the Memo & Order demanding “that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8” because the Order manifesting a penalty and stiff encroachments on *fundamental free exercise principles* of the First Amendment, when an Order forces Plaintiff to deliver a different message under exactly the same circumstances.

District Judge John A. Ross

III). Exhibit Z- #3: ORDER, dated 11th day of April, 2017 (Doc. No. 29).

Plaintiff request concerns legal matter, particularities and/or irregularities of the following:

III-A). REVIEW:

1). Review [Judge Ross]’s Order for an *abuse of discretion*, by [Judge Ross] endorsing the language and law of **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8 by decreeing “Plaintiff has not complied with the Court’s order that he file an amended complaint in 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.’”.

2). Review [Judge Ross]’s Order for an *abuse of discretion*, as [Judge Ross] does not favor Plaintiff’s pure speech with religious content, with an Order that discriminates based on content and restricting expression because of its message, its ideas, its subject matter, or its content.

3). Review [Judge Ross]’s Order for an *abuse of discretion*, as [Judge Ross] refused to

allow (Doc. No. 28) to be in compliance with a Notice pleading, thus Plaintiff attempt to initiate conformity with a Court Order.

4). Review [Judge Ross]'s Order for an *abuse of discretion*, as [Judge Ross] actions are *compelling speech*, to accept a *secular message* in a pleading that shall be simple, concise and direct over Plaintiff's articulated religious beliefs and message of content written and professed in [OVC/Petition]. [OVC/Petition] is a message as pure speech of religious belief.

III-B). ALTER:

1). The [Judge Ross]'s Order requires Plaintiff change his religious message to "short and plain statement of the claim(s)" and that "[e]ach averment of a pleading shall be simple, concise, and direct." This court order instruction is not the same as: "(a)(2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief; and" "(d)(1) In General. Each allegation must be simple, concise, and direct. No technical form is required." [Judge Ross] Memo & Order needs to be altered or modify to the current **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. RULE 8 if lawful to do so.

2). Alter [Judge Ross]'s Order to recognize the significance of certain legal words, such "*averment*" used in **2006 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(e)(1) and the word "*allegation*" used in the **2016 Edition** of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(d)(1). The Court Order concerns only "averment" and does not address the any legal positions of pertaining to an "allegation". Plaintiff is confused by the Court action in using "averment" versus "allegation" or what "precise language" constructs "*conformity with the requirements of Rule 8*".

3). Alter or modify [Judge Ross]'s Order to *administered justice versus* the promotion and acceptance professional legal values of a lawyer for *just-a-system for justifications* that failed to specify *which paragraphs* have an alleged defect in the complaint or failed to mention of *seven*

causes of action and seven claims for relief as set forth in [OVC/Petition].

III-C). AMEND:

1). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Order to properly reflect how Plaintiff Notice of short and concise statement in (Doc. No. 28) "does not comply with the Court's previous Orders (see Doc. Nos. 8, 18).

2). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Order to properly reflect which paragraphs of the 4,451 paragraphs are "simple" versus not "concise" or "direct" but are "direct however not "simple" or "concise"

3). Amend or modify [Judge Ross]'s Order from imposing unconstitutional viewpoint-based restrictions on Plaintiff's free or pure speech, as well as viewpoint-based discrimination on Plaintiff's [Protected Speech].

III-D). VACATE ORDER:

1). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order endorsing the striking of the complaint, as Plaintiff has a constitutional right to *formulate a legal protest* and *precisely assemble* an [OVC/Petition] as in the right to petition the government, "*showing that the pleader is entitled to relief*" under Rule 8(a)(1) and of the requested declaratory and prospective injunctive relief set forth and described therein.

2). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order because of unjust restrictions are placed on PLAINTIFF'S FREE EXERCISE OF PURE SPEECH OF RELIGIOUS BELIEFS by imposed unconstitutional viewpoint-based restrictions on Plaintiff's free or pure speech, as well as, viewpoint-based discrimination on Plaintiff's [Protected Speech].

3). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order endorsing the striking of the complaint & its exhibits, for the reasons it invalidates and violate the First Amendment right to petition Plaintiff's pure speech of religious beliefs, and for other reasons set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Brief.

4). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" as this Order limits, controls and infringes on constitutional rights, Plaintiff personal liberty of *individual freedom of mind* and for other reasons PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. RULE 60(b)(6) "*any other reason that justifies relief*" as set forth in Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and Brief.

5). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because "[A]s a general matter, 'the First Amendment means that government has no power to restrict expression because of its message, its ideas, its subject matter, or its content.'" See *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*, 535 U.S. 564 (2002).

6). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because Plaintiff is engaged in *peaceful expressive activity* pursuant to established *fundamental free exercise rights* of the First Amendment and the Rule of law of this Nation. [OVC/Petition] is a message as pure speech of religious beliefs.

7). Vacate [Judge Ross]'s Order demanding "that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8" because the Order manifesting a penalty and stiff encroachments on *fundamental free exercise principles* of the First Amendment, when an Order forces Plaintiff to deliver a different message under exactly the same circumstances.

WHEREFORE, premises considered and for the *germane* facts herein, and to advance The U.S. Supreme Court Doctrine of *due process*, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court REVIEW, ALTER, AMEND, OR VACATE ORDERS as set forth herein or in accordance with established law or for such other relief as the Court deems proper.

Respectfully Submitted,



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

Date: May 19, 2017

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 19th 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 # 7008-3230-0001-6638-2454 at the following address:

Gregory L. Mokodean
Trial Attorney, Tax Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7238
Washington, D.C. 20044

Initials 

Signatures of



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

Date: May 19th, 2017