

**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 AGF</b>
<i>Pro se,</i>	}	
Plaintiff,	}	
	}	
-Vs-	}	
	}	
“UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT,	}	
	}	
Defendants.	}	
	}	

---

**PLAINTIFF’S FIRST NOTICE TO PRESENT THE MERITS OF HIS ACTION  
AND/OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,  
*to make a conscientious effort to comply with the court's initial review order***

---

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 rights*** 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**

A). 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]”).

B). FOR THE RECORD, Plaintiff’s suit is not groundless or meritless within a system of justice. Plaintiff has set forth within his [OVC/Petition] seven causes of action listed as seven counts and seven claims for DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF pursuant to violations of the U.S. Constitution, the First Amendment and related U.S. Supreme doctrine, decision & tests or federal statutes. Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition] also seeks the Court’s approval IN THIS PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT.

C). 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. A message as *pure speech* of *religious belief* and of *civil liberty* secured, preserved and guaranteed under the *rule of law* of this Nation. However, Court Orders have manifested stiff encroachments *on fundamental free exercise principles* of the First Amendment, when such *Orders forces Plaintiff to deliver a different message under exactly the same circumstances*.

D). IN THE RECORD, and was previously of the record, as set forth in [OVC/Petition] but, nevertheless, or on the contrary, Magistrate Judge H. Bodenhausen’s Memorandum and Order dated 23<sup>rd</sup> day of February, 2017 (**Doc. No. 8**) *arguably strikes the entire breath and merits* of Plaintiff’s [OVC/Petition]. Plaintiff in making a *conscientious effort* to comply with the court's initial review order and to properly present the merits of this case, hereby states, avers or alleges the following paragraphs, as well as presenting the following exhibits:

#### **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT - NATURE OF THE CASE & ITS CONTROVERSIES**

1. This action arises under the Establishment/Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. This lawsuit is not about taxation. It is about 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.

2. Where a given religion is strongly associated – or perceived to be associated, manifested by the said parties proselytizing or when engaged in numerous forms of religiously oriented expressions of their activities, it cultivates *intrinsic and expressive associations*. The legal endorsements of this through [THE CODE] has encouraged loyalty and given a hierarchy exclusive patronage of the national government involving the spheres of religious activity.
3. Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates *free exercise principles* do not cause a man to sacrifice his integrity, his rights, the freedom of his convictions, the honesty of his feelings, or the independence of his thoughts. These are Mankind's supreme possessions. These are not the objects of sacrifice. Plaintiff [believes] the mind is a *sacred place* with the human heart (emotions) being a *sacred space* found within us all. Within these *most sacred precincts of private & domestic life*, religious experiences are created for many people or this Plaintiff.
4. In light of forces and influences in the forums of dialogue shared or exercised in the eyes of its beholders, whether reserved or germane to said Parties' participation is an issue herein. Whether openly or secretly in the affairs of any religious practice, Federal questions arise in the interplay between Establishment challenges and the *free exercise clause* and what is truly the right test(s) for evaluating such issues presented in this case and its controversies.
5. Plaintiff [believes] when a person believes in, practices or makes a proper return to the IRS and their path of life, beliefs and practices it manifests [Worship of Argumentative Wealth, Words & Wants of Materialism] (“[Worship]”). This proselytizing effect is for a *religion of reality*; an IRS Path of Life to keep your Faith **THEIRS**. These activities in Defendants'

endorsements are advanced by an Organized Religion of **THEIRS**, *per se* as Taxology.

6. *Scientology*, one of the many IRS' endorsed religions, beliefs declare: "*Auditing is precise, thoroughly codified and has exact procedures*". This identical dogma of THE-IRS, shared or created, supports the undue influences of [Intellectual Tithing]. The [Govspel] [Body of Rites] [Peter to Paul Mandates] as [THE WORDS] of **THEIRS**; expressed as [Government Speech creating spirituality, assessment & empowering Body/Mind/Spirit] ("[Government Speech]") for taxp[r]ayers, forces persons to profess a belief or disbelief in an IRS religion.
7. Defendants' described activities crafts dependent conditions for an IRS *body of believers* manifested the Fruits of the *Purpose-Driven Life* of **THEIRS** – the semblances of religion, *inter alia*. Plaintiff [believes] an IRS Pilgrimage, Knowing the Unknowable Answers Exist is advanced by The **ABC**'s of Salvation: **Admit** – **Believe** – **Confess**. A dogma of *knowing how to know, per se being of one substance, essence and nature of a usurping body of law*.
8. Plaintiff [believes] the *Internal Religious Service*, aka IRS ("[IRS]"), & its [Mega Church] is utilizing the prestige, power, and influence of a public institution. The practice of [Form 1040] is a covenant, petition & viewpoint, *inter alia*, a forum of expressive activity. This establishment or endorsements of IRS' *religious effects* converts *taxpayers into taxprayers*.
9. Such conduct in Defendants' endorsements of religious belief over the lack of such belief with their establishment of religion, makes an "injury in fact" by its laws and practice. This subjecting the Plaintiff with adverse effects on his First Amendment *free exercise rights* of [life, liberty and pursuit of happiness] as ("[LLP]") shapes the causes of action in [OVC].
10. Plaintiff challenges the constitutionality of Defendants' activities in proselytizing a taxing environment, culture, realm or *sacred precincts* into the described formations, implements, atmospheres of religious belief and indoctrination, creating religion, not reason, *inter alia*.

Such proselytism, or law respecting an establishment of religion, is repugnant to Plaintiff's beliefs. Defendants have fused religion, revenue and returns into an Orthodoxy of THEIRS.

11. Defendants' religious infusions, endeavors or core values are enmeshed in [THE CODE] and [THE WORDS] of THEIRS. This causes a man to pray or barter away his life, freedom, or substantial rights, only to produce an orthodox result which the Defendants could never command directly. These unconstitutional conditions embraces that Defendants may grant benefits or one's rights on the condition that the beneficiary surrender constitutional rights.
12. The Orthodoxy of THEIRS has the power of an organized religion, using the force of law. Their force in dogmatic regulations, or within the submissive enumerations calling for an identification of the solicitors of an offered tax benefit, is for a contrived return of a tax. This has given authorities some basis/census for investigating strangers coming into the IRS' community, culture or its realm when making a proper return to an [IRS Path of Life].
13. Defendants' incursions forces the Plaintiff to profess a belief or disbelief in religion that affects him in a personal and individual way through the process of instilling religious doctrines. His religious sensibilities and legal calculus predicates taxing activities; herein conferring upon *taxprayers* special favors, benefits or rights. Equally, if not practiced by a person, dissenters or the Plaintiff all will suffer substantial disabilities or worse, penalties.
14. The practiced faith in [Form1040] has created a covenant, a viewpoint, also a precedent as giving Defendants' religious Orthodoxy a legal agency in carrying into effect a public and civil duty. These or other such activities visibly obliterate the essential distinction between civil and religious functions. This act of faith serves a surreal physical & spiritual marriage.
15. Plaintiff [believes] and [conscience] dictates [THE CODE] induces a form of a *spiritual abortion*, as a stillborn plan of escape from laying and collecting taxes on incomes from

whatever sources derived. Over 19 trillion dollars in a national debt confirms this stillborn plan of escape being ineffectual, abortive or fruitless from the creation of its very inception.

16. 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.
17. 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.
18. Plaintiff [believes] Defendants have proselytized a **body of believers** by creating a deified taxing system. An IRS body who believes in, accepts, practices or makes a proper return to an [IRS Path of Life] confirms this. Defendants have produced and endorsed a Doctrine of Exchange using refunds, exemptions, exclusions, credits, deductions, adjustments, or abatements (“[Doc-of-Exch]”) through an [Institutionalized Faith in Taxism] (“[Taxism]”).
19. Plaintiff [believes] that Taxology is a religion he was ‘**born into**’ and later was compelled to assent in a religious faith of Taxism. Plaintiff did practice Taxology for over 20 years. Plaintiff’s religious activities consisted of making a [proper return] and as a result endorsed Defendants’ religion; including all facets of religious observances, practices, or its values.
20. Conversely, justiciable controversies exist with Plaintiff’s [Q.U.E.S.T.] and codified fruits in a personal stake of **taxation by confession**. Every rebate from a tax when conditioned

upon *expressive activities or conduct* is in some measure a temptation, a religious belief, a devout practice, or a moving experience. Such acts of atonement, redemption or symbolic conduct, are central to and compelled by, a deified taxing system composed of religious tenets or other essential religious endeavors as an exercise or it's simply a means to an end.

21. This functions as [To LIVE as EVIL] in one's life, as evidenced by, a genuine nexus occurs with tax refunds, exemptions, exclusions, credits, deductions, adjustments, and abatements as dutiful. This serves as evidence of an organized religion, its endeavors or its expressive activities in the various forms of salvation offered and redemption provided by Taxology. Such *dealings* with the IRS transforms legal status as citizens into customers of **THEIRS**.
22. There is **no** legal nexus between a legitimate government interest (power to lay and collect taxes on incomes) and Defendants' actions herein, being beliefs, tools and atmospheres for religious indoctrination. Any legal nexus is offensive once a constitutional right turns upon whether a governmental benefit is characterized as a *right or as a privilege*; when fostering religious experiences, overtones of indoctrination, or a support for a compulsory religion.
23. Defendants producing clear deprivations of, or use conduct impermissibly infringes upon Plaintiff's *free exercise rights* of his [LLP] & [CLP], using evils, incursions or invasions on Fundamental Liberty Interests and Property Interests of the First Amendment. Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates his Liberty of Labor is a **most sacred property** & Individual Freedom of Mind – a **sacred place**. Such matters are beyond “Service + Enforcement = Compliance”
24. Plaintiff has a right to decline to foster such IRS religious, political, and ideological beliefs while exercising his **Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment**, its penumbral, as an unenumerated right of his. The Establishment/Free Exercise Clauses were to prevent such a fusion of governmental and religious functions; when so permeated by religion that the

secular side cannot be separated from the sectarian, seeing taxpayers *per se* as *taxprayers*.

25. Such actions complained of, makes 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. This is not a manifestation of religious neutrality. *Compelled associations* and religious composition of government-sponsored speech, or its forums are a *designed* result in [A Complacent Policy of Indifference to Evil] (“[To LIVE as EVIL]”). Defendants' activities herein captures the essential commands of the Establishment Clause.
26. The challenged government conduct and activities have no legitimate, compelling interest or clear secular purpose, but has the actual purpose of endorsing religion with the primary effect of advancing it. This inhibits, impinges and burdens Plaintiff's *free exercise* of his religion, conscience, [Protected Conduct], [Protected Speech] or other *free exercise rights*. [THE CODE] controls, regulates and defines with impunity the "marketplace of ideas".
27. Defendants are fostering an excessive entanglement with religion and henceforth have created forced choices, threats, sanctions, or a coercive intent initiated by offering and penalizing or denying religious benefits, incentives or aid for unparalleled considerations. This is because of the Defendants' own actions, operating the forums in a particular manner and permitting religious expressions, confessions or dutiful activities to take place therein.
28. An objective and reasonable observer perceives such actions of the described governmental activities are motivated by religious syncretism; a religious perspective communicating messages often of contradictory beliefs, while blending practices of various schools of religious thoughts. Plaintiff's belief-system, rooted in religion, is protected by the free exercise clause; which, by its terms, is given special protections by Establishment Clause.
29. Such conduct or associations reveal true semblances of syncretism, sponsoring religious

beliefs, exercises and endeavors; thus creating an excessive government entanglement with an organized religion's *forms* of salvation. That excessive entanglement does unescapably result from a germane fact that subsidy, benefit and its census is on an annual basis, when adherents/converts make a proper return to the IRS and its path of life, beliefs and practices.

30. Such conditions upon public benefits cannot be sustained if they so operate; whenever their purpose *devalued* or deters the *free exercise* of First Amendment freedoms. To condition the availability of benefits or subsidy upon this, Plaintiff's *voluntary compliance* violates *cardinal principles* of his religion and *secular faith* effectively penalizing *free exercise* of constitutional liberties. One faithful cardinal principle is the separation of church and state.
31. A separation principle identical to: "is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar?" Jesus said to them: "*Therefore render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's*". Our religious experiences of truth or falsity of one's own constitution is a forbidden domain of the Defendants, utilizing the prestige, power, & influence of a public institution.
32. Defendants are compelling a person to choose between exercising a First Amendment right and participation in an otherwise available public program of tax subsidies, benefits or endeavors. Such activities serve religious purposes and have a primary effect of advancing religion versus the obviously secular function of laying and collecting taxes on incomes.
33. Such endorsements of religiously motivated conduct, beliefs, assemblies or activities have made the secular purpose, or the genuine power to lay and collect taxes on incomes merely secondary and a total sham. This case presents how Defendants' religious autonomy can *degraded, deprived* or further its religious harassment or hostility towards the unclean, using a *Collective Experience* of religious dominance, decisions and its taxing dimensions.

34. Plaintiff has a First Amendment *free exercise right* of religious beliefs; thereby [believes] in Taxology and [Taxism]; but conversely has a First Amendment Establishment right not to practice, partake or advance these established religions. Plaintiff's [conscience] dictates: **I am** an architect of my [LLP]. I know what is to come by the principle on which it is built. Freedom is the light of all sentient beings with the right to exist as **I Am**, not as *any person*.
35. The laws at issue and Defendants' actions complained of by act or word, as set forth in this [OVC] manifests violations of: (1) Establishment Clause Tests, (2) Endorsement Tests, (3) Free Exercise Clause Tests, (4) Balancing Tests of Court: "Strict Scrutiny" manifested in "Compelling Interest Test" (5) Content-Based Restrictions Test, and squarely conflicts with (6) Doctrines of Substantial Overbreadth & Void for Vagueness (7) Public Forum Doctrine, (8) Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine or with Plaintiff's [CLP] for his [LLP].
36. Plaintiff brings this action as a U.S. Citizen, not to *define* him as an IRS' taxp[r]ayer or as a *customer "dealing"* with the Internal Revenue Service. Plaintiff's [Q.U.E.S.T.] 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*.

**PLAINTIFF REINSTATES &/OR PRESENTS THE MERITS OF HIS ACTION  
FOR THE INTERSECTION OF CHURCH AND STATE**

The intersection church and state advances the germane legal matters of illuminating the link between asserted injury or harm and relief sought. Plaintiff has alleged a personal stake in the outcome of the particular controversies of this case as "to assure that concrete adverseness which sharpens the presentation of issues upon which the court so largely depends for illumination of difficult constitutional questions." See *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U. S. 186, 369 U. S. 204 (1962).

## **An Intersection of Church and State - Personal Constitution & U.S. Court Doctrine**

- Exhibit D- #1... Justice – Equality – Service – Unity – Sacrifice / 3 pages
- Exhibit D- #2... Separation of Powers Doctrine (a system of checks and balances) / 2 pages
- Exhibit D- #3... The Preamble of the United States Constitution - Letters and Spirit of / 1 page
- Exhibit D- #4... For God & Country - Preambles of 50 State Constitutions of U.S.A. / 8 pages
- Exhibit D- #5... *Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947) A Landmark Case* / 1 page
- Exhibit D- #6... *Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971) A Landmark Case* / 2 page
- Exhibit D- #7... *Larkin v. Grendel's Den, Inc., 459 U.S. 116 (1982) Est. Clause Dec.* / 2 pages
- Exhibit D- #8... *Walz v. Tax Comm'n of City of New York 397, U. S. 664 Est. Clause* / 3 pages
- Exhibit D- #9... *Butchers' Union Co. v. Crescent City, 111 U.S. 746 (1884)* / 3 pages
- Exhibit D- #10... *United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)* / 3 pages
- Exhibit D- #11... *Loan Assoc. v. Topeka, 87 U.S. 20 Wall 655 (1874)* / 1 page
- Exhibit D- #12... *U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)* / 3 pages
- Exhibit D- #13... *Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965)* / 4 pages
- Exhibit D- #14... J. Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States §1893/1 p
- Exhibit D- #15... The Public Policy Doctrine of United States Criminal Law / 15 pages
- Exhibit D- #16... Contemporary Civil Religion in the United States / 16 pages
- Exhibit D- #17... IN GOD WE TRUST- A Principle system for Mankind's possibilities/21 pages
- Exhibit D- #18... [Quintessential Rights] of the First Amendment Free Exercise Clause/17 pages
- Exhibit D- #19... The All Seeing Eye of Providence & The Chief Cornerstone / 2 pages
- Exhibit D- #20... *United States v. Bishop* & 28 U.S. Code §2007 & Mo. Const. Art I, Sec.11/ 3p
- Exhibit D- #21... *Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S 1 Cranch 137 137 (1803)* / 4 pages
- Exhibit D- #22... *McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 4 Wheat 316 316 (1819)* / 7 pages

Exhibit D- #23... *Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Co.*, 259 U.S. 20 (1922) / 2 pages

Exhibit D- #24... *County of Allegheny v. ACLU*, 492 U.S. 573 (1989) / 4 pages

Exhibit D- #25... *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 483 U.S. 578 (1987) / 5 pages

Exhibit D- #26... *Grosjean v. American Press Co., Inc.*, 297 U.S. 233 (1936) / 3 pages

Exhibit D- #27... *Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union of U. S., Inc.*, 466 U.S. 485 (1986) / 1page

Exhibit D- #28... *Gibbons v. Ogden*, 22 U.S. 1 (1824) /29 pages

Exhibit D- #29... Doctrine of Stare Decisis / 3 pages

Exhibit D- #30... Intelligent Design of Civil Religion / 2 pages

Exhibit D- #31... The Intersection of Church and State/Our Church of Greater Reality / 35 pages

Exhibit D- #32... [Commanding Heights] *E Pluribus Unum* (Latin for "Out of many, one") /11 p

The above listed Exhibits attached hereto; are also described in Sections D in the [OVC/Petition] and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

**Wherefore** premises considered, with exhibits entered back into the record and with relief sought, this Notice touches the letters & spirit of the Court's review and its Orders. Plaintiff is seeking a remedy in court sanction *legal* and *constitutional relief* of civil liberty through this notice pleading and in any *Court accepted matters* that establishes "[WHATEVER]" conformity within Rule 8; as it pertains to or allows for or controls Plaintiff's religion and his sincerely held religious beliefs, including but not limited to, his sacred right of conscience or an individual's freedom of mind. Plaintiff's [OVC/Petition] and this notice pleading seeks a *measure of justice* and law as Plaintiff's sincerely held religious beliefs are not *frivolous* in the "United States" or within a court of law for the United States of America.

*Respectfully Submitted,*

Date: May 23, 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 23, 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.

Executed this 23<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2017

*Respectfully submitted,*

---

TERRY LEE HINDS, *pro se, Plaintiff*  
438 Leicester Square Drive  
Ballwin, Missouri 63021  
PH (636) 675-0028

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY**

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 23<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2017 and served upon Defendants and its U.S. Attorney, by First class postage prepaid, U.S. Certified mail # 7015-3430-0000-3764-9288 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*

Date: May 23<sup>th</sup>, 2017

---

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