

**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 HYBRID PLEADING #5 MAKING A CONSCIENTIOUS EFFORT TO  
COMPLY WITH COURT’S ORDERS MANIFESTING AN AMENDED COMPLAINT  
[Revelation #5]**

---

TO THE DEFENDANTS:

Please take notice that the undersigned, Plaintiff TERRY LEE HINDS, *pro se* (“Plaintiff”) pursuant to the Court’ Orders (Doc. Nos. 8, 18, 29, 36, 42), Fed. R. Civ. P. RULE 15(2), and the First Amendment; Plaintiff hereby gives notice and enters into the record, the following *sacred or sincerely held religious beliefs and/or secular statements*, truths, averments, or allegations all having a basis in law or fact; thereby *to deliver a different message under exactly the same circumstances adversely effecting or substantially burdening Plaintiff’s sincerely held religious beliefs and his civil liberty, including other vital First Amendment rights or protections under the rule of law*. Plaintiff states the following to be admitted or denied by Defendants, and hereby states:

**FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO PETITION AND PROTEST**

Plaintiff *exerting legal rights* filed with the Court on February 16, 2017 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 and its controversies listed on 549 pages] (“[OVC/Petition]”). 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*.

**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).

#### **IV. LAW AT ISSUE AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

##### **Section B - U. S. Constitutional Provisions & germane Amendments at issue in this Case**

- 1) Plaintiff avers The First Amendment mandates: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.” more particularly described in Exhibit B- #1 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 2) Plaintiff avers The Due Process of Fifth Amendment which holds in part: “No person shall... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...”, more particularly described in Exhibit B- #2 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and

incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

- 3) Plaintiff avers The Ninth Amendment of Unenumerated rights of which holds: “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” more particularly described in Exhibit B- #3 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 4) Plaintiff avers The Thirteenth Amendment mandates:  
  
Section 1. “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.”  
  
Section 2. “Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”  
  
The Thirteenth Amendment is more particularly described in Exhibit B- #4 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 5) Plaintiff avers The Sixteenth Amendment: “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.” The Sixteenth Amendment is more particularly described in Exhibit B- #5 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.
- 6) Plaintiff avers Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, grants the federal government of the United States its power of taxation and spending; more particularly described in Exhibit B- #6 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

7) Plaintiff avers Article VI, Clause 2 mandates: “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof... shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any state to the Contrary notwithstanding.” The Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution is more particularly described in Exhibit B- #7 attached to Plaintiff’s Exhibit List (Doc. No. 3) and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

**Wherefore** premises considered, as this is not presented as a “motion for reconsideration” or any other contrived idea or as a *frivolous interpretation* of a legal process, rather presented to the “Defendants” so they can admit or deny, for the record, Plaintiff’s sacred or sincerely held religious beliefs or secular statements, truths, averments, or allegations having a basis in law or fact. For the record, this notice and pleading seeks a *measure of justice* and a *due process of law* as, Plaintiff’s *sincerely held religious beliefs* are not *frivolous* in the “United States” or within any court of law for the United States of America.

*Respectfully Submitted,*

Date: June 14, 2017

---

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

**VERIFICATION OF NOTICE AND HYBRID PLEADING**

I, Terry Lee Hinds of lawful age is the Plaintiff in this civil action. I verify that I read this verification of Notice and hybrid pleading filed involving this case: FILE NUMBER: 4:17 – CV – 750 AGF on June 14, 2017, and declare under penalty of perjury and under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing facts, truths, averments or allegations in the hybrid pleading are correct and true to the best of my knowledge, information or my sincerely held religious beliefs.

Executed this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2017

*Respectfully submitted,*

---

In re: TERRY LEE HINDS, Petitioner,  
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 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2017 and served upon Defendants and its U.S. Attorney, by First class postage prepaid, U.S. Certified mail # 7008-3230-0001-6638-2478 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: June 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017

---

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