

Exhibit U#35

(A/7): Notice Pleadings with the “Religiosity of Facts” 1 to 7. (ECF No. 45.)

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED AND ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS

ISSUE PRESENTED # I. (A/7)

Under unalienable rights of the Ninth Amendment, does Plaintiff’s Notice Pleadings with the “Religiosity of Facts” 1 to 7. (ECF No. 45) manifest a unenumerated right to exist as ‘I Am’ when practicing [Commanding Heights] *per se* (Fundamental Liberty Interest or Property Interests) & [CLP] *per se* as (Controlling Legal Principles) as an artful blend; while granting full protection under the protocols of the First Amendment and as guaranteed by the Ninth Amendment; thereby to *secure, protect and defend* Plaintiff’s *free exercise of unalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness*,

- Ninth Amendment of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution
- Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution
- The *due process of law* provision of the Fifth Amendment, U.S. Constitution
- Religious Freedom Restoration Act (“RFRA”) (42 U.S.C. § 2000bb et seq)
- *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 304-XXX (1940)

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR # I. (A/7.1)

Did the District Court err, as a matter of law, and/or Federal Judge(s) abuse their discretion when the Court failed to acknowledge Plaintiff’s Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment manifest a unenumerated right to exist as ‘I Am’ when practicing [Commanding Heights] *per se* (Fundamental Liberty Interest or Property Interests) & [CLP] *per se* as (Controlling Legal Principles) as an artful blend?

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR # I. (A/7.2)

Did the District Court err, as a matter of law, and/or Federal Judge(s) abuse their discretion when the Court failed to uphold or protect Plaintiff's *free exercise of unalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness*?

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR # I. (A/7.3)

Did the District Court err, as a matter of law, and/or Federal Judge(s) abuse their discretion when the Court failed to acknowledge or address Plaintiff's unalienable rights of the Ninth Amendment?

ISSUE PRESENTED # II. (A/7)

Under the *free exercise clause* of the First Amendment or the Court's doctrine and precedent of *due process of law* under the 5th Amendment, does Plaintiff's Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment manifest the *religious right* to believe in "**Religiosity of Facts**" 1 to 7 (ECF No. 45) with the *secular belief* in the *due process of law*, when the Court erred, as a matter of law, or as an *abuse of discretion* and would work a manifest injustice by failing to acknowledge or address "Religiosity of Facts" *de facto* rebuffing sincerely held religious beliefs of the Plaintiff.

- Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution
- The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution
- The *due process of law* provision of the Fifth Amendment, U.S. Constitution
- Religious Freedom Restoration Act ("RFRA") (42 U.S.C. § 2000bb et seq.)
- *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 303-304 (1940)
- *Cummings v. Missouri*, 71 U.S. 277, 304, 4 Wall. 277 (1866)
- *Thomas v. Review Bd., Ind. Empl. Sec. Div.*, 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981)

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR # II. (A/7.1)

Did the District Court err, as a matter of law, and/or a Federal Judge abuse her discretion when the Court failed to acknowledge or address Plaintiff's *Notice Pleadings with the "Religiosity of Facts"* 1 to 7 (ECF No. 45.)?

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR # II. (A/7.2)

Did the District Court err, as a matter of law, and/or a Federal Judge abuse her discretion when the Court failed to declare *Notice Pleadings with the "Religiosity of Facts"* 1 to 7 (ECF No. 45) as "Other Amendments" under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure?

ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR # II. (A/7.3)

Did the District Court err, as a matter of law, and/or a Federal Judge abuse her discretion when the Court denied or rebuffing sincerely held religious beliefs of the Plaintiff seen as "Religiosity of Facts" 1 to 7 (ECF No. 45)?