

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

**RULE 5.1. CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO A STATUTE
NOTICE, CERTIFICATION, AND INTERVENTION**

COMES NOW, Plaintiff TERRY LEE HINDS, appearing *Pro se* (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) pursuant to Rule 5.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, (F.R.C.P.) hereby gives notice to Constitutional Challenge to Federal Statutes At Large, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, its amendments with the Court and United States Attorney General and states:

RULE 5.1. Notice, Constitutional Challenge to Federal Statute

1). Plaintiff hereby provided Notice on February 16, 2017, in U.S. District Court, case _____
_____ F.R.C.P. Rule 5.1.(a) Constitutional Challenge to a Statutes
Notice, Certification and Intervention for [THE CODE] in an Original Verified Complaint for
declaratory judgement, injunctive and other appropriate relief in a petition for Quintessential
Rights of the First Amendment, filed on February 16, 2017 and served, with a copy of the
Summons & Complaint on U.S. Attorney, Richard Callahan, for the Eastern District of Missouri,
Department of Justice, Thomas Eagleton U.S. Courthouse 111 S. 10th Street, 20th Floor, St. Louis,

MO 63102. The Rule 5.1 Notice appears with the Court and the page containing the Rule 5.1 Notice appears as Exhibit U - #1 in the Original Verified Complaint.

2). The “UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT are the Defendants and party, fulfilling the notice requirement Rule 5.1(a)(2) and CERTIFICATION BY THE COURT is not required. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Clerk of the Court certifies this fact to the Attorney General of the United States, if necessary.

The following are the material facts giving rise to the constitutional question:

3). Plaintiff challenges the constitutional validity of [THE CODE] *inter alia*, in violation of the Establishment Clause and the applicability of Plaintiff’s *free exercise rights* of First Amendment freedoms concerning law respecting an establishment of religion. Plaintiff claims a remedy under the Establishment/Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

4). Plaintiff has suffered and continues the loss of First Amendment rights and one’s liberty in law.

5). 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 of the Defendants.

6). 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.

7). 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. Conversely, justiciable controversies exist with Plaintiff's [Q.U.E.S.T.] and codified fruits in a personal stake of *taxation by confession*.

8). 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 as *any person* or in 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*.

9). Plaintiff's challenges Rule 5.1 of F.R.C.P. as it establishes mental, physical and financial burdens on Plaintiff's First Amendment right to petition the Defendants due to the breath and volume of documents in this case to be sent to United States Attorney General, located in Washington, D.C.

10). Plaintiff's declares all the facts in this Original Verified Complaint, with the numerous federal questions and challenges it presents is with U.S. Attorney, Richard Callahan. Plaintiff believes he has met the essential spirit and letters of the law, being of the U.S. Constitution and all laws made in pursuance thereof.

Respectfully submitted this the 16th day of February, 2017.

Terry Lee Hinds, *pro se Plaintiff*
PH# (636) 675-0028
Email address: quest76.att.net

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY

I further certify that the foregoing was served upon the Attorney General of the United States by mailing a copy thereof to the address indicated below with postage prepaid attached and served via Certified Mail #7009-0960-0000-0249-6705 under the exclusive care and custody of the United States Postal Service:

Jefferson B. Sessions
Attorney General of the United States
Office of the Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001