

**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: 4:17 – CV – 750 AGF
<i>Pro se,</i>	}
Plaintiff,	}
	}
-Vs-	}
	}
“UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT,	}
	}
Defendants.	}

**PLAINTIFF’S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION OF
THE “REPLY IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES’ MOTION TO DISMISS”, ECF No. 86**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... ii & iii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiv - vii

I. INTRODUCTION AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS..... p. 1 - 5

- A. Protection of Religious Liberty & Speech as a primary right of self-government.
- B. The protected speech in the pure speech of religious beliefs cannot be dismissed.
- C. A case of actual controversies appropriate for judicial power & determination.

II. PLAINTIFF'S GERMANE RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' "REPLY IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES' MOTION TO DISMISS" ...p. 5- 15

- A. The "United States" to sue and be sued being unequivocally expressed.
- B. The Legal Fiction in a Waiver of Federal Sovereign Immunity v. Free Exercise Clause.
- C. Federal sovereign immunity doctrine is the earmark of "*the King can do no wrong*".
- D. This Suit concerns Constitutional law & its rights; not common law or contract rights.
- E. Defendants' actions or consensus disregarded or abandon Federal Sovereign Immunity.
- F. A "waiver" of Federal Sovereign Immunity by the United States is a presumption.
- G. Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine conflicts with constitutional restrictions.
- H. Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine amends the Constitution of the United States.
- I. A *republican form* of government is guaranteed & bars Federal Sovereign Immunity.
- J. Traditional tools of statutory construction being unequivocally expressed.

III. "SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BARS PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES BECAUSE HE HAS NOT ESTABLISHED A WAIVER."

- A. The Legal Fiction of Federal Sovereign Immunity Creating an Indispensable Party
- B. The Defendants' claim of Federal Sovereign Immunity is barred under the First Amendment or repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the laws in pursuance thereof or predisposed in *Langford v. United States, 101 U.S. 341 (1879)*
- C. Defendants cited Inapplicable Case Law or proffers legal positions that have no merits

IV. “EVEN IF PLAINTIFF COULD IDENTIFY A WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY, RELIEF IS PRECLUDED.”p 30

Appendix D

- A. Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§2201, 2202
- B. Injunctive Relief *versus* Ant-Injunction Act (“AIA”) (equitable and ancillary relief including preliminary and permanent injunctive relief)
- C. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P, Rule 52, Judgment on Partial Findings
- D. Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 8(a)
- E. Rule 57 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
- F. U.S. Const. Art. III, Sec. 2. Pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1651 – Writs,
- G. First Amendment Relief in the right to petition

V. “IN ANY CASE, PLAINTIFF HAS NOT PLED A VIOLATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT.”p. 30

- A. Defendants raised no objection or defense to Notice Pleadings (Doc. Nos. 33 & 34)
- B. Plaintiff’s Notice Pleadings with the “Religiosity of Facts” 1 to 7. (Doc. No. 45.)
- C. See Appendix D addressing why relief is not precluded listed as A through G

VI. CONCLUSION

APPENDIX A A-1

APPENDIX B B-1

APPENDIX C C-1

APPENDIX D D-1

LIST OF EXHIBITS E-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	Constitutional Provisions	<u>Page(s)</u>
	First Amendment free exercise clause.....	<i>passim</i>
	Establishment Clause.....	<i>passim</i>
	¹⁶ Article III, § 2, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.....	<i>passim</i>
	Amendment 5, Bill of Rights, without due process of law.....	<i>passim</i>
	²⁸ Bill of Rights, Ratified by Congress 12/15/1791.....	p10
	³⁶ Enumerated powers of The U.S. Congress, Article I, Section 8.....	p12
	Article IV, Section 4 is referred to,as the Guarantee Clause.....	p13
	Tenth Amendment.....	p13
	Ex post facto laws, bills of attainder.....	p13

U.S. Supreme Court Doctrine & Tests

	Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine.....	<i>passim</i>
	³¹ Strict Scrutiny Test manifested in “Compelling Interest Test”.....	<i>passim</i>
	³² Separation of Powers Doctrine (a system of checks and balances)	<i>passim</i>
	Lemon Test.....	p12
	The rule of law.....	<i>passim</i>

Case Law

	⁴ <i>Cummings v. Missouri</i> , 71 U.S. 277, 4 Wall. 277 (1866).....	p1
	⁵ <i>Wallace v. Jaffree</i> , 472 U.S. 38, 53 (1985)	p1
	⁷ <i>Baker v. Carr</i> , 369 U.S. 186, 204-205 (1962).....	p2
	^{9 & 46} <i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 163 (1803).....	p 2 & 4 & 15
	¹² <i>Police Department of Chicago v. Mosley</i> , 408 U.S. 92, 95-96 (1972).....	p4

¹⁵ <i>Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition</i> , 535 U.S. 234, 253 (2002)	p5
²¹ <i>Phelps-Roper v. Nixon</i> , 545 F.3d 685, 690 (8th Cir. 2008).....	p6
<i>Gray v. Bell</i> , 712 F.2d 490; 229 U.S.App.D.C. 176 (1983).....	p7
²⁵ <i>Langford v. United States</i> , 101 U.S. 341 (1879). Syllabus 1 and at 343-343.....	<i>passim</i>
³⁰ <i>Bailey v. State of Alabama</i> , 219 U. S. 219, 239 (1911).....	p11
³³ <i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i> , 403 U.S. 602 (1971) <i>A Landmark Case</i>	p12
³⁴ <i>Jacobson v. Massachusetts</i> , 197 U.S. 11, 12 (1905).....	p12
³⁵ <i>Yates v. United States</i> , 354 U. S. 298, 354 (1957).....	p12
⁴⁵ <i>California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited</i> , 404 U.S. 508 (1972).....	p15
⁴⁶ <i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. 1 Cranch 137, 137 (1803).....	p15
<i>Olmstead v. United States</i> , 277 U. S. 438, (1928).....	p16
⁵³ <i>United States v. Lee</i> , 106 U.S. 196 (1882); <i>Alden v. Maine</i> , 527 U.S. 706 (1999); <i>Hans v. Louisiana</i> , 134 U.S. 1 (1890).....	p18
⁵⁵ <i>Kawananakoa v. Polyblank</i> , 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S.Ct. 526, 527, 51 L.Ed. 834. (1907)...	p19
⁶⁹ <i>United States v. Ballard</i> , 322 U.S. 78 (1944); <i>United States v. Seeger</i> , 380 U.S. 163 (1965)..	p29
⁷⁰ <i>Thomas v. Review Bd., Ind. Empl. Sec. Div.</i> , 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981).....	p30

Federal Statute or U.S. Code

¹³ 28 U.S. Code § 2201 - Creation of remedy.....	p4
¹¹ The Judiciary Act of 1789, SEC. 32. 1 Stat. 73	<i>passim</i>
¹⁴ 28 U.S. Code § 2202 - Further relief (June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 964.).....	p5
28 U.S. Code § 1345 - United States as plaintiff	p5
28 U.S. Code § 1346 - United States as defendant.....	<i>passim</i>
28 U.S. Code § 2403 - Intervention by United States or a State.....	p17
26 U.S.C. § 2201(a).....	p27

26 U.S.C §7410. Cross references*passim*

26 U.S.C. § 7421(a).....p28

28 U.S.C.§ 3002(2).....p28

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Rule 1- Scope and Purpose.....p14

Rule 12(b)(1) - *subject matter jurisdiction*.....*passim*

Rule 12(b)(6) Failure to state a claim.....*passim*

Rule 17 - Plaintiff and Defendant; Capacity; Public Officers.....p14

Rule 55 - Default; Default Judgment.....p15

Rule 8.....*passim*

Rule 5.1. Constitutional Challenge to a Statute.....*passim*

Rule 15(a).....*passim*

Governmental Policy

¹ IRS Strategic Plan, (IRS publication 3744 rev. 6-2004) Catalog # 31685B.....p1

² Plaintiff’s Exhibit E#1 / IRS Strategic Plans (Doc No. 3).....p1

³ Federal Law Protection for Religious Liberty, October 6, 2017.....p 1 & 27

⁶ Plaintiff’s Exhibit F- #1 IRS Strategic Plan 2005-2009.....p2

Other Authority

²²<http://thelawdictionary.org/legal-fiction/> (Black's Law Dic. Online Legal Dict. 2nd Ed.)... p6

²³ 3 W. Holdsworth, A History of English Law 458-69 (5th Edition 1942).....p7

²⁴ The Federalist Papers, Federalist No. 15.....p8

²⁶ District Court Orders (ECF Nos. 8, 18, 29, 36, 42, 55, 66 & 91.).....p9

²⁹ Gettysburg Address, Nov.19, 1863 - http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/gettyb.asp.. P10

⁴⁸ Declaration of Independence, July 4 1776 establishment of the united States of America ..p16

⁴⁹ “IRS Historical Fact Book”p17

^{68*} None of these IRS documents have a required or a valid OMB control number.....p28

Privacy Act Notice 609.....p28