#### IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

FILED

In re: TERRY LEE HINDS

Petitioner,

FEB - 3 2018 MICHAEL GANS CLERK OF COURT

VS.

Case # RE:

The Honorable Judge Audrey G. Fleissig United States District Court. Eastern District of Missouri

Respondent.

18-1299

"UNITED STATES" GOVERNMENT, Real Party in Interest.

VERIFIED PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDAMUS & A WRIT OF PROHIBITION or, in the alternative,

A VERIFIED PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI PURSUANT TO FRAP, RULE 21(c) - OTHER EXTRAORDINARY WRITS

Petitioner, TERRY LEE HINDS, a pro se Plaintiff in Civil Action No. 4:17- CV-750 AGF captioned as TERRY LEE HINDS vs. "UNITED STATES" GOVERNMENT, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, hereby applies, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S. Code, § 1651 and Fed. R. App. P., Rule 21 and the Judiciary Act of 1789, SEC. 32, for writs of mandamus and prohibition or, in the alternative, other extraordinary writs to be issued by this Court directing the Honorable Audrey G. Fleissig, Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, to modify, vacate, set aside or reverse the District Court's "Order of Dismissal" issued on December 11, 2017 (ECF. No. 94) and the Order issued in Memorandum and Order (ECF. No. 93). Such Orders, based upon a clear abuse of discretion and bias dictum or a legal fiction of a waiver in sovereign immunity, but nevertheless; actions committed to defects of justice, in contravention of a statutory duty or as illicit Orders made in favor of unbridled power.

RECEIVED

FEB - 9 2018

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Date Filed: 02/09/2018 Entry ID: 4629028 Appellate Case: 18-1299 Page: 1

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents Appendix	or Page No(s)
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv - xviii
JURISDICTION	1
RELIEF SOUGHT	1-5
ISSUES PRESENTED	6-8
For a Writ of Mandamus	6
For a Writ of Prohibition.	7
For a Writ of Certiorari	8
FACTS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND PETITIONS	9-14
For facts of procedural posture	Appendix H
DEFECTS OF JUSTICE	
Prevailing Preferences or Perspective versus Primacy of a Righteous Policy	10-11
Unbridled power of discretion.	11
The Act of Subterfuge	11-12
Intellectualism of Indifference	12
A Practice of Justification not of Justice	12 -13
Manifesting Second Class Citizenship	13
Bias dictum	13
Dichotomous Doctrines of Establishment Law	13-14
This Legal Fiction of a Wavier	14
Other First Amendment Burdens	14
REASONS WHY THE WRITS SHOULD ISSUE	14-18

## <u>Table of Content</u> – continued

CONTROLLING LAW AND LEGAL STANDARDS 19-23 / A	ddendum, xx
CONCLUSION	23
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE, SERVICE & VERIFIED PETITION	24-25
ADDENDUM OF APPENDIXES	xviii - xix
ADDENDUM OF LAW	xx - xxii
<i>//</i>	
<i>//</i>	

iii

### TABLE OF CITATIONS OR AUTHORITIES

### **CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

	Page No(s).
Article I, Congressional and legislative authority & intent	passim
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution	W-15
Article II, § 1, Clause 1: Exec. Power of the President & Clause 8: Oath of Office	I-3- I-6
Article III, §§ 1 and 2	passim
Article VI, Clause 2, Supremacy Clause	4, A-15, E
Establishment/Free Exercise Clause, First Amend. of the United States Constitution	passim
Due Process of Fifth Amendment of United States Constitution	passim
Ninth Amendment of the United States Constitution	-15, E, W-2
Thirteenth Amendment	W-15
Sixteenth Amendment	W-15
ORGANIC LAW	
U. S. Code, Front Matters, The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776	3
U.S. SUPREME COURT DOCTRINES AND TESTS	
Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine	passim
Public Forum Doctrine of the First Amendment	passim
The Doctrine of Substantive Due Process	passim
The Doctrine of Procedural Due Process of Law	passim
Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine	passim
The Doctrine of Stare Decisis	I-1 to I-25
The Mootness Doctrine & Capable-of-Repetition Doctrine	I-1 to I-25

Establishment Clause Doctrine (Separation of Church & State)	W-14
The Lemon Test	J J
The Justiciability Doctrines	passim
Prior Restraint Doctrine or Content-Based Restrictions	. passim
The Doctrines of Substantial Overbreadth	. W-14
The "Void for Vagueness" Doctrine	W-14
Doctrines Neutrality & Coercion Tests or Endorsement Test	J, W-14
Separation of Powers Doctrine	J
Judicial Review of Strict Scrutiny Standard or test	J, W-14
U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS OR DECISIONS	
Federal Cases	Page No(s).
Am. Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn, 341 U. S. 6, 17-18 (1951)	20
Adderly v. Florida, 385 U.S. 39 (1966)	W-21
Arkansas Ed. Television Comm'n v. Forbes 523 U.S. 666, 690 (1998)	R-3, 5
Abood v. Detroit Bd. of Educ., 431 U.S. 209 (1977)	W-23
Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition, 535 U.S. 234 (2002)	W-26
Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union, 535 U.S. 564 (2002)	W-26
Arbaugh v. Y & H Corp., 546 U.S. 500 (2006)	20
Butchers' Union Co. v. Crescent City, 111 U.S. 746 (1884)	W-28
Boyd v. United States, 116 U.S. 616 (1886)	W-17
Bailey v. Drexel Furniture Co., 259 U.S. 20 (1922)	W-29
Bailey v. State of Alabama, 219 U. S. 219, 239 (1911)	A-20, W-17

Bolling v. Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497 (1954)	W-20
Braunfeld v. Brown, 366 U.S. 599 (1961)	22, W-20
Baker v. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 369 U.S. 204 (1962)	W-10
Bob Jones Univ. v. Simon, 416 U.S. 725, 736 (1974)	2, B1
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 US 1 (1976)	W-23
Bowen v. Roy, 476 U.S. 693 (1986)	W-24
Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union of U. S., Inc., 466 U.S. 485 (1986)	W-30
Board of Airport Comm. City v. Jews for Jesus, Inc., 482 U.S. 569 (1987)	W-25
Boy Scout of America v. Dale, 530 U.S. 640 (2000)	W-26
Bartnicki v. Vopper, 532 U.S. 514 (2001)	W-26
Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc., 573 U.S (2014)	W-26
Cummings v. Missouri, 71 U.S. 277, 4 Wall. 277 (1866)	W-16
Church of the Holy Trinity v. United States, 143 U.S. 457 (1892)	W-17
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)	W-18
Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296, 304 (1940)	18, 22
California v. LaRue, 409 U. S. 109 (1972)	20
California Motor Transport Co. v. Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508 (1972)	W-22
City of Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95, 109-110 (1983)	19, 20
City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent, 466 U.S. 789 (1984)	W-24
Cornelius v. NAACP Leg. Def. Fund, 473 U.S. 788 (1985) 5, 7,	R-4, W-24
County of Allegheny v. ACLU, 492 U.S. 573 (1989)	W-29
Cheek v. United States, 498 U.S. 192 (1991)	W-25

Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520 (1993)	22, W-25
Capitol Square Review and Advisory Bd. v. Pinette, 515 U.S. 753 (1995)	W-26
Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Columbia, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004)	14
Davis v. Beason, 133 U.S. 333, 342-343 (1890)	W-16
Dobson v. Commissioner, 320 U.S. 489 (1943)	W- 19
Data Processing Service Organizations, Inc. v. Camp, 397 U.S. 150, 154 (1970)	7, U -1
Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947)	W-27
Engel v. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962)	W-20
Elrod v. Burns, 427 U.S. 347 (1976)	W-22
Estate of Thornton v. Caldor, Inc. 472 U.S. 703 (1984)	W-24
Edwards v. Aguillard, 483 U.S. 578 (1987)	W-29
Employment Div. v. Smith, 494 U.S. 872, 879 (1990)	2, W-25
Farrington v. Tokushige, 273 U.S. 284 (1927)	W-17
Follett v. Town of McCormick, 321 U.S. 573 (1944)	W- 19
Fowler v. Rhode Island, 345 U.S. 67 (1953)	W-20
Freedman v. Maryland, 380 U.S. 51 (1965)	W <b>-</b> 21
Forsyth County v. Nationalist Movement, 505 U.S. 123, 133 (1992)	R-2
Gibbons v. Ogden, 22 U.S. 1, (1824)	. W-30
Grosjean v. American Press Co., Inc., 297 U.S. 233 (1936)	W-30
Griswold v. Connecticut, 381 U.S. 479 (1965)	W-21, 28
GONZALES V. O CENTRO ESPIRITA, 546 U. S (2006)	W-26
Hurtado v. California, 110 U.S. 516 (1884)	W-16

Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43, 74-75 (1906)	W-31
Hamilton v. Regents of University of California, 293 U.S. 245 (1934)	W-18
Hernandez v. Commissioner, 490 U.S. 680 (1989)	W-25
Hurley v. Irish-American Gay, Lesbian, and Bisexual, 515 U.S. 557 (1995)	W-25
Illinois Central R. Co. v. Adams, 180 U.S. 28, 29 (1901)	A-2
Insurance Corp. of Ireland v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee, 456 U.S. 694 (1982)	20
International Soc. for Krishna Consciousness, Inc. v. Lee, 505 U. S. 672, 678 (1992)	R-5
Jacobson v. Massachusetts, 197 U.S. 11 (1905)	W-17
Johnson v. New York, N.H., & H.R. Co., 344 U.S. 48, 51 (1952)	C-4
Jimmy Swaggart Ministries v. Bd. of Equalization of Cal., 493 U.S. 378, 394 (1990)	A-8
KNOX v. SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERN. UNION, 132 S.Ct. 2277 (2012)	.W-26
Loan Assoc. v. Topeka, 87 U.S. 20 Wall 655 (1874)	W-28
Langford v. United States, 101 U.S. 341, 343-344 (1879)	passim
Lawrence v. State Tax Commission of Mississippi, 286 U.S. 276 (1932)	W-18
Lemon v. Kurtzman, 403 U.S. 602 (1971)	W-27
Larkin v. Grendel's Den, Inc., 459 U.S. 116 (1982)	W-27
Larson v. Valente, 456 U.S. 228 (1982)	W-24
Lynch v. Donnelly, 465 U.S. 668 (1984)	W-24
Lebron v. National R.R. Passenger Corp., 115 S.Ct. 961, 393 (1995)	W-25
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S 1 Cranch 137 137 (1803)	W-29
Martin v. Hunter's Lessee, 14 U.S. 1 Wheat. 304 304 (1816)	W-16
McCulloch v. Maryland, 17 U.S. 4 Wheat 316 316 (1819)	W-29

Murdock v. Memphis, 87 U.S. 20 Wall. 590 590 (1874)	W-2
Minersville School District v. Board of Ed., 310 U.S. 586 (1940)	W-19
Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U.S. 105 (1943)	W- 19
Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643 (1961)	W-21
Machinists v. Street, 367 U.S. 740, 789 (1961)	W-22
NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415 (1963)	W-21
New York Times Co. v. Sullivan, 376 U.S. 254 (1964)	W-21
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)	W-21
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U. S. 438, 277 U. S. 478 (1928)	W-18
Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925)	W-17
Palko v. Connecticut, 302 U.S. 319 (1937)	W- 19
Presbyterian Church v. Hull Church, 393 U.S. 440 (1969)	W-22
Perry v. Sindermann, 408 U.S. 593 (1972)	W-22
Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. (8 Otto) 145 (1878)	, W-16
Roe v. Wade, 410 U.S. 113, 155 (1973)	1, B1
Roberts v. United States Jaycees, 468 U.S. 609 (1984)	W-24
Riley v. Nat. Fed. of the Blind of N. Carolina, 487 U.S. 781 (1988) I-12,	W-25
Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of Univ. of Va., 515 U.S. 819, 828 (1995)	10, 11
Rumsfeld v. Forum for Academic & Inst. Rights, Inc., 547 U.S. 47 (2006)	W-26
Steward Mach. Co. v. Collector, 301 U.S. 548 (1937)	W-18
Sable Communications, Inc. v. FCC, 492 U.S. 115, 126 (1989)	13
Speiser v. Randall, 357 U.S. 513 (1958)	W-20

Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479 (1960)	W-20
School Dist. of Abington Tp. v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1963)	W-20
Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963)	, W-21
Stanley v. Georgia, 394 U.S. 557 (1969)	W-22
Schneckloth v. Bustamonte, 412 U.S. 218 (1973)	W-23
Southeastern Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad, 420 U. S. 546, 553 (1975)	R-2
Stone v. Graham, 449 U.S. 39 (1980)	W-23
Truax v. Corrigan, 257 U.S. 312 (1921)	W-17
Thornhill v. Alabama, 310 U.S. 88, 97 (1940)	R-1
Thomas v. Collins, 323 U.S. 516 (1945)	W- 19
Thomas v. Review Bd., Ind. Empl. Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707 (1981)	W-23
Texas v. Johnson, 491 U.S. 397 (1989)	W-25
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)	W-28
U. S. v. Mayer, 235 U.S. 55, 69 (1914)	5, 20
United States v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931)	W-18
United States v. Murdock, 290 U.S. 389 (1933)	W-18
United States v. Constantine, 296 U.S. 287 (1935)	W-18
U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)	W-28
United States v. Carolene Products, Co., 304 U.S. 144 (1938)	A-20
United States v. Ballard, 322 U.S. 78 (1944)	W-19
United States v. Morgan, 346 U.S. 502 (1954)	5, 21
United States v. Seeger, 380 U.S. 163 (1965)	W-21

## $\underline{\textbf{Table of Citations or Authorities}}\textbf{-}\textbf{Continued}$

United States v. Robel, 389 U.S. 258 (1967)	W-22
United States v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346 (1973)	. W-23
United States v. Lee, 455 U.S. 252, 260, 263, n.3 (1982)	22
United States v. Kokinda, 497 U. S. 720, 726-727 (1990)	R-5
United States v. Bishop, 412 U.S. 346 (1973)	W-29
United States v. Lanier, 520 U.S. 259, 266 (1997)	passim
United States v. Playboy Entm't Group, 529 U.S. 803, 813 (2000)	13
USPS v. Council of Greenburgh Civic Assns., 453 U.S. 114, n. 6 (1981)	5, W-23
Valley Forge Coll. v. Americans United, 454 U.S. 464 (1982)	W-24
Watson v. Jones, 80 U.S. 13 Wall. 679 679 (1871)	W-16
Wilson v. United States, 221 U.S. 361, 384 (1911)	W-31
Whitney v. California, 274 U.S. 357 (1927)	W-18
WELCH v. HENRY, 305 U.S. 134, 147 (1938)	W- 19
West Virginia State Board of Ed. v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943) I-10, R-8,	W- 19
Welsh v. United States, 398 U.S. 333 (1970)	W-22
Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972)	W-22
Wooley v. Maynard, 430 U.S. 705 (1977)	W-23
Widmar v. Vincent, 454 U.S. 263 (1981)	W-23
Wallace v. Jaffree, 472 U.S. 38 (1985)	W-24
Walz v. Tax Comm'n of City of New York, 397 U.S. 664 (1970)	W-28
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)	W-17
Yates v. United States, 354 U.S. 298 (1957)	W-20

Yazoo & M. V. R. Co. v. City of Clarksdale, 257 U.S. 10 (1921)	W-31
Zorach v. Clauson, 343 U.S. 306 (1952)	W-20
[Controlling Legal Principles] ("[CLP]") of the Petitioner	
[Controlling Legal Principles]	pend. J, L
8th Circuit Court of Appeals Case Law	
Estate of Snyder v. Julian, 789 F.3d 883, 886 (8th Cir. 2015)	C-2, 3, 4
In re <i>Bieter</i> , 16 F.3d 929, 932 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994)	14
Osborn v. United States, 918 F.2d 724, 729 (8th Cir. 1990)	A-7, B-2
Phelps v. U.S., 15 F.3d 735, 739 (8th Cir. 1994)	A-17
Phelps-Roper v. Nixon, 545 F.3d 685, 690 (8th Cir. 2008)	1, A-19
Rockport Pharmacy, Inc. v. Digital Simplistics, Inc., 53 F.3d 195, 197 (8th Cir.1995)	C-4
Titus v. Sullivan, 4 F.3d 590, 593 (8th Cir. 1993)	B-2
Other Circuit Court of Appeals or District Court Jurisdictions	
Olson v. Soc. Sec. Admin., 243 F. Supp. 3d 1037, 1053-54 (D.N.D. 2017)	A-17
Scott v. Mo. State Bd. of Educ., 656 F. Supp. 2d 1007, 1011 (E.D. Mo. 2009)	B-2
Cosgrove v. Bartolotta, 150 F.3d 729, 732 (7th Cir.1998)	C-4
Elm Ridge Exploration Co. v. Engle, 721 F.3d 1199, 1220 (10th Cir. 2013)	C-4
Federal Statutes and U. S. Code ("U.S.C.")	
Judiciary Act of 1789, 1 Stat. 73 September 24, 1789	passim
The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, Pub. L. No. 103-141, 107 Stat. 1488 (November 16, 1993) 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb <i>et seq.</i> ("[RFRA]")	passim

Pub. L. 105-206, title III, §3468, July 22, 1998, 112 Stat. 770
PROHIBITION ON REQUESTS TO TAXPAYERS TO GIVE UP RIGHTS TO BRING ACTIONS7, A-10, B1

(Aug. 16, 1954, ch. 736, 68A Stat. 876; Pub. L. 89-719, title I, § 110(c), Nov. 2, 1966, 80 Stat.

#### **Anti-Injunction Act:**

1144; Pub. L. 94-455, title XII, § 1204(c)(11), Oct. 4, 1976, 90 Stat. 1699; Pub. L. 95-628, § 9(b)(1), Nov. 10, 1978, 92 Stat. 3633; Pub. L. 97–258, § 3(f)(13), Sept. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 1065; Pub. L. 105-34, title XII, §§ 1222(b)(1), 1239(e)(3), title XIV, § 1454(b)(2), Aug. 5, 1997, 111 Stat. 1019, 1028, 1057; Pub. L. 105–206, title III, § 3201(e)(3), July 22, 1998, 112 Stat. 740; Pub. L. 105-277, div. J, title IV, § 4002(c)(1), (f), Oct. 21, 1998, 112 Stat. 2681-906, 2681-907; Pub. L. 106–554, § 1(a)(7) [title III, §§ 313(b)(2)(B), 319(24)], Dec. 21, 2000, 114 Stat. 2763, 2763A– 642, 2763A-647; Pub. L. 114-74, title XI, § 1101(f)(10), Nov. 2, 2015, 129 Stat. 638.) ...... See Appendix B-1 Aug. 16, 1954, ch. 736, 68A Stat. 917.... V1 5 U.S.C. § 101. Government Organization and Employees..... A-14 5 U.S.C. § 3331. Oath of Office..... 21 18 U.S. Code § 2076. Clerk of United States District Court..... U-1 28 U.S.C. § 453. Oaths of justices and judges..... 21 28 U.S.C. § 1345. United States as plaintiff..... 19, A-19 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2). Venue generally...... A-13, W-11 28 U.S.C. § 1651. All Writs Act..... passim

xiii

28 U.S.C. § 1654. Appearance personally or by counsel....... A-13, W-11

passim

4

28 U.S.C. § 2071. Rule-making power generally.....

28 U.S.C. § 2106. Determination.....

28 U.S. Code § 2007. Imprisonment for debt	W-29
28 U.S.C. § 2201 Creation of remedy	6, A <b>-</b> 12
28 U.S.C. § 2202 Further relief	6, A-12
28 U.S.C. § 1291 Final decisions of district courts	5
28 U.S.C §2403. Intervention by United States or a State	8
28 USC 3002(15). "United States" means	A-14
42 U.S.C. §1981. Equal rights under the law	A-17
42 U.S.C. §1983 Civil Action for Deprivation of Rights	3, 17, C-2, 3
Internal Revenue Code ("IRC") or 26 U.S.C. existing as Mixed Law and	Fact
26 U.S.C. § 5067. For general administrative provisions applicable to the assessment, collection, refund, etc., of taxes, see subtitle F	18
26 U.S.C. §7402(a). Jurisdiction of district courts	7
26 U.S.C. § 7421. Prohibition of suits to restrain assessment or collection 3,	4, 6, 18, B1
26 U.S.C. § 7426. Civil actions by persons other than taxpayers	passim
26 U.S.C. § 7428. Declaratory judgments relating to status	passim
26 U.S.C. §7604 Enforcement of summons	V1 page 17
26 U.S.C. § 7604(c)(1). Cross references	7
26 U.S.C. § 7806 Construction of title	7, 18, V, V1
IRC subtitle F — Procedure and Administration (sections 6012 to 7874)	18, V, V1
IRC/Federal Taxing Statues or internal revenue laws aka [THE CODE]	& V1, A-11
//	
//	

xiv

### Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("FRCP") or ("Fed. R. Civ. P.")

2006 Edition of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8. General Rules of Pleading	21
2016 Edition of Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8. General Rules of Pleading	15, 21
FRCP, Rule 1. Scope and Purpose	passim
FRCP, Rule 5. Serving and Filing Pleadings and Other Papers	I-5, 23, 24
FRCP, Rule 5.1. Constitutional Challenge to a Statute	passim
FRCP Rule 6(b)(1) Computing and Extending Time; Time for Motion Papers	C-1
FRCP, Rule 12. Defenses and Objections	passim
FRCP, Rule 12(f). Motion to Strike	2, 8, C-1
FRCP, Rule 12(d) Result of Presenting Matters Outside the Pleading	C-7
FRCP, Rule 12(b)(1) subject matter jurisdiction	passim
FRCP, Rule 15(a)(2). Amended and Supplemental Pleadings (a) AMENDMENTS BEFORE TRIAL. (2) Other Amendments	Passim
FRCP, Rule 19. Required Joinder of Parties	8
FRCP 60(b)(6) Relief from a Judgment or Order	C-5, R-10
FRCP, Rule 46- Objecting to a Ruling or Order	C-3, R-10
FRCP, Rule 52. Judgment on Partial Findings	6, W-1
FRCP, 54(a)(b) Judgment; Costs	C-3, R-10
FRCP Rule 56. Summary Judgment	
(a) Motion for Summary Judgment or Partial Summary Judgment	C-8
FRCP, Rule 57. Declaratory Judgment	A-12, W-1
FRCP, Rule 59(e) Motion to Alter or Amend a Judgment	C-3, R-10

FRCP, Rule 902(5) Evidence That Is Self-Authenticating	U-1
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure ("FRAP")	
Rule 21 Writs of Mandamus and Prohibition, and Other Extraordinary Writs	1, xxi
Local Rule- 8 Cir. R. 21A	xxii
Other Authorities	
President Trump issued Exec. Order No. 13798, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675 (May 4, 2017)	10-11
U.S. Attorney General Sessions' 25-page Memo. & 2-page directive. (Oct. 6, 2017)	10-11
Respondent, Honorable Audrey G. Fleissig, Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri, ORDERS &/or MEMORUNDUM AND ORDER (ECF Nos. 32, 42, 55, 66, 91, 93, 94.)	Append. K
ECF No. 8 - Memorandum and Order issued by Magistrate Judge John H. Bodenhausen.	Append. K
ECF No. 18 - Memorandum and Order issued by U.S. District Judge John A. Ross	ppend. K
Black's Law Dictionary Online Legal Dictionary 2 <sup>nd</sup> Ed	passim
Black's Law Dictionary (8th ed. 2004)	R-7
Petitioner's personal constitution	passim
Psalm 18:33App	pend. R-3
God's Ninth Commandment: "Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness"	R-5
[Commanding Heights] are Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment	passim
Privacy Act Notice 609	I-8
L.R. 2.07 (A)(1) and (B)(1)	A-13
Local Court Rule 7 - 4.01 Motions and Memoranda	C-8

xvi

Appellate Case: 18-1299 Page: 16 Date Filed: 02/09/2018 Entry ID: 4629028

Montesquieu,	Baron Charles de, <i>The Spirit of the Laws</i>	1, B-1
J. Story, Com	mentaries on the Constitution of the United States §1893	W-28
Mo. Const. A	rt I, Sec.11,	W-29
	Judicial Materials/Law Reviews	
The Particular	t Paper, No. 47, r Structure of the New Government and the Distribution ong Its Different Parts, February 1, 1788	9
Appendix D:	"Suing the Federal Government: Sovereignty, Immunity, and Judicial Independence" Professor of Law, Vicki C. Jackson, Georgetown University Law Center, 35 Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev. 521-609 (2003)	2, 5
Appendix F:	"Strict Scrutiny in the Middle Forum"  Harvard Law Review  Vol. 122, No. 8 (Jun., 2009), pp. 2140-2161  Published by: The Harvard Law Review Association	. 2, 6, 8, 17
Appendix G:	"Relief from Ultra Vires Governmental Action" Marquette Law Rev	. (1959). 6, 15
Appendix U:	FIRST AMENDMENT– RELIGION AND FREE EXPRESSION Official publication of the Government Printing Office, 300 pages Religion & Free Expression -A <i>Spiritual Stake</i> in First Amendment	Values 3, 7
Appendix Y:	"Taxaonmy of Due Process Manifesting Strict Scrutiny in the Middle Harvard Law Review Vol. 122, No. 8 (June., 2009)	
	Don B. Kates, Jr. and William T. Barker  Notre Dame Law School Scholarly Works Faculty Scholarship	5, 60 pages
	1-1-2010 Stare Decisis as Judicial Doctrine	25, 57 pages
	AVII	

Appellate Case: 18-1299 Page: 17 Date Filed: 02/09/2018 Entry ID: 4629028

### **Revelations & its Evidence**

Appendix Z: Petitioner's Exhibits for Petitioner's case stored at Clerk of Court Office, Eastern District Court House, St. Louis Missouri
IRS' Creed: "Our core values guide our path to archiving our vision". (IRS pub. 3744) 6
The Promise Land & [THE BOOK] "IRS Historical Fact Book" Internal Religious Service ("IRS") established in the year 1646 per a Federal document, inter alia
Dominion Theology: Divine right of Kings, a dogmatic doctrine as "the King can do no wrong"
TABLE OF CONTENTS
ADDENDUM OF APPENDIXES
Appendix A: Clear and Prejudicial Error of Law and Fact.    A-1-A-21
Appendix B: Fundamental Error B, 4 pages
Appendix B1: Grounds for Fundamental Error, Points and Authorities B1, 7 pages
Appendix C: Reversible Error
Appendix D: "Suing the Federal Government: Sovereignty, Immunity, and Judicial Independence" Professor of Law, Vicki C. Jackson, Georgetown University Law Center, 35 Geo. Wash. Int'l L. Rev. 521-609 (2003)
Appendix E: Petitioner's Index List of Plaintiff's Exhibits (Doc. No. 3) E-1, 26 pages
Appendix F: Strict Scrutiny Standard of Judicial Review F-1, 2 / 22 pages
Appendix G: "Relief from Ultra Vires Governmental Action"  Marquette Law Review (1959)
Appendix H: Certified Copy of Court Docket Sheet, No. 4:17-CV-750 AGF H-1, 13 pages
Appendix I: Respondent's oft-repeated error, or manifests a persistent disregard of the federal rules, inter alia 17, I
Appendix J: [Commanding Heights] Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment. J-1, 59 pages

xviii

Appellate Case: 18-1299 Page: 18 Date Filed: 02/09/2018 Entry ID: 4629028

## <u>Table of Contents / Addendum of Appendixes</u> - Continued

Appendix K: District Court's Orders and/or Memorandum and Order issued K-1, 29 pages
Appendix L: Petitioner's Constitutional Protected Interests L-1, 3 pages
Appendix M: Essential Rights as Fundamental Rights or of Unalienable Rights M-1
Appendix N: Rule 15(a)(2) "Other Amendments"
Appendix O: Motions and Briefs Filed by the Petitioner
Appendix P: Motions and Briefs Filed by the Real Party in Interest
Appendix Q: Declarations Filed by Petitioner
Appendix R: A Forum for Actions Subject to a Strict Scrutiny Standard of Judicial Review
Appendix S: Petitioner's Brief in Support of Original Verified Complaint/Petition (Doc. No. 2)
Appendix T: Original Verified Complaint/Petition [OVC/Petition] (Doc. No. 1) T-1, 549 pages
Appendix U: FIRST AMENDMENT– RELIGION AND FREE EXPRESSION Official publication of the Government Printing Office, A Spiritual Stake in First Amendment Values
Appendix V: Master List of Cross References where the word "see" is used, are made only for convenience, and shall be given no legal effect V, 88 pages
Appendix V1: Subtitle F — Procedure and Administration, Chapter 61 through Chapter 80
Appendix W: The Merits of the Case and its Constitutional Claims
Appendix X: Violations of or Encroachments on the Judiciary Act of 1789 X-1 to X-11
Appendix Y: The Taxaonmy of Due Process Manifesting Strict Scrutiny in the Middle Forum
Appendix Z: Petitioner's Exhibits for Petitioner's case stored at Clerk of Court Office,  Eastern District Court House, St. Louis Missouri

Appellate Case: 18-1299 Page: 19 Date Filed: 02/09/2018 Entry ID: 4629028

#### **JURISDICTION**

This Court has jurisdiction to issue a Writ of Mandamus and a Writ of Prohibition, or, in the alternative, a Writ of Certiorari or, *all writs necessary or appropriate*, to the district court and U.S. District Judge Fleissig, the Respondent under the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. §1651 & Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Judiciary Act & for the District Court is 28 U.S.C. §1331.

#### STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

#### A Writ of Mandamus:

Petitioner, respectfully requests this Court grant this petition for a writ of mandamus, to compel the district court to remedy defects of justice and direct Respondent to perform an official and statutory duty which the law clearly and positively requires, however, refused to do so. This Court has succinctly held "it is always in the public interest to protect constitutional rights".\[^1\]

Petitioner's petitions lies in a First Amendment case where there are specific legal rights, but no specific legal remedy for enforcing those rights; when eviscerated by the Real Party in Interest, who invoked surreal power within Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine. Sequentially, the District Court erred as a matter of law, by usurping the constitutional authority of the Congress, or when issuing an Order that cannot pass constitutional muster. Significantly, this semi-autonomous invisible line with the word waiver = consent\[^2\] are not of a corresponding meaning, nor as a visibly equivalent in law to affirm the Real Party in Interest's argument to precluded jurisdiction or relief. The ever-shifting sands of legalism or to work a manifest injustice mandates relief sought herein.

The Court's *Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine* prevents, a duty that is imperative, or commanding the performance of a specified official act, legally impossible; or worse to correct a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Phelps-Roper v. Nixon, 545 F.3d 685, 690 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008) plaintiff seeking entry of a declaratory judgment finding, and the issuance of a preliminary and permanent injunction, in the matters of free speech of religious belief and of its practice.

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{2}{3}$  The term *waiver* is used in many legal contexts. *Consent* means either permission or agreement.

prior illegal action.<sup>3</sup> <u>Petitioner</u>'s writ of mandamus seeks an equitable remedy, because <u>Petitioner</u> is irreparable harm or affected by an official act in contravention of a statutory duty and where a prohibited or unconstitutional Order is made. The district court Judge's duty is imperative and not discretionary, with <u>Petitioner</u>'s actions governed by well-settled principles of *controlling law* and *germane* U.S Supreme Court doctrines. <u>Petitioner</u> seeks a mandate directing the Respondent, to modify, vacate, set aside or reverse the District Court's "Order of Dismissal" issued on December 11, 2017 (ECF No. 94) and the Order issued in Memorandum and Order (ECF No. 93). Such Orders, whether based upon a clear abuse of discretion and *bias dictum* or of *Federal Sovereign Immunity*, but nevertheless, actions committed to defects of justice, in contravention of an official and statutory duty or as illicit Orders made in favor of *unbridled power* cannot pass *constitutional scrutiny*. *see* Appendixes A through Z.

### A Writ of Prohibition for raison d'etre:

raison d'etre: (the most important reason or purpose for someone or something's existence)

The *raison d'etre* of prohibition is to provide an extemporaneous remedy when the normal legal channels for relief are insufficient. It is submitted that such a spirit of 'relief when it is needed' should govern the rules concerning the issuance of the writ. Therefore, the <u>Petitioner</u>, respectfully requests that this Court grant this petition for a writ of prohibition, to prevent Respondent from exercising her power in a manner unauthorized by law, whereby, she circumvents her jurisdiction ("principles of law and due process"), and failed to grant relief at the earliest possible moment in the course of litigation. The <u>Petitioner</u> has been irreparably injured. The "judicial act" of violating a constitutional doctrine of separation of powers or the Court's doctrine of the separation of church and state is profound, self-evident and everlasting. This writ of prohibition is for *raison d'etre*:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> prior illegal action: matters addressed as Fifth Amend. & First Amend. *clause violations* and the Establishment Clause Challenges, in conjunction with pertinent Court doctrines, tests or case law.

- 1). To prevent the lower court to act outside its jurisdictional powers, or to transgress the limits of powers vested in it, when <u>Petitioner</u> is in real danger of losing his fundamental and substantial rights, thereby, violating the *raison d'être* for the creation of the Constitution of the United States.
- 2). To forbid the contravention of a statutory duty in 26 U.S.C. §7806; or to prohibit a usurper throne *advancing legalism* for illicit Orders; made in favor of *unbridled power* by usurping the constitutional authority of the Congress and the lawful and legal rights of <u>Petitioner</u>.
- 3). To shield <u>Petitioner</u>'s protected speech and expression, being free from [a]ny system of prior restraint of pure speech, conscience, assessment of thought, content based restrictions, or self-censorship, inter alia, when embracing a "spiritual stake in First Amendment values sufficient to give standing to raise issues concerning the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause"
- 4). To prevent <u>Petitioner</u> irreparable harm with no adequate remedy by way of appeal for "judicial enforcement of established rights" or for *ultra vires* relief with constitutionally protected interests or essential rights that merits enforcement or protection by the law.
- 5). To prevent a doctrine in Dominion Theology, inter alia theologies to prevail in favor of a waiver or consent of the purview within Federal sovereign immunity doctrine involving a dogmatic doctrine in defense of absolutism or to advance the "United States" government's religious zeal of absolutism in an IRS' creed, or the pious beliefs and devout practices in [Taxology] and Taxism.
- 6). To prevent the advancement or endorsement of law respecting an establishment of religion that invaded <u>Petitioner</u>'s *sacred precincts* of mind and soul or constitutionally protected interests.
- 7). To prevent 5<sup>th</sup> Amend. & First Amend. exercise/establishment clauses to become meaningless, irrelevant or to manifest a *lack of faith* in one's life, liberty or pursuit of happiness.

#### The raison d'être for the creation of our Constitution of the United States:

- "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.
- -That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,
- -That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

The Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Set forth & defined as *Organic Law* in the Front Matter of the United States Code that formed the foundation of the Constitution of the United States of America; manifesting U.S. government.

One aspect of legal theory underlying the requested writs might be expressed as follows: when all other remedies fail to offer adequate relief, the writ of prohibition should be used as a ground for intervention. Some judicial acts are so excessive, as a matter of law that prohibition lies as a matter of course. The Petitioner's case presents constitutional issues and right to restrain by prohibition, however the Court's medieval doctrine of Federal sovereign immunity ("the King can do no wrong") is misplaced, and barred without due process of law a provision in 5<sup>th</sup> Amendment.<sup>5</sup>

For the purpose of determining the right to restrain by prohibition, a much broader meaning is given. In such proceedings, lack of jurisdiction may be applied to a case where, although the court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and parties in the fundamental sense, but, it had no "jurisdiction" or power to act except in a particular manner or to give certain kinds of relief or to act without the occurrence of certain procedural requirements. Simply stated, or as in this case, it is possible for a court to commit an act which may be prohibited by a superior court even though the lower court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties. Respondent has refused or ignored her official duty or failed to gain jurisdiction over the Real Party in Interest or court's jurisdiction, as a matter of law, of which is constitutional preserved the by Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution and its Article III powers granted, as well as, an Oath of Office before God.

# OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE - PURSUANT TO FRAP, RULE 21(c) – OTHER EXTRAORDINARY WRITS

#### A Petition for a Writ of Certiorari:

In the alternative, <u>Petitioner</u>, seeks a vital legal remedy pursuant to FRAP, RULE 21(c) - OTHER EXTRAORDINARY WRITS with appellate relief, lawfully brought within 28 U.S.C. §2106 – Determination, or within the *inherent equitable powers* to issue *Writs*, to correct original

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Amendment 5, United States Constitution Bill of Rights, in pertinent part provides: "No person shall be... deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"

judgement upon discovery with clear and prejudicial error of law, fundamental error or reversible error. § set forth herein, with Petitioner's constitutionally protected liberty and property interests. This alternative Petition, for a Writ of Certiorari, addresses in essence, this Court power to compel the district Court to issue a Writ of Error Coram Nobis for correction of the court's errors of fact or "where the errors were of the most fundamental character -- that is, such as rendered the proceeding itself irregular and invalid". Petitioner believes, the Writ of Error Coram Nobis is perfectly suited to the challenges of this case, where the Court's decision-making was subverted by the lawyers for the Real Party in Interest, and that there is no reason why this Court cannot and should not employ these writs to accord Petitioner relief. Because federal courts generally invoke subject-matter jurisdiction over live controversies of federal questions; the fact the Real Party in Interest religiously raised a subject-matter jurisdiction defense of Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine, with the district court in lock step with the bias dictum for a fictional waiver or using unbridled power against Petitioner, the right under 28 U.S. Code §1291 - Final decisions of district courts, becomes legally pointless or moot. It is the equation of jurisdiction which explains the power of government. 10 Here, in distinction, by merits 11 the correction of one evil would not justify the creation on another of equal degree. 678 A writ of certiorari is an indicia of judiciary veracity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> see Appendix A.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> see Appendix B.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> see Appendix C.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> see U. S. v. Mayer, 235 U.S. 55, 69 (1914); United States v. Morgan, 346 U.S. 502 (1954).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> see Appendix D.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> see Appendixes, E & W.

#### **ISSUES AND QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

ORDER OF DISMISSAL (ECF No. 94) & MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (ECF No. 93)

#### For a Writ of Mandamus:

The issue presented is whether <u>Petitioner</u> is entitled to *injunctive relief and judicial review*<sup>1</sup> as a mandate to the district court, or *other such relief* as this Court deems appropriate; when Judge Fleissig clearly abused her discretion,<sup>2</sup> by granting a motion in favor of *unbridled power*, *defects of justice*,<sup>3</sup> or for *Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine*;<sup>4</sup> thereby advancing the "United States" government's *religious zeal*, IRS' *creed*, <sup>5</sup> *beliefs and devout practices* in [Taxology]<sup>6</sup> and Taxism.<sup>7</sup>

Did the District Court err as a matter of law, by usurping the constitutional authority of the Congress, or issuing an Order that cannot pass constitutional muster, or by Respondent failure to raise *judicial review* or *grant legal reliefs sought*, amounting to a judicial usurpation of power or clear and prejudicial errors of law & fact; when Respondent failed to faithfully fulfill her official duties, or sworn oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the laws made in pursuant thereof?

Answer: Yes

<sup>1</sup> for judgment as a matter of law on the merits & strict scrutiny standards with U.S.C. §7421(a)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> of a non-discretionary manner of strict scrutiny standards, see Appendixes A, B, C, F, inter alia.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$ see "Relief from Ultra Vires Governmental Action", Marquette Law Review (1959) Appendix G

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> A *dogmatic doctrine*, *ultra vires* to U.S. Const., precluded by germane Doctrines & Errors herein.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> IRS religious creed: "Our core values guide our path to archiving our vision". (IRS pub. 3744)

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{6}{2}$  [Organized Religion of THEIRS] per se Taxology is set forth passim in this case of controversies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Institutionalized Faith in Taxism declared *passim* the lawsuits, not just *per se*, at Compl. at ¶ 305

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> authorities: see 26 U.S.C. §7806 & 28 U.S.C. §§2201, 2202, 1346, inter alia, 5<sup>th</sup> & 1<sup>st</sup> Amends.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Langford v. United States, 101 U.S. 341 (1879). Syllabus #1, at 343-344, and see Addendum.

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{10}{2}$  strict scrutiny review, Rule 52 or Rule 57 remedy, injunctive relief for claims or *liberty interests*.

<sup>11</sup> grounds for a writ being Defects of Justice as facts listed herein or unbridled power, inter alia.

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{12}{2}$  public/official nature: substantive & procedural due process of law & judicial review, inter alia.

<sup>13</sup> see premises & arguments in (Doc. Nos. 43, 80, 81, 85, 92) & Addendum of Law

PETITIONER'S PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT For a Writ of Prohibition:

The issue presented is whether Respondent abridged<sup>1</sup> <u>Petitioner</u>'s *free exercise of petition* speech<sup>2</sup> that conveys vital religious beliefs, equitable claims, grievances/enforcement of rights and a spiritual message, within a strict scrutiny standard forum<sup>3</sup> to manifest protection of the law when he receives an injury; while embracing a "spiritual stake in *First Amendment values* sufficient to give standing to raise issues concerning the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause".<sup>4</sup>

Does the First Amendment still protect <u>Petitioner</u>'s *free exercise* of *pure speech* or *religious* beliefs<sup>5</sup> that is unfavorable to Respondent and the <u>Real Party in Interest</u>, <sup>6</sup> or does the government or its Respondent avowing a doctrine in a *divine right of Kings*<sup>2</sup> prevail; to advance or endorse law respecting an establishment of religion that invaded <u>Petitioner</u>'s *sacred precincts* of mind and soul?

Answer: "the King can do no wrong" & subjecting U.S. citizens with Dominion Theology. 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>Petitioner</u>'s protected speech or by regulating the contents of pure or petition speech via Court Orders & Memos, as an invasion of constitutional protected interests or curtail essential rights.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Protected speech and expression being free from [a]ny system of prior restraint of expression or from unnecessary burdens, content based restrictions, vague rules or self-censorship, *inter alia*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Courthouse with strict scrutiny for "the access sought by the speaker", see Appendixes R, W, Y.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Data Processing Svc. Orgs. v. Camp, 397 U.S. 150, 154 (1970) case/controversy test-Article III

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> pure speech of religious beliefs constituted in [OVC/Petition] & "Other Amendments" as notice pleadings filed pursuant to FRCP 15(a)(2) or Declarations, Exhibits and briefs filed by <u>Petitioner</u>.

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{6}{2}$  favoring viewpoint-based discrimination or restrictions on (Doc. Nos. 1, 3, 28, 33, 34, 44, 45.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Divine right of Kings, a *dogmatic doctrine* in defense of monarchical absolutism, which asserted that Kings derived their authority from God and could not therefore be held accountable for their actions by any earthly authority such as a parliament, or of a constitutional case of controversies.

<sup>§</sup> The long standing common law maxim, that the King was believed to be *divine in nature* and it would be a contradiction of the **King's perfection** to *allow suits or any claims against the* **King**.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> IRS' Dominion Theology endorsed in IRC §7402(a) Jurisdiction of district courts, to issue orders, processes, & judgments with no legal effect since Congress declared in IRC §7806(a) Construction of title a waiver of jurisdiction in IRC §7604(c)(1) Cross references are made for convenience only

JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL AND SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS

For a Writ of Certiorari:

Whether <u>Petitioner</u> is entitled  $\frac{1}{2}$  to sue the <u>Real Party in Interest</u>  $\frac{2}{2}$  as a necessary party to the

suit, 3 or plead and manage one's causes personally as a "course of proceeding whatsoever" in a

suit against the "United States" government under Article III jurisdiction; versus a legal fiction of

a waiver within the purview of sovereign immunity,<sup>5</sup> effectively leaving no adequate appellate

remedy to exists; when Petitioner is in real danger of losing his fundamental and substantial rights.

Did the District Court err as a matter of law, by failing to analyze or apply the controlling

law correctly, 6 when District Judge Fleissig reaches a decision so arbitrary & unreasonable as to

amount to a clear and prejudicial error of law; <sup>7</sup> thus, manifesting irreparable harm with no adequate

remedy by way of appeal for "judicial enforcement of established rights" or ultra vires relief with

constitutionally protected interests or essential rights that merits enforcement or protection by law?<sup>9</sup>

Answer: Yes

<sup>1</sup> 'entitled' means: entitlement to sue because of the Court's Doctrine of Standing or the capacity to sue the "United States" government involving issues of constitutional magnitude; because the federal courts at every level viewed this type of complaint/lawsuit/action/equitable claims through the *prism of due process*, which is the right to fair administration of justice, & due process of law.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> per 28 U.S.C §2403 Intervention by United States or a State; constitutional question, inter alia.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> necessary party meaning; also as an indispensable party (also called a required party, necessary party, or necessary and indispensable party) is a party in a lawsuit whose participation is required for jurisdiction or the purpose of rendering a judgment. See FRCP, Rule 19 & 28 U.S.C. §2403.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 'petition speech' via Judiciary Act of 1789, SEC. 32, 35 & with requirement of demurrer upheld.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> improper purposes unrelated to federal/constitutional questions or upholding a privilege of U.S. citizenship, *due process* or *free exercise* to petition and protest as First Amend. rights, *inter alia*.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> controlling law: Langford v. United States, Marbury v. Madison, or listed herein or Addendum

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> see (ECF Nos. 93, 94.) FRCP, Rule 8(e) CONSTRUING PLEADINGS, Appendixes A-C, F, I, K.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> see Addendum of Law

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> see Appendixes passim.

#### FACTS NECESSARY TO UNDERSTAND PETITIONS

James Madison, writing as "Publius," stated in The Federalist paper, No. 47:

"The accumulation of all powers legislative, executive and judiciary in the same hands, whether of one, a few or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny." The **raison d'être** for accountability government.

This statement of governmental power is a fact necessary to understand the petitions presented.

The doctrine and maxim in a *divine right of Kings*, manifesting "the King can do no wrong" from which the maxim was drawn; prevails today in favor of a waiver of Federal sovereign immunity, or worse yet, consent to sue pertaining to <a href="Petitioner">Petitioner</a>'s amended complaint and "PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT" for "DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF". In the eyes of the <a href="Petitioner">Petitioner</a>, his supreme possessions bound by the chains of injustice; are controlled by a dogmatic doctrine in defense of absolutism. The "United States" government's religious zeal of a Dominion Theology, IRS' creed, beliefs and devout practices in [Taxology] and Taxism manifested this result quoted above. This

"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." Petitioner's [OVC/Petition] at ¶3 & in Doc. No. 44 [Revelation #1] at ¶¶ 5 & 6. (pleaded facts of these *supreme possessions* are *passim*)

heartfelt burden to exist as a 'subject' and not as a citizen, or worse, be compelled to become a

taxp[r]ayer is a fact necessary to understand the petitions presented, and this constitutional issue:

Another raison d'etre fact necessary to understand the petitions presented, passim in this suit:

"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." [OVC/Petition] at ¶36 & in Doc. No. 44 [Revelation #1] page 14 at ¶101, ¶102. (supreme possessions as facts passim in this suit & case).

additionally,

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." [OVC/Petition] at ¶34 & Doc. No. 44 [Revelation #1] at ¶99.

<u>Petitioner</u> avers, the <u>existence of my life</u>, liberty or pursuit of happiness extends far beyond the limitations of me. The <u>Petitioner</u>'s <u>sincerely held religious beliefs</u> ([Commanding Heights] are Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment) and his <u>secular beliefs</u> ([CLP] & U.S. Supreme Court doctrines, tests & case precedents) manifesting one's <u>personal constitution</u> built upon God's Policy of Truth is set against "<u>United States</u>" IRS' dominion theology, inter alia. see <u>Appendix J</u>

Another fact necessary to understand, these Court Orders (ECF No. 93 & 94) and the <u>Real</u>

<u>Party in Interest</u> actions as pleaded; both embraces *ultra vires governmental actions*, under the *dogmatic shield* of a Court doctrine, whereby *sovereign immunity*, in this *case of controversies*, may justly be pronounced as the very definition of tyranny.

For facts necessary to understand the petitions or procedural posture, see appendixes, accordingly:

#### **DEFECTS OF JUSTICE**

#### Prevailing Preferences or Perspective versus Primacy of a Righteous Policy:

"By definition, a government has no conscience, sometimes it has a policy, but nothing more" is a fact necessary to understand the petitions presented, and the righteousness of securing free speech and religious liberty, the touchstone of Petitioner's case. The current administration, through the Article II powers of the Executive Branch; recognized certain 'defects of justice' within Federal practices concerning infringing on religious beliefs or defeating its liberty. To suppress such governmental activity and protect principles of Religious Liberty under Federal law by "Promoting Free Speech and Religious Liberty"; President Trump issued Exec. Order No. 13798 §4, 82 Fed. Reg. 21675 (May 4, 2017). Made perfectly clear, on October 6, 2017, by U.S. Attorney General

Sessions' 25-page Memorandum and 2-page directive ("[Religious Liberty/Directive]"). This [Religious Liberty/Directive] is germane with Petitioner's speech of self-government and, the legal ambits of Petitioner's case and the issues and questions presented in these petitions. However, the prevailing perspective of the lawyers of the IRS' tax division for the DOJ have ignored or suppress [Religious Liberty/Directive] in favor of unbridled power exercised in (ECF Nos. 51, 52, 59, 67, 82, 83, 84, 86.). [Religious Liberty/Directive] contains no ambiguity of prevailing or controlling law and preserves a compelling governmental interest, and of the President's declaration that "[i]t shall be the policy of the executive branch to vigorously enforce Federal law's robust protections for religious freedom." Exec. Order 13798, §1 (May 4, 2017), as well, within this written directive:

"Litigating Divisions and United States Attorney's Offices should also consider, in consultation with the Associate Attorney General, how best to implement the guidance with respect to arguments already made in pending cases where such arguments may be inconsistent with the guidance." (Emphasis added).

Petitioner filed (Doc. Nos. 87, 88, 89, 90) legal notice & seeking leave to file a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition of the "REPLY IN SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES' MOTION TO DISMISS" re: (ECF No. 86). Respondent issued an Order (ECF No. 91) granting the request for leave, whereby Petitioner filed a sur-reply brief (Doc. No. 92). The argument, premises of law and factual issues were ignored by Respondent or suppressed by the prevailing perspective in (ECF Nos. 93, 94) of bias dictum or for its defects of justice, in favor of unbridled power.

#### Unbridled power of discretion:

The *arbitrary power* of not evoking germane Court doctrines and precedents, or discarding strict scrutiny standards of judicial review or to alter the law with absolute impunity. A *usurping power*, abridging the pure or protected speech of religious beliefs or conscience, favoring viewpoint-based discrimination or viewpoint-based restrictions.

#### The Act of Subterfuge:

The art of manipulation or achieve one's goals as an act of subterfuge is a *faithless discharge* of one's oath or official duties. In this case, the *color of law* artfully premised by crossing a threshold of restricting protected speech, based on its content, or for defects of justice; as *governmental* actors manifested artful activities, executing (ECF Nos. 82, 82-1, 83, 84, 86, 93, 94), sequentially. Intellectualism of Indifference:

"We are in a sense as much responsible for what we do to others with words... as we would be with weapons." Mankind has created a legal system and attempted to introduce a distinction between "interpretation" and "construction", but what if, our understanding of these concepts is defined... only by the intellectualism of indifference and not from Mankind's true creations of "empathy, sacrifice, love... these qualities are not confined to walls of flesh and blood... but are found within the deepest, best parts of man's soul no matter where that soul resides."

#### A Practice of Justification not of Justice:

when the Real Party in Interest, requested the Respondent only to dismiss "with prejudice all counts and claims for relief in Plaintiff's amended complaint" (ECF No. 82). A fact reaffirmed, as artfully enlarged by a "[Proposed] ORDER (ECF No. 82-1) whereby "the United States moved to dismiss Plaintiff's complaint..." vs an amended complaint. This practice of justification, not of Justice becomes self-evident; when the dismissal of this case operated on formalities not as an adjudication, judgement or decision on the merits. The ever-shifting sands of legalism is advanced by clear and prejudicial error of law, fundamental error or reversible error. These unmerited practices of injustice on the free exercise of Petitioner's pure speech as frivolous or allowed Respondent, to Order "that all pending motions are DENIED as moot" (ECF No. 93).

see (Doc. Nos. 80, 64, 53, 49, 46,). Petitioner was seeking to exercise the legal right of procedural

due process within these plead motions, but curtailed by a practice of justification, not of Justice.

Manifesting Second Class Citizenship:

"National citizenship" and its status are First Amendment privileges with the full protection of due process of law. U.S. citizenship and its legal status offers certain tangible or intangible benefits to its citizens. Under, strict scrutiny the government must prove that the challenged law is both narrowly tailored and the least-restrictive means available to further a compelling governmental interest. Respondent ignoring strict scrutiny standards of judicial review or failing to uphold U.S. Supreme Court precedents in United States v. Playboy Entm't Group, 529 U.S. 803, 813 (2000) and Sable Communications, Inc. v. FCC, 492 U.S. 115, 126 (1989) degrades tangible or intangible benefits of citizenship. The Court has no compelling governmental interest of generating second-class citizenship only to be transformed as one's national citizenship by a clear abuse of discretion.

Bias dictum:

A judge's remark or observation on some point of law which is not essential to the case in question, hence not binding as a legal precedent, but advances vital departures from the law, by favoring viewpoint-based discrimination. Simply stated, a judge has full knowledge of the law with no desire to present the legalized will or legal reasoning, that is or was essential to the case in question.

Dichotomous Doctrines of Establishment Law:

The U.S. Supreme Court *Establishment Clause Doctrine* in the Separation of Church and State precludes a waiver, and prevails over the pious preeminence of [Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine *aka* "the King can do no wrong"] ("[FSID]"). Both are United States Supreme Court Doctrines and presents a totally dichotomy of *judicial reasoning* and political thought. Petitioner, asserts [FSID] is a religious zeal of the "United States" government. The Real Party in Interest or its Respondent are avowing a medieval doctrine in a divine right of Kings, premised as religion.

Artfully practiced when protecting matters of *church and state*, as witnessed in this lawsuit; a fact not denied by the <u>Real Party in Interest</u>. The facts, legal premises and law cited in <u>Petitioner</u>'s *surrely* (Doc. No. 92) was not contested, nor denied by this party, nor addressed by the Respondent in (ECF No. 93). If this Court accepts this *dysfunctional doctrine* [FSID] as opposed to <u>Petitioner</u>'s *arguments* of sound judicial reasoning or establishment clause challenges; there is a continuous chain of court precedents that bar the Courts, advancing conflicts with *constitutional restrictions* or failing to *preserve constitutionally protected liberty and property interests*.

#### This Legal Fiction of a Wavier:

"Believing or assuming something not true is true" or in this case, as a legal fiction of a waiver for the purview of sovereign immunity. This legal fiction within a constitutional system of law is [To LIVE as EVIL]. The Petitioner will not live under that yoke, because, it is a manifestation of injustice violating [RFRA] and Mankind's supreme possessions, becoming the objects of sacrifice.

#### Other First Amendment Burdens:

There are too many First Amendment Burdens, *inter alia* to list, manifesting a work of injustice. The further facts necessary for these petitions, are expounded with *legal precision*, with clear and prejudicial error of law and fact as *a clear abuse of discretion* in Appendix A, as well, fundamental errors in Appendix B, in addition to *reversible error* in Appendix C, as vital facts set forth herein.

#### REASONS WHY THE WRITS SHOULD ISSUE

A writ of mandamus/prohibition are extraordinary remedy appropriate only in exceptional circumstances, such as those amounting to a judicial "usurpation of power" or a clear abuse of discretion. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Columbia*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004). There are 'five nonconclusive guidelines' in determining whether to grant mandamus/prohibition relief, see In re Bieter, 16 F.3d 929, 932 (8th Cir. 1994).

In deciding whether to issue such writs, this Court considers:

(1). The party seeking the writ has no other adequate means, such as direct appeal, to attain the relief desired:

To seek or make a direct appeal, thereby to attain the relief desired or relief from *ultra vires* governmental actions; first, the Real Party in Interest would have to have a *judicial system* that cannot bypass, Supreme Court precedent, germane court doctrine or strict scrutiny test. Moreover, Federal Judges that would not misapply, misuse or exploit any Editions of Fed. R. Civ. P. or RULE 8 and uphold policy & the law. Law The Real Party in Interest, would have officials that obey the U.S Constitution, or the desires to uphold Petitioner's First Amendment rights of religious liberty and protected speech; because Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine precludes any remedy or other adequate means or equity. In view of the delay that has already occurred, any further postponements or extensions of time will continue to unnecessarily or unjustly burden the free exercise principles and practices of the Petitioner's constitutional rights of the First Amendment. The preventative function and ambits of prohibition sought or mandamus requested are discussed or set forth herein, with each of the factors weighs heavily in favor of why the writs should issue.

### (2). The <u>Petitioner</u> will be damaged or prejudiced in a way not correctable on appeal:

There is no specific remedy at law concerning the <u>Petitioner</u>'s free exercise of First Amendment rights, or Establishment Clause challenges, when granting a motion in favor of unbridled power and of bias dictum for ultra vires governmental action; absent of strict scrutiny review, thereby manifesting irreparable harm with no adequate remedy by way of appeal for "judicial enforcement of established rights" or for any ultra vires relief with constitutionally protected interests or essential rights that merits enforcement or protection by the law. see Appendixes G, F, I, K, R, Y.

<sup>12</sup> see Addendum of Law.

(3). The district court's order is clearly erroneous as a matter of law:

1). Petitioner's case was not ripe or meets 'condition present' for an Order of Dismissal at this

stage of litigation or proceedings pursuant to Judiciary Act of 1789, SEC. 32. This Order of

Dismissal is the ambits of fundamentals error with its Memorandum and Order, both premature

and precluding the merits of the case or excluding evidence which Petitioner was entitled to have

admitted, manifesting reversible error. see Appendixes A-C.

2). The District court does not apply the correct law; as the controlling law for sovereign immunity

is in Langford v. United States 101 U.S. 341 (1879) the Court held: "As applicable to the

government or any of its officers, the maxim that the King can do no wrong has no place in our

system of constitutional law." at 343-344

3). The District court rests its decision on a clearly erroneous finding of a material fact, as in this

case, it presents mixed questions of law and fact involving liberty, law and religion, not

administrative remedies or facts of a Bivens claim. Furthermore, a legal fiction of a waiver of

sovereign immunity invokes a Theology Doctrine of the government. Intensely, Respondent's

Orders willingly ignored capable-of-repetition doctrine or the 'Doctrine of Unconditional

Conditions' as the uncontested facts of Petitioner's case provides, there would in any event be a

real basis for federal jurisdiction of such a suit; it is for violation of the Constitution and he will

again be subjected to the alleged illegality. Any wavier in Federal Sovereign Immunity doctrine,

with unknown terms or conditions in such a waiver, manifests "exceptional situations," where the

Petitioner can make a reasonable showing that he will again be subjected to the alleged illegality

or unconstitutional conditions of issuing an Order of Dismissal (ECF No. 94).

4). District court rules in an irrational manner, contrary to Article III powers, in part, provides that

the "judicial Power" extends to the determination of various "Cases" and "Controversies." District

court failed to fully address the legal premises and constitutional issues raised in <u>Petitioner</u>'s RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO Rule 12(b)(1) & 12(b)(6) re82 (Doc. No. 85) or with his surreply of points and authority brief (Doc. No. 92).

- 5). The District court made errors of law, and Respondent abused her discretion by erroneously interpreting a law or by resting its decision on an inaccurate view of the law. see Appendixes A, B, C, F, I, K, L, M, P, R, V, W, X, Y.
- 6). Record contains no evidence to support district court's decision, that this case concerns a Bivens claim or legal reasons for "Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies" or making a claim against IRS agents (no such claims exist). The many cases cited by the Respondent or Real Party in Interest, are not exhibits entered into the record, to confirm their germane use and accuracy of the words rely upon as the law.
- (4). The district court's order is an oft-repeated error, or manifests a persistent disregard of the federal rules: by consistently forsaking or reliably forgetting due process of law and FRCP, Rule 8(e) CONSTRUING PLEADINGS. It is the Respondent, not the Petitioner, who seeks to disregard well-established procedural law. It is the function and not the fiction that is fundamental in attaining the relief. These Orders issued (ECF Nos. 93, 94.) is merely a staged application and function, in support of defects of justice, legal fictions or consent for Federal sovereign immunity; effectively leaving no adequate appellate remedy to exists; when Petitioner is in real danger of losing his fundamental and substantial rights. To the extent that Petitioner seeks to attack these Orders, it is only because these Orders disregards the law, not the Court ability to apply an Order in a case. see Appendix I.
- (5). The district court's order raises new and important problems or issues of law of first impression:

- 1). See page 7, <u>PETITIONER</u>'S PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST
- AMENDMENT. The Orders abridged protected speech of religious beliefs, petition, inter alia.
- 2) 26 U.S.C. §7421 is within "subtitle F":

Importantly, the law Respondent was relying on, 26 U.S.C. §7421 ("The Anti-Injunction Act") which has "no legal effect" pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7806- Construction of title; as "see subtitle F" is "made only for convenience" due to its "Cross reference" 26 U.S.C. §5067. "For general administrative provisions applicable to the assessment, collection, refund, etc., of taxes, see subtitle F. "See Appendix V, V-1.

- 3). Another important problem or issue of law of first impression, The <u>Real Party in Interest</u>, set forth in (Doc. No. 92, page 2) as:
- "The Defendants in this case, denoted as the Legislative, Executive & Judiciary Branches of the United States government are to protect religious liberty; not prevent the *free exercise* of religious beliefs or *abridge* the protected speech that it has manifested within this case or controversies."
- 4). Another first impression and problem concern a landmark case: Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296, 304 (1940) "freedom to believe" is absolute. Petitioner 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 organized religions of the Real Party in Interest or the Institutionalized Faith of Taxism.
- 5). <u>Petitioner</u>'s "Original Verified Complaint" included the legal aspects as a **Petition** seeking "IN THIS PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT" (Doc. No. 1, & passim in other notice pleadings) pursuant to the Ninth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. This single new and important problem or issue of law of first impression, commands a legal precedent.

#### CONTROLLING LAW AND LEGAL STANDARDS

<u>Petitioner</u> avers the following *controlling law and legal standards* to understand said petitions:

- 1). Federal Sovereign Immunity: Langford v. United States 101 U.S. 341, 343-344 (1879) Syllabus #1 re: "the King can do no wrong" long standing common law maxim, that the King was believed to be divine in nature and it would be a contradiction of the King's perfection to allow suits or any claims against the King. A Dominion Theology, whereby the Divine right of Kings, a dogmatic doctrine in defense of monarchical absolutism, which asserted that Kings derived their authority from God and could not, therefore, be held accountable for their actions by any earthly authority such as a parliament, or as herein, a constitutional case of controversies of religious liberty and establishment clause challenges. The U.S. Supreme Court has insightful held for over 200 years:
- "That the maxim of English constitutional law, that the King can do no wrong, is one which the courts must apply to the government of the United States, and that therefore there can be no tort committed by the government. It is not easy to see how the first proposition can have any place in our system of government. We have no King to whom it can be applied. It is not easy to see how the first proposition can have any place in our system of government. We do not understand that either in reference to the government of the United States, or of the several states, or of any of their officers, the English maxim has an existence in this country." (Emphasis added)
- 2). For the *legal fiction in a protocol for a waiver* and/or purview of <u>consent</u> concerning Federal Sovereign Immunity, existing as *articulated law* for the "United States" to sue and be sued being, *unequivocally expressed*, is pursuant to 28 U.S. Code §1345 United States as plaintiff and 28 U.S. Code §1346 United States as defendant, respectively. *See* (**Doc. No. 92**, page 5, Sec. II, subsection A, addressing 28 U.S.C. §1346(a)(2)): in pertinent part:
- "The district courts shall have original jurisdiction...Any other civil action or claim against the United States, not exceeding \$10,000 in amount, founded either upon the Constitution, or any Act of Congress, or any regulation of an executive department"
- 3). Regarding *capable-of-repetition doctrine* or controlling law for questions of mootness and its exceptions of <u>Petitioner</u>'s claim or conduct "capable of repetition but evading review," *see* City of Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95, 109-110 (1983).
- 4). For subject matter jurisdiction in 12(b)(1) &12(b)6 motion to dismiss see (Doc. Nos. 85 & 92).

- 5). For *controlling law* that declaratory and injunctive relief sought is precluded by statute or law, see 26. U.S.C. §7806 or the Court Doctrine in a Separation of Church and State, the Justiciability Doctrines, Judicial Review Doctrine, Prior Restraint Doctrine, or statutes 28 U.S.C. §§2201, 2202 implemented through Rule 57 of the Fed. R. Civ. P. and its Rule 52 or 28 U.S.C §1651 Writs. 6). A federal court has the authority to determine whether it has jurisdiction to hear a particular
- case. see United States v. Ruiz, 536 U.S. 622, 628 (2002) (citing United States v. Mine Workers of Am., 330 U.S. 258, 291 (1947)).
- 7). The *principles of waiver*, consent, and estoppel do not apply to *jurisdictional issues*—the actions of the litigants cannot vest a district court with jurisdiction above the limitations provided by the Constitution and Congress.

In *Insurance Corp. of Ireland v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee*, 456 U.S. 694 (1982), the Supreme Court noted that:

Subject-matter jurisdiction, then, is an Art. III as well as a statutory requirement; it functions as a restriction on federal power, and contributes to the characterization of the federal sovereign. Certain legal consequences directly follow from this. For example, *no action of the parties* can confer subject-matter jurisdiction upon a federal court. Thus, the consent of the parties is irrelevant, *California v. LaRue*, 409 U. S. 109 (1972), principles of estoppel do not apply, *Am. Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn*, 341 U. S. 6, 17-18 (1951), and *a party does not waive the requirement by failing to challenge jurisdiction early in the proceedings*. (Emphasis added)

Id. at 702. See also Arbaugh v. Y & H Corp., 546 U.S. 500 (2006) (jurisdiction upheld).

#### Writ of Error Coram Nobis:

The Writ of Error Coram Nobis is a common law writ that is preserved for the Supreme Court by the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. §1651(a) ("The Supreme Court ... may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of ... [its] jurisdiction and agreeable to the usages and principles of law."). As the Court observed in United States v. Morgan, 345 U.S. 502, 507-08 (1954), in directing a lower

federal court to consider issuance of Coram nobis pursuant to §1651(a):

The writ of coram nobis was available at common law to correct errors of fact. It was allowed without limitation of time for facts that affect the "validity and regularity" of the judgment, and was used in both civil and criminal cases.

The Writ of Error Coram Nobis has come before this Court infrequently. When it has, however, the Court has uniformly upheld its availability under the All Writs Act to remedy "errors of the most fundamental character." Morgan, 345 U.S. at 512, quoting United States v. Mayer, 235 U.S. 55, 68 (1914); See also Stroude v. The Stafford Justices, 1 Brock. 162, 23 F. Cas. 236 (C.C.D. Va. 1810) (Marshall, C.J.) (granting Coram Nobis relief).

#### STATUTORY DUTIES OF JUDICIARY OFFICE

#### The Judiciary Act of 1789, in SEC. 7 in pertinent part:

"I, A. B., do solemnly swear or affirm, that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent on me as, according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeably to the constitution, and laws of the United States. So help me God."

#### **Federal Judiciary Oaths:**

In the United States, federal judges are required to take two oaths. 28 U.S.C. §453, Oaths of justices and judges and 5 U.S.C. §3331, Oath of Office.

#### **LEGAL FICTION**

The district court used the **2006 Edition** of FRCP, Rule 8 as its legal authority to dismiss the [OVC/Petition] (Doc. No. 1) (ECF No. 8) when the **2016 Edition** of FRCP should prevailed. What is **LEGAL FICTION**? (Black's Law Dictionary 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)

"Believing or assuming something not true is true. Used in judicial reasoning for avoiding issues where a new situation comes up against the law, changing how the law is applied, but not changing the text of the law." See http://thelawdictionary.org/legal-fiction/
Certain legal fictions addressed herein.

#### To withstand the strictures of the free exercise clause:

In interpreting and applying the Free Exercise Clause, the Court has consistently held religious beliefs to be absolutely immune from governmental interference. But it has used a number of standards to review government action restrictive of religiously motivated conduct, ranging from formal neutrality to clear and present danger of its conduct to strict scrutiny. For cases of intentional governmental discrimination against religion, the Court still employs strict scrutiny. But for most other free exercise cases it has now reverted to a standard of formal neutrality. "[T]he right of free exercise," it has stated, "does not relieve an individual of the obligation to comply with a 'valid and neutral law of general applicability on the ground the law proscribes (or prescribes) conduct that his religion prescribes (or proscribes)". 18

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. (8 Otto) 145 (1878); Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296 (1940); Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520 (1993).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Reynolds v. United States, 98 U.S. (8 Otto) 145 (1879); Braunfeld v. Brown, 366 U.S. 599 (1961).

<sup>15</sup> Cantwell v. Connecticut, 310 U.S. 296 (1940).

 $<sup>\</sup>frac{16}{2}$  Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U.S. 398 (1963); Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (1972).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520 (1993).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Employment Div. v. Smith, 494 U.S. 872, 879 (1990), quoting United States v. Lee, 455 U.S. 252, 263, n.3 (1982) (Justice Stevens concurring in the judgment)

#### Addendum of Law

See Addendum, for controlling law, standard of law or points & authorities used for these petitions.

#### **Addendum of Appendixes**

List Attached.

#### **CONCLUSION**

For all the foregoing reasons, and based upon the record, <u>Petitioner</u> respectfully request that this Court grant the Petition for Writ of Mandamus and a Writ of Prohibition in its entirety *or*, *in the alternative*, grant other extraordinary writs as petition herein or as this Court deems *necessary or appropriate* and order that an answer to the Petitions be filed by Respondent.

//

//

//

//

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: February 9, 2018

In re: TERRY LEE HINDS, <u>Petitioner</u>, 438 Leicester Square Drive Ballwin, Missouri 63021 636-675-0028

Attached hereto & incorporated herein by reference Appendixes A through Z, Addendum of Law are documents essential to understand the matters set forth herein.

The undersigned hereby certifies that on this 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2018, the above was filed with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AND DELIVERY**

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2018 and served upon the Respondent, the Honorable Judge Audrey G. Fleissig, United States District Court, Eastern District of Missouri by hand delivery at the Clerk of Court Office of Judge Fleissig served by the Petitioner.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed this 9<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2018 and served upon Defendants, being the <u>Real Party in Interest</u> and its U.S. Attorney, by First class postage prepaid, U.S. Certified mail # 7009-0960-0000-0249-7078 at the following address:

Gregory L. Mokodean Trial Attorney, Tax Division U.S. Department of Justice P.O. Box 7238 Washington, D.C. 20044

Date: February 9, 2018

Date: February 9, 2018

**Initials** 

Respectfully Submitted,

In re: TERRY LEE HINDS, <u>Petitioner</u>, 438 Leicester Square Drive Ballwin, Missouri 63021 636-675-0028

#### CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE & RIGHT TO PETITION

Certificate of Compliance with type-volume limitation, and page requirement pursuant to:

#### Rule 21 -Writs of Mandamus, Prohibition and Other Extraordinary Writs

- computer generated 7,800 words
- handwritten or typewritten 30 pages

I certify that this petition for Writs of Mandamus, Prohibition and Other Extraordinary Writs complies with the page limitations of Fed. R. App. 21(d), and that in contains \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ words with 23 pages and has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2016, Times New Roman. The right to petition is pursuant to Judiciary Act 1789, and the jurisdiction of this Court, including Petitioner's First Amendment constitutional right to petition, as set forth herein, and to protest the color of law, *inter alia*, by the government or Respondent's action/or inactions as complained of herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

In re: TERRY LEE HINDS, Petitioner,

438 Leicester Square Drive Ballwin, Missouri 63021

xxi

#### **VERIFICATION OF PETITIONS FOR WRITS**

I, TERRY LEE HINDS of lawful age is the Petitioner in herein. I verify that I read these Petitions for a Writs of Mandamus, Prohibition and Other Extraordinary Writs involving this case: FILE NUMBER: 4:17–CV – 750 AGF on February \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, 2018, and declare under penalty of perjury and under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing facts in Petitions are correct and true to the best of my knowledge and information.

Subscribed & sworn to before me in St. Louis County on this day of the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of February, 2018.

Date: Executed on of February, 2017

In re: TERRY LEE HINDS, <u>Petitioner</u>, 438 Leicester Square Drive Ballwin, Missouri 63021 636-675-0028 or at *tlc76.com* 

Chrotema

CHRISTOPHER VARDEMAN
Notary Public-Notary Seal
State of Missouri, St Charles County
Commission # 15637745
My Commission Expires Aug 26, 2019

(name)

**NOTARY PUBLIC My Commission Expires:** 

8-24-19

Christopher

Petitioner prays for this extraordinary remedy to provide for the full enforcement and relief within our system of justice and in the *due process of law*, upholding the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights. As a faithfully servant of God and Country, and all person of the same faith are admonished to draw near and give their attention, for this Court is now presented these petitions. "God save the United States and this Honorable Court." So help us God.

TITLE V-EXTRAORDINARY WRITS

RULE 21A: PETITIONS FOR WRITS OF MANDAMUS AND PROHIBITION

Within 14 days after the filing of the petition, or as the court orders, the court must either dismiss the petition or direct that an answer be filed.

Appellate Case: 18-1299 Page: 44 Date Filed: 02/09/2018 Entry ID: 4629028