

Appendix Q

Declarations Filed by Petitioner

(Facts Necessary to Understand Petitions)

or as parts of the record that may be essential to understand the matters set forth in the petition

Doc. No. 13, 03/06/2017 – filed in support of All Causes of Action, attached to Memorandum in Support of re **Doc. No. 12**:

PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A RESPONSE TO
The Court’s Memorandum and Order dated 23rd day of February, 2017 (ECF No. 8)

listed as attachments: #1, **FIRST DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS**, #2 Exhibit T-9 (page 1), #3 Exhibit T-9 (page 2), #4 Exhibit T-9 (page 3), #5 Exhibit T-9 (page 4).

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner’s causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not “admissible in evidence”. See **ECF No. 52**.

Doc. No. 20, 03/17/2017, – **SECOND DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS** filed in support of ALL CAUSES OF ACTION and attached as Exhibit U#16 to:

PLAINTIFF’S SECOND REQUEST FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RELIEF AND A MOTION TO STRIKE ENTRY OF APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL & NOTICE OF APPEARANCE
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
MOTION TO SHOW CAUSE WHY SUCH PLEADINGS SHOULD NOT BE STRICKEN

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner’s causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not “admissible in evidence”. See **ECF No. 52**.

Doc. No. 24, 03/27/2017, – **THIRD DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS** filed in support of ALL CAUSES OF ACTION and attached to:

PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE AND REQUEST FOR A HEARING DATE

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of

the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner's causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not "admissible in evidence". See **ECF No. 52**.

Doc. No. 69, 08/21/2017, **FOURTH DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS** filed in support of **Doc. No. 44** and **Doc. No. 45**, in conjunction with **Doc. No. 68**:

PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE PERTAINING TO THE COURT'S
May 12th, 2017 Ruling & March 10th, 2017 Ruling & February 23rd, 2017 Ruling
[Constructive Notice vs. Actual Notice]

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner's causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not "admissible in evidence". See **ECF No. 52**.

Doc. No. 71, 08/22/2017, **FIFTH DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS** filed in support of **Doc. No. 44** and **Doc. No. 45**, in conjunction with **Doc. No. 70**:

PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE PERTAINING TO THE COURT'S
May 26th, 2017 Ruling & April 11th, 2017 Ruling & February 23rd, 2017 Ruling
[Constructive Notice vs. Actual Notice]

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner's causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not "admissible in evidence". See **ECF No. 52**.

Doc. No. 73, 08/23/2017, **SIXTH DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS** filed in support of **Doc. No. 44** and **Doc. No. 45**, in conjunction with **Doc. No. 72**:

PLAINTIFF'S INITIAL CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE PERTAINING TO THE COURT'S
July 11th, 2017 Ruling & May 5th, 2017 Ruling & February 23rd, 2017 Ruling
[Constructive Notice vs. Actual Notice]

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner's causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not "admissible in evidence". See **ECF No. 52**.

Doc. No. 75, 08/24/2017, **SEVENTH DECLARATION OF TERRY LEE HINDS** filed in support of **Doc. No. 44** and **Doc. No. 45**, in conjunction with **Doc. No. 74**:

PLAINTIFF'S FOURTH CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE IN OPPOSITION TO U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS AS TO FIRST AMENDMENT CHALLENGES/VIOLATIONS
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
OF PLAINTIFF'S ACTUAL NOTICE HAVING A BASIS IN LAW & FACT

FACT: The Respondent did not properly consider or make mention of this Declaration in any of the Memorandums, in support of Petitioner's causes of action or claims asserted. The Real Party in Interest did not move to strike any objectionable paragraphs of this declaration, pursuant to the 12(f) motion **ECF No. 51** or this Declaration contained statements that would be otherwise not "admissible in evidence". See **ECF No. 52**.

See: Doc. Nos. 12, 13, 20, 24, 69, 44, 45, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73 & ECF Nos. 51, 52 of which are entered into the Court's Pacer system for the review of these documents.

See Clerk of Court Office, Eastern District of Missouri stored in paper form for these Exhibits