

No. 17-_____

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

TERRY LEE HINDS,

Petitioner,

-v-

“UNITED STATES” GOVERNMENT,

Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

TERRY LEE HINDS

PETITIONER PRO SE

438 LEICESTER SQUARE DRIVE

BALLWIN, MO 63021

(636) 675-0028

ALPHAOMEGA44@OUTLOOK.COM

MAY 24, 2018

SUPREME COURT PRESS ♦ (888) 958-5705 ♦ BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

The issue presented is whether the Eighth Circuit or district court erred as a matter of law. Under such grounds or the precedent in *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 163 (1803) and *United States v. Morgan*, 346 U.S. 502, 503 (1954) this Court should vacate the Court of Appeals' judgment and instruct that court to remand the case to the district court with directions to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the laws made pursuant thereto; providing prospective, declaratory or other relief consistent with the judgement as a legal remedy at law, with regards to the First, Fifth and Ninth Amendment rights established by the U.S. Constitution and in accordance with U.S. Supreme Court's decisions, doctrines or the Judiciary Act of 1789 germane to this case or of its appeal.

Three questions of exceptional importance are presented:

1. Did judges of the Eighth Circuit or district court satisfy their sworn oath of office and solemn duty or important role to faithfully discharge Court doctrines and to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the laws made pursuant thereto?

2. Did the Eighth Circuit appropriately conclude that Petitioner's substantive and procedural due process challenges to his First Amendment *free exercise claims* as *protected speech* of religious beliefs and conscience or within his *petition speech* of establishment clause challenges were properly considered?

3. Did the Eighth Circuit forsake the *Supremacy Clause*?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	viii
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
OPINIONS BELOW	1
JURISDICTION.....	2
CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	3
A. Nature of the Case	3
B. Statement of Fact.....	5
C. Relevant Procedural History	9
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	13
I. THE ISSUES PRESENTED SOWS INCONSISTENCY WITHIN THE LAW WHEN THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT ENTERED A DECISION THAT SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER; WITH A CASE INVOLVING IMPORTANT QUESTIONS OF FEDERAL LAW NOT YET ADDRESSED BY THE SUPREME COURT OR DECIDED IN CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS OR ITS DOCTRINES. SUP. CT. R. 10(a)(c).	13
A. United States Constitution	13

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
B. First, Fifth & Ninth Amendment Rights of the U.S. Constitution	14
C. U.S. Supreme Court’s Doctrines, Precedents or Decisions	15
D. Fed. R. App. P. & EXEC. ORDER # 13798 & Policy published	15
E. Federal Statutes or U.S. Code.....	16
F. U.S. District’s Memorandums and Orders..	17
G. Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals’ Judg- ment, Mandate & Order	17
II. THE ISSUES PRESENTED IN THIS CASE OF EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE IS AN ENDORSE- MENT, ESTABLISHMENT, OR ADVANCEMENT OF A RELIGION AND COMMON LAW (ECCLESIA- STICAL)	18
A. 26 U.S. Code § 7806. Construction of Title	18
B. Law Respecting an Establishment of Religion	18
C. Common Law-Ten Commandants & “the King Can Do No Wrong”	18
III. THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL ISSUES PRESENTED TO THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT	19
A. The Issues and Questions Presented to Eighth Circuit	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

	Page
B. Eighth Circuit Advancing First Amendment Burdens, Conflicts or Unconstitutional Activity and Religious Discrimination of a Public Benefit	29
C. The Eighth Circuit Not Preserving the Breadth, Practicing or Conflicting with U.S. Supreme Court’s Doctrines, Precedents or Controlling Law.....	32
CONCLUSION.....	39

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

Judgment of the Eighth Circuit (February 26, 2018)	1a
Mandate of the Eighth Circuit (February 26, 2018)	2a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri (December 11, 2017)	3a
Order of Dismissal of the District Court of Missouri (December 11, 2017)	14a
Verified Petition For a Writ of Mandamus & a Writ of Prohibition <i>or, in the alternative</i> , A Verified Petition for a Writ of Certiorari Pursuant to Frap, Rule 21(c)-Other Extraor- dinary Writs (February 9, 2018).....	15a

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Order of the Eighth Circuit Denying Petition for Rehearing En Banc (April 2, 2018).....	51a
Appellant’s Petition for En Banc Rehearing or for Panel Rehearing and Request to Recall Mandate & Issue Writs <i>or, in the alternative</i> , With Suggestion for En Banc Review and Disposition (March 8, 2018).....	52a
Civil Docket Sheet for Case No.: 4:17-cv-00750-AGF (February 16, 2017).....	70a
Petitioner’s Addendum of Law (February 9, 2018).....	99a
Plaintiff’s Exhibits to Original Verified Complaint for Declaratory Judgement, Injunctive and Other Appropriate Relief in This Petition for Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment (February 16, 2017).....	160a
Constitutional, Doctrines, Decisions, Precedents, Orders, Codes, and Statutory or Other Provisions of Law Involved.....	213a
Memorandum for All Executive Departments and Agencies (October 6, 2017).....	333a
Memorandum for All Component Heads and United States Attorneys (October 6, 2017) ...	387a
Executive Order-13798 (May 4, 2017).....	391a

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Motions and Briefs or Requests Filed by the Petitioner	394a
Law Respecting an Establishment of Religion	404a
The Founders' Constitution Chapter 16, Document 23—James Madison, Property (March 29, 1792).....	458a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court of Missouri (February 23, 2017).....	464a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court of Missouri (March 10, 2017)	468a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court of Missouri (May 12, 2017).....	470a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court of Missouri (May 26, 2017).....	472a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court of Missouri (July 11, 2017).....	476a
Memorandum and Order of the District Court of Missouri (August 18, 2017).....	481a
Organic Law The Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776)	485a
Taxaonmy of Due Process Manifesting Strict Scrutiny in the Middle Forum Harvard Law Review Vol. 122, No. 8 (June., 2009)	493a

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Continued

Page

APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont.)

Clear and Prejudicial Error of Law and Fact as a Clear Abuse of Discretion (Facts Presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	498a
Facts of &/or Malfeasance of Fundamental Error (Facts Presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	541a
Grounds for Fundamental Error, Points and Authorities (Facts Presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	545a
Facts of &/or Malfeasance of Reversible Error (Facts Presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	558a
Essential Rights as Fundamental Rights or of Unalienable Rights (Facts Presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	574a
A Forum for Actions Subject to Strict Scrutiny Standard of Judicial Review (Facts Presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	577a
Exhibits Entered into the Record When Case Filed—510 Exhibits (Facts presented to the Eighth Circuit in Petitions) (February 9, 2018)	596a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union</i> , 535 U.S. 564 (2002)	32
<i>Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition</i> , 535 U.S. 234 (2002)	32
<i>Calif. Motor Transport v. Trucking Unlimited</i> , 404 U.S. 508 (1972)	33
<i>Cantwell v. Connecticut</i> , 310 U.S. 296 (1940)	33
<i>Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of Columbia</i> , 542 U.S. 367 (2004)	33
<i>Chisholm v. Georgia</i> , 2 U.S. 2 Dall. 419 (1793)	33
<i>Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah</i> , 508 U.S. 520 (1993)	33
<i>Data Processing Svc. Orgs. v. Camp</i> , 397 U.S. 150 (1970)	26, 33
<i>Employment Div. v. Smith</i> , 494 U.S. 872 (1990)	33
<i>In Re Slaughter-House Cases</i> , 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36 (1872)	33
<i>La Buy v. Howes Leather Co., Inc.</i> , 352 U.S. 249 (1957)	33
<i>Langford v. United States</i> , 101 U.S. 341 (1879)	passim

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
<i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i> , 403 U.S. 602 (1971)	34
<i>Marbury v. Madison</i> , 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137 (1803).....	i, 15, 29, 34
<i>McCulloch v. Maryland</i> , 17 U.S. 4 (1819)	34
<i>Perry v. Sindermann</i> , 408 U.S. 593 (1972)	34
<i>Rhode Island v. Massachusetts</i> , 37 U.S. 12 Pet. 657 (1838).....	34
<i>Schneckloth v. Bustamonte</i> , 412 U.S. 218 (1973)	34
<i>Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer</i> , 582 U.S. ___ (2017).....	34
<i>United States v. Morgan</i> , 346 U.S. 502 (1954)	i, 15, 34
<i>Western Pac. Ry. Corp. v. Western Pac. Ry. Co.</i> , 345 U.S. 247 (1953).....	34
<i>Yick Wo v. Hopkins</i> , 118 U.S. 356 (1886)	35, 36

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. Const. amend. I.....	passim
U.S. Const. amend. IX.....	passim
U.S. Const. amend. V	passim
U.S. Const. Art. III, § 2, cl. 1.....	4

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
STATUTES	
26 U.S.C. § 5067.....	19
26 U.S.C. § 7402.....	19
26 U.S.C. § 7421(a).....	16, 19, 21, 27
26 U.S.C. § 7422.....	25
26 U.S.C. § 7604.....	27
26 U.S.C. § 7806.....	18, 22, 27
28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).....	3
28 U.S.C. § 1346.....	22
28 U.S.C. § 1651(a).....	3, 16
28 U.S.C. § 2106.....	3
28 U.S.C. § 2201.....	22
28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).....	16, 19
28 U.S.C. § 2202.....	22
28 U.S.C. § 2403.....	28
28 U.S.C. § 453.....	23
42 U.S.C. § 1981.....	9
42 U.S.C. § 1983.....	10
Judiciary Act of 1789.....	i, 13, 23, 35
JUDICIAL RULES	
Sup. Ct. R. 10(a)(c).....	13
Sup. Ct. R. 14.....	7

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
Sup. Ct. R. 33(1)(g)(i)	7
Fed. R. App. P. 21(a)(c)	16
Fed. R. App. P. 21(c).....	20, 31
Fed. R. App. P. 35	16
Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(2).....	16
Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.1.	9
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8	11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)	10, 11, 25
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).....	11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(1).....	11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(c).....	32
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1).....	13
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f).....	13
Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2).....	26
Fed. R. Civ. P. 19	28
Fed. R. Civ. P. 52.....	23
Fed. R. Civ. P. 57.....	16, 23
EXECUTIVE ORDERS	
Exec. Order No. 13798.....	15, 16



PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner, Terry Lee Hinds, respectfully petitions this Court for a Writ of Certiorari to review the judgment and mandate of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in case No. 18-1299, entered on February 26, 2018. Petitioner also seeks a review of the Order issued regarding his petition for a panel rehearing and rehearing *en banc* with the Circuit Court, which was denied on April 2, 2018.



OPINIONS BELOW

On February 26, 2018, a panel of the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals offered no written opinion affirming the final judgment and the validity of the proceedings in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri regarding case No. 4:17-CV-750 AGF. That district court had issued an “Order of Dismissal”, as well as, Memorandum and Order on December 11, 2017. A copy of the Order or judgement appears in (App.14a) with a copy of the Memorandum and Order appears in (App.3a-13a) to this petition. The district court decreed no legal remedy exists for Petitioner’s claims and causes of action, due to Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine, or U.S. Tax Law; providing no *strict scrutiny standard of review* or a legal standard within the court proceeding or memorandum itself. Petitioner pursued an appeal of this judgment or decree and filed on February 9, 2018 a verified petition for a “Writ of Mandamus and

a Writ of Prohibition, *or, in the alternative*, a verified petition for a Writ of Certiorari” with the Eighth Circuit. A copy of these petitions, minus the appendix sections in (App.15a-50a) is attached hereto. The Eighth Circuit issued a final judgment and its mandate denying apparently one of the two verified petitions; without addressing *subject matter jurisdiction*, First Amendment challenges/claims or Petitioner’s appeal sought, *inter alia*. A copy of that decision or judgement appears in (App.1a) and a copy of the mandate attached to this petition appears in (App.2a).

On March 8, 2018, Petitioner filed a petition for panel rehearing and rehearing *en banc* with the Eighth Circuit Court, which was denied on April 2, 2018. A copy of that petition appears in (App.52a-69a) to this petition. The Eighth Circuit issued an Order without a call for a vote or bothering to write dissents, especially dissents from the denial of rehearing *en banc* “dissentals”, pursuant to “REASONS WHY THE PETITION SHOULD BE GRANTED” or provided a legal remedy for court sanction reliefs sought for vital constitutional matters regarding the First, Fifth and Ninth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and the laws made pursuant thereto. A copy of that Order is attached hereto as (App.51a).



JURISDICTION

The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed their final judgment and issued a mandate on February 26, 2018. The Eighth Circuit Court denied a petition for a panel rehearing and rehearing *en banc* on April 2,

2018. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1254(1), 1651(a), 2106 and Part III of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States.



CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Pertinent provisions of law are set forth in to this petition. Appendix., *infra*, (App.213a-332a).



STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A. Nature of the Case

Petitioner's suit arises under the Establishment/Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment and as a matter of *first impression* in a Ninth Amendment right of a civil liberty sought, for *raison d'etre*. A religious Plaintiff, with a spiritual stake in First Amendment values sufficient to give standing to raise issues or claims concerning the *establishment clause* and the *free exercise clause*. This lawsuit seeks prospective, declaratory and other reliefs consistent with the judgement as a legal remedy at law, with regards to the First, Fifth and Ninth Amendment rights established by the U.S. Constitution and in accordance with U.S. Supreme Court's decisions or doctrines.

A *pro se* verified complaint/petition filed as a civil action for rights, privileges, or immunities

secured by the U.S. Constitution and the Rule of Law, thereby to secure, protect and defend Petitioner's *free exercise* of unalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. An actual case with substantial controversy exists between Petitioner and Respondent, as to their respective legal rights and duties that may be adjudicated by the Court's jurisdiction consistent with the U.S. Constitution, Article III, Section 2, Clause 1, and the laws made in pursuant thereof. Petitioner is engaged in peaceful expressive activity pursuant to established fundamental *free exercise rights* of the First Amendment and the rule of law of this Nation. This civil action and its exhibits presented are a properly formatted message and expression of *protected conduct in pure speech* of religious belief and conscience. Petitioner filed this suit in order to be able to run his business and conduct his personal or private affairs in a manner that is consistent with revered religions, vital vested legal rights and within his [sincerely held religious beliefs] ("[believes]"); that have shaped his life, liberties and pursuant of happiness, as well as, his little company as a spiritual enterprise from its start. The Petitioner, as a U.S. citizen and as a person's conscience dictates; holding that conscience is the most sacred of all property; believes in the *absolute constitutional right* to endorse, indoctrinate, or proselytize religion with the *free exercise* right of religious belief over the lack of such belief. Therefore, this Court must guarantee full First Amendment protections to both the *lawful practice* of establishment, endorsement or proselytizing a religion, and with the *free exercise* of religious beliefs or conscience, as one cannot exist without the other.

B. Statement of Fact

This constitutional case maintains that the IRS (Internal Revenue Service *de facto* Internal Religious Service) and Respondent's actions of indoctrinating, proselytizing and converting taxpayers into taxp[r]ayers directly violates the establishment clause. Respondent's activities and conduct have created a *collective experience* of religious beliefs, devout practices or goodwill. Respondent's activities and their law respecting an establishment of religion have manifested an [Organized Religion of THEIRS] *de facto* as Taxology; built and based upon an Institutionalized Faith in Taxism.

Taxp[r]ayers making a proper return to the IRS and its path of life, beliefs and practices, are establishing religious objectives, core values and vision within devout beliefs permeated by actions, as set forth in the original verified complaint/petition or its "other amendments" to the case that were established by district court's orders.

A taxp[r]ayer is a *religious status* with the IRS. If accepted, on a case by case basis and with a *proper return* based on *census information generally available benefits* are provided solely on account of this religious identity. This has given authorities some basis/census for investigating strangers coming into the IRS' community, culture or its realm when making a proper return to an [IRS Path of Life] [Purpose-Driven Life].

These governmental benefits are in the forms of refunds, tax credits, deductions, and a large host of other public benefits written within [THE CODE]. A taxp[r]ayer is granted *first class citizenship* whereas taxpayers, or a person like the Petitioner is reduced

to a second-class citizenship status. Furthermore, the [THE CODE] creates a stigmatic injury when a person is seen as a tax dodger or manifests a legal status as Non-filers existing as Non-Believers of THEIRS, infringing on Petitioner's rights of conscience. Petitioner believes in the *public benefit* of U.S. citizenship, and is a constitutional protected privilege. The Respondent was to ensure and manifest (1) Equality Before the Law, and (2) Equal Justice Under Law, and (3) Equal Protection of The Law. Nevertheless, Petitioner as a religious observer and person has suffered a loss of First Amendment rights and unequal treatment under the law. Respondent, the district court judges and the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals have forsaken the Supremacy Clause, *inter alia*. This Court should take notice, not just by the hand of the IRS, its government's lawyers, but as advanced by the Respondent's district court, its judges and the Eighth Circuit itself, collective as the "United States" government.

Respondent's incursions force Petitioner to profess a belief or disbelief in religion that affects him in a personal and individual way through the process of instilling *religious doctrines*. 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 the 5th Amendment. This medieval doctrine of the Court avowing a *theology doctrine* in a Divine Right of Kings, is from 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. However, the Divine Right of Kings, is 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 currently a district court's jurisdiction concerning a constitutional case of controversies. Petitioner's religious sensibilities and legal calculus predicates such activities herein; conferring upon "subjects" of the IRS or taxp[er]layers special favors, benefits or rights. Equally, if not practiced by a person, dissenters or the Petitioner, all will suffer substantial disabilities, penalties, or worse, First Amendment burdens.

It is settled law that the right to petition is fundamental. Our concepts on the legal right to protest, or what shall constitute due process of law, may vary in the realm of time and space or within a specified forum—however minor or insignificant—and are subject to a strict scrutiny standard. (App.68a). Petition for a Writ of Certiorari (Rule 14) is limited to 9,000 words pursuant to Sup. Ct. R. 33(1)(g)(i). This limitation on a First Amendment right (to petition the government) is a burden, however no greater than the other undue &/or substantial burdens placed on the Petitioner's petition speech and pure speech of his religious beliefs and the sacred rights conscience concerning this case and its appeals. Therefore, due to limitations that this forum has procured for protection and enforcement of constitutional rights, Petitioner declares:

“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." OVC/petition, Doc. No. 44.

This pure speech presented to the Court is *protected speech* of religious beliefs and conscience. Petitioner seeks a proper review of his case and its controversies, to wit:

"The Honorable, the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! All persons having business before the Honorable, the Supreme Court of the United States, are admonished to draw near and give their attention, for the Court is now sitting. God save the United States and this Honorable Court!" <https://www.supremecourt.gov/about/procedures.aspx>

This Petitioner *prays for a grant of certiorari* providing *Equality Before the Law*, therefore, procuring *Equal Justice Under Law* for the practice or *Equal Protection of The Law*. Petitioner [believes] in this God and, the power, in the name of J.E.S.U.S. because, Petitioner is not required by law to separate his religious beliefs from his secular beliefs. Justice – Equality – Service – Unity – Sacrifice, acronym: J.E.S.U.S.

C. Relevant Procedural History

1. On February 16, 2017 Petitioner exercising legal rights filed with the Court an ORIGINAL VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGEMENT, INJUNCTIVE AND OTHER APPROPRIATE RELIEF IN THIS PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, presented with a 16-page Brief in Support, with an Exhibit List consisting of 26 pages instituting 510 Exhibits attached thereto; a case and its controversies listed on 549 pages (“[OVC/Petition]”). (App.70a-71a).

2. On 02/16/2017, Petitioner contemporaneously filed with the Clerk of the Court Office, a Civil Cover Sheet & other case opening notifications, paid \$400 filing fee and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 5.1 Constitutional Challenge to a Statute to this original proceeding. The Clerk accepted the [OVC/Petition] and assigned Case No. 4:17-cv-750 JMB with JOHN M. BODENHAUSEN, as the Magistrate Judge. (App.71a-72a).

3. Unknown to the Petitioner at that time through the *pro se lawyers* of Clerk’s Office and without disclosing or providing any notice; *arbitrarily changed* the filing status and the “protected speech” of the Petitioner. The Clerk’s *pro se lawyers* manifested the applicable law as: 42 U.S.C. § 1981, Cause: 42 U.S.C. § 1981 Civil Rights with the Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other. No such claims were made or such an action was filed, thus filing a “Notice to the nature of suit in opposition to civil cover sheet.” Doc. No 11. (App.73a). Petitioner filed on 03/13/2017 a motion to correct this unlawful activity or infringement by

government lawyers, curtailing his petition speech. (App.75a) (App.394a).

4. On 07/11/2017, District Judge Fleissig issued MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (ECF No. 55) failing to address properly the civil rights issue, the cause of action or the law presented within this case decreeing:

“The Court has also reviewed Plaintiff’s requests to change the “Cause” on the Court’s docket sheet because “42:1981 Civil Rights” is an inaccurate representation of his case. The Court will order the clerk of the court to update the “Cause” to reflect that this matter asserts violations of Plaintiff’s constitutional (i.e. civil) rights, which may be brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.”

(App.479a).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court will change the “Cause” listed on the docket sheet to reflect that the matter is brought pursuant to § 1983.

IT IS FINALLY ORDERED that the Clerk of Court will mail a blank civil cover sheet and civil nature of suit code descriptions sheet to Plaintiff. (App.480a).

5. On 02/23/2017, Magistrate Judge Bodenhausen issued MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (ECF No. 8) curtailing Petitioner’s protected speech of religious beliefs and conscience by decreeing “A review of the Complaint shows that it fails to comply with the strictures of Rule 8(a).” *See* ECF No. 8 (App.465a).

6. Magistrate Judge Bodenhausen *sua sponte* decision making, or with the Court acting on its own

initiative, manifesting a *legal fiction* decreeing, in part:

The Court finds that filing a responsive pleading to the instant Complaint would not only be difficult but costly in terms of time and money especially in light of the numerous legal theories advanced in the case. Accordingly, finding the Complaint violates Rule 8(a) and (e) to the extent that a great deal of judicial energy and resources would have to be devoted to restructuring the pleading and streamlining the unnecessary matter, the Court will strike the Complaint. *See* ECF No. 8 (App.467a).

7. On 03/08/2017, this Case was reassigned to District Judge John A. Ross for all further proceedings. (App.74a). On 03/10 this Judge issued MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (ECF No. 18) manifesting a patently coercive predicament, decreed “that Plaintiff shall file an amended complaint in conformity with the requirements of Rule 8 no later than Friday, May 19, 2017. Failure to do so may result in dismissal of this action.” (App.75a) (App.469a).

8. Petitioner objecting to a ruling or order declared in part,

The Court’s findings, review and Order are based on violations of due process of law. Plaintiff lawful questions the brevity of Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2) or in 8(d)(1) and the generality of its terms, that left the judiciary with the not inconsiderable tasks of fashioning the procedures by which the Courts and parties shall operate and/or of giving content to Fed.

R. Civ. P. indefinite adjectives. When, Fed. R. Civ. P. are used as a source of unbridled power is [To LIVE as EVIL]. *See* Doc. No. 14 (App.74a).

9. Judge Ross disregarded Petitioner's objections or opposition to the Old Edition 1999-2000 of the Fed. R. Civ. P., being invoked and used by Judge Bodenhausen in his Memorandum and Order (ECF No. 8) declaring "*Thus, no motion for reconsideration will be considered.*" (App.469a). Petitioner maintains the 2016 Edition of Fed R. Civ. P. should have been used or invoked as current law.

10. Federal Judge Fleissig decreed Doc. No 44 was an "amended complaint" but refused to address Respondent's motion regarding Doc. Nos. 45, or answer Petitioner's arguments regarding Doc. Nos. 28, 33, 34.

11. Petitioner filed Doc. No. 92, but was not addressed by Judge Fleissig in her final judgement, Memorandum and Order. Judge Fleissig declared moot (Doc. Nos. 80, 64, 53, 49, 46.) (App.12a).

12. Judge Fleissig issued an Order of Dismissal based on dictum, without a legal standard or a standard of review declared in her Memorandum. (App.3a-13a).



REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

- I. THE ISSUES PRESENTED SOWS INCONSISTENCY WITHIN THE LAW WHEN THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT ENTERED A DECISION THAT SANCTIONED SUCH A DEPARTURE BY A LOWER COURT, AS TO CALL FOR AN EXERCISE OF THIS COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER; WITH A CASE INVOLVING IMPORTANT QUESTIONS OF FEDERAL LAW NOT YET ADDRESSED BY THE SUPREME COURT OR DECIDED IN CONFLICT WITH APPLICABLE SUPREME COURT PRECEDENTS OR ITS DOCTRINES. SUP. CT. R. 10(a)(c).

A. United States Constitution

i. Article I, Congressional & Legislative Authority or Intent

The original Judiciary Act 1789, 1 Stat. 73, was established by Congress pursuant to (App.213a). The court record reveals, (App.70a-98a) Respondent failed to comply with SEC. 32. of this statute, particular when "*the party demurring shall specially sit down and express together with his demurrer as the cause thereof.*" (App.301a). The Petitioner was not granted this right under law, when Respondent filed a 12(f) motion to strike the entire breadth of the complaint/petition (App.86a) (ECF No.51) or when seeking a dismissal under Rule 12(b)(1) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (App.95a) (ECF No.82). Congress established Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 12(f) and 12(b)(1). But, Federal Judge Fleissig ignored or refused to consider Petitioner's arguments. (App.95a-96a) (Doc. No.

85) and (App.97a) (Doc. No. 92) or that [THE CODE] is law respecting an establishment of religion. Federal Judge Fleissig discussion and final decision in Memo and Order (App.3a-13a.) failed or refused to address Petitioner's legal arguments presented. The Eighth Circuit and the district court has decided important federal questions in a way that conflicts with the powers of Congress, granted to them by Article I, Congressional & legislative authority or intent.

B. First, Fifth & Ninth Amendment Rights of the U.S. Constitution

The First, Fifth and Ninth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution are granted and guaranteed by Respondent (App.215a). These three constitutional rights are vital protections manifesting or advancing essential rights as fundamental rights or of unalienable rights for life, liberty or pursuit of happiness. (“[LLP]”). (App.574a-576a).

The First Amendment *free exercise* right of Petitioner's religious beliefs and the scared rights of conscience are not yet resolved. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Petitioner and Respondent as to their respective legal rights and duties pursuit to Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment. (App.596a-597a). Petitioner desires a *free exercise* in the [Commanding Heights] and [CLP] as an Artful Blend, manifested by his [Q.U.E.S.T.] (App.212a) (App.162a-171a). These elements of religious and secular beliefs are granted under the protocols of the First Amendment and guaranteed by the Ninth Amendment for Petitioner's [LLP]. (App.574a-576a).

C. U.S. Supreme Court's Doctrines, Precedents or Decisions

The issue presented is whether the Eighth Circuit or district court erred as a matter of law. (App.58a-66a). Under such grounds or precedent in *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 163 (1803) and *United States v. Morgan*, 346 U.S. 502, 503 (1954) this Court should vacate the Court of Appeals' judgment. The Eighth Circuit and the district court have decided important federal questions in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions, doctrines or precedents of this Court. (App.54a-57a). Additionally,

- *See* Doctrines of Constitutional Construction. (App.216a-218a).
- *See* Doctrines of Statutory Construction. (App.218a-234a).
- *See* Procedural Doctrines. (App.226a-240a).
- *See* Substantive Law Doctrines. (App.240a-250a).
- *See* Free Exercise Clause Doctrine (Petitioner's Controlling Legal Principles set forth as Exhibits in this case). (App.250a-283a).
- *See* Establishment Clause Doctrine (Separation of Church & State) (App.283a-290a).

D. Fed. R. App. P. & EXEC. ORDER # 13798 & Policy published

The Eighth Circuit has decided important questions of federal law, pure speech and protected speech that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court

regarding Fed. R. App. P. 35 En Banc Determination. (App.53a-57a).

The Eighth Circuit has decided an important federal question (establishment clause challenges/free exercise clause claims) in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court regarding Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(2). (App.57a-64a).

The Eighth Circuit has decided important questions of federal law, and mandamus jurisdiction, that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court regarding Fed. R. App. P.,21(a)(c). (App.16a-24a).

The Eighth Circuit has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power regarding Executive Order # 13798. (App.391a-393a). Furthermore, with DOJ Policy. (App.333a-386a) (App.386a-390a.).

E. Federal Statutes or U.S. Code

The Eighth Circuit and district court have decided important questions of federal law, 28 U.S. Code § 1651(a) that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court regarding (App.404a-457a).

The Eighth Circuit and district court have decided important questions of federal law (Rule 57. Declaratory Judgment/Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a),) that have not been, but should be, settled by this Court regarding Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine and with (App.404a-457a).

The Eighth Circuit and district court have decided important questions of federal law (26 U.S.C. § 7421(a). The Anti-Injunction Act) that has not been, but should

be, settled by this Court regarding petition speech and with (App.404a-457a).

F. U.S. District's Memorandums and Orders

The Eighth Circuit has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power regarding (establishment clause challenges/free exercise clause claims) and with (App.25a-30a), (App.404a-457a), (App.498a-540a), (App.541a-544a), (App.545a-557a), (App.558a-573a).

G. Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals' Judgment, Mandate & Order

The Eighth Circuit has decided an important question of federal law (App.25a-30a). These important questions have not been, but should be, settled by this Court regarding Petitioner's establishment clause challenges/free exercise clause claims.

The Eighth Circuit has decided an important question of federal law substantive and procedural due process challenges that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court regarding First and Fifth Amendment rights.

The Eighth Circuit has decided an important question of federal law (Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine) that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court regarding substantive and procedural due process challenges.

The Eighth Circuit has decided an important question of federal law (First Amendment free exercise claims as protected speech of religious beliefs and conscience) that has not been, but should be, settled

by this Court regarding pure speech and petition speech of religious beliefs and conscience.

II. THE ISSUES PRESENTED IN THIS CASE OF EXCEPTIONAL IMPORTANCE IS AN ENDORSEMENT, ESTABLISHMENT, OR ADVANCEMENT OF A RELIGION AND COMMON LAW (ECCLESIASTICAL)

A. 26 U.S. Code § 7806. Construction of Title

The issue presented in 26 U.S. Code § 7806(a) whereby the entire breadth of Subtitle F—Procedure and Administration (sections 6012 to 7874) are made only for convenience and shall be given no legal effect pursuant to 26 U.S. Code § 5067. Cross reference. “For general administrative provisions applicable to the assessment, collection, refund, etc., of taxes, *see* subtitle F.” (App.317a-318a) (App.404a-457a). This issue presented sows inconsistency within the law when the Eighth Circuit entered a decision that sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court’s supervisory power.

B. Law Respecting an Establishment of Religion

The Eighth Circuit and the district court have decided important questions of federal law that have not been, but should be, settled by this Court pursuant to [THE CODE].

C. Common Law-Ten Commandants & “*the King Can Do No Wrong*”

The Eighth Circuit and the district court have decided important questions of federal law that have not been, but should be, settled by this Court concerning common law, being The Ten Commandants of God

Exodus 20:1-17 and the theology doctrine "*the King can do no wrong*".

III. THE CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL ISSUES PRESENTED TO THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

A. The Issues and Questions Presented to Eighth Circuit

This is an extraordinary case with controversies of exceptionally importance. A First and Fifth Amendment case without a legal remedy at law according to the district court. A constitutional case without the legal right to proceed, seek reliefs or appeal because Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine ("FSID") prevails and whereby U.S. Code § 7402 (Jurisdiction of district court), is eviscerated by U.S. Code § 7806(a) (Construction of title), manifesting no legal effect pursuant to U.S. Code § 5067. Cross reference. The self-style eviction of this case is advanced by a district court judge who invoked U.S. Code § 7421(a)-Prohibition of suits to restrain assessment or collection or misapplied 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) for self-serving purposes.

Petitioner/Appellant sought an appeal of the district court's final judgment and Orders and an extraordinary legal remedy for the constitutional issues and matters regarding law respecting an establishment of religion, the advancement or support of a government religion and for the protection of his *free exercise* of religious beliefs and rights of conscience. Petitioner filed with the Eighth Circuit as an appeal:

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

It is apparent one of these two petitions presented was denied; however, which one, as well as, with or without prejudice is unknown at this time. This final judgment of the Eighth Circuit superficially addressed apparently a *single petition and only one* “extraordinary writ” (App.1a.) The panel decreeing:

“Petition for extraordinary writ has been considered by the court and is denied. Mandate shall issue forthwith.”

Petitioner/Appellant sought a panel rehearing and *en banc* reconsideration or an *en banc* hearing for the disposition and reversal of the panel’s [JUDGMENT, MANDATE and the breadth of the underlying proceeding], (“[decision]”). On March 8, 2018, Petitioner/Appellant filed a petition for panel rehearing and rehearing *en banc* with the Eighth Circuit Court, which was denied on April 2, 2018. Constitutional issues are important questions about the meaning of the United States Constitution that spark significant disagreement. The Eighth Circuit has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court’s supervisory power when that Court failed to properly consider:

ORDER OF DISMISSAL (App.14a) & MEMORANDUM AND ORDER (App.3a-13a)

1. For a Writ of Mandamus (App.25a-26a)

The issue presented is whether Petitioner is entitled to *injunctive relief and judicial review* as a mandate to the district court, or *other such relief* as this Court deems appropriate; when Judge Fleissig clearly

abused her discretion, by granting a motion in favor of *unbridled power, defects of justice, or for Federal Sovereign Immunity Doctrine*; thereby advancing the “United States” government’s *religious zeal, IRS’ creed, beliefs and devout practices* in [Taxology] and Taxism.

Petitioner maintains he was entitled to *injunctive relief* and *judicial review* manifesting a judgment as a matter of law on the merits with the Court invoking strict scrutiny standards with U.S.C. § 7421(a).

Petitioner maintains Judge Fleissig clearly abused her discretion, involving a non-discretionary manner of strict scrutiny standards, *inter alia*, as set forth in the Eighth Circuit petitions’ appendixes A, B, C, F.

Petitioner maintains the Judge Fleissig clear abuse of discretion was in favor of unbridled power, defects of justice, or for FSID; and in so doing, advancing “United States” government’s religious zeal, IRS’ creed, beliefs and devout practices in [Taxology] and Taxism.

Petitioner maintains the unbridled power, and defects of justice are addressed in (App.33a-38a).

Petitioner maintains Respondent’s FSID is a dogmatic doctrine, existing as *ultra vires* to the U.S. Constitution precluded by germane Court’s doctrines. This dogmatic doctrine has manifested errors of law. (App.213a-332a).

Petitioner maintains Respondent, manifesting three branches of government, are clearly advancing the “United States” government’s religious zeal, IRS’ creed, beliefs and devout practices in [Taxology] and Taxism. (App.404a-457a).

The IRS religious creed is “*Our core values guide our path to archiving our vision*”. (IRS pub. 3744). The Respondent’s [Organized Religion of THEIRS] *per se* Taxology is set forth passim in this case of controversies. The Institutionalized Faith in Taxism is declared *passim* within the lawsuits, not just *per se*, at Compl. at ¶ 305. (App.4a) (App.500a) (App.508a) (App.512a) Petitioner presented this vital question for a writ of mandamus at the Eighth Circuit; however, Federal Judge Fleissig, at that time, was listed as the Respondent in that petition to Eighth Circuit, to wit:

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

Petitioner maintains the district court erred as a matter of law when usurping the constitutional authority of the Congress, regarding 26 U.S. Code § 7806 and 28 U.S. Code §§ 2201, 2202, 1346, *inter alia*, the First and Fifth Amendments.

Petitioner maintains the district court Orders cannot pass constitutional muster due to the controlling law *Langford v. United States*, 101 U.S. 341 (1879). Syllabus # 1, at 343-344. (App.44a-45a) (App.124a-126a).

Petitioner maintains the district judge failed to raise *judicial review* or grant legal reliefs sought, and failed to *uphold strict scrutiny review*, Rule 52 or Rule 57 remedy, or injunctive relief for claims of liberty interests.

Petitioner maintains these detailed actions amounting to a judicial usurpation of power or clear and prejudicial errors of law or fact. (App.498a-540a). The presiding district judge failed to faithfully fulfill her official duties or sworn oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the laws made in pursuant thereof. *See* Judiciary Act of 1789, SEC. 8., 28 U.S.C. § 453, Oaths of justices and judges. (App.48a) (App.148a).

Petitioner maintains judicial usurpation of power is grounds for a writ of mandamus based upon defects of justice as errors of law or fact are listed manifestly or for *unbridled power*, used against Petitioner, *inter alia*. (App.33a-38a).

Petitioner maintains the presiding district judge failed to faithfully fulfill her official duties of a public/ official nature pertaining to *substantive & procedural due process of law & judicial review*, *inter alia*. (App.240a-241a) (App.493a-494a).

Petitioner maintains the judges of the Eighth Circuit court failed to satisfy their sworn oath of office and solemn duty or important role to faithfully discharge Court doctrines, and to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the laws made pursuant thereto. (App.48a) (App.148a) (App.213a-332a).

The Eighth Circuit has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this

Court's supervisory power when that Court failed to properly consider:

PETITION FOR QUINTESSENTIAL RIGHTS OF
THE FIRST AMENDMENT

2. For a Writ of Prohibition (App.27a-28a)

A fundamental question in deciding this case is whether this issue presented to the Eighth Circuit is an issue of first impression in this Court regarding Petitioner's seeking to establish a Ninth Amendment right as Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment *aka* the [Commanding Heights]. Petitioner presented this issue for the writ of prohibition, however, Federal Judge Fleissig, at that time, was listed as the Respondent with the Real Party in Interest as the "United States" government in that petition to Eighth Circuit, to wit:

The issue presented is whether Respondent abridged Petitioner's *free exercise of petition speech* that conveys vital religious beliefs, equitable claims, grievances/ enforcement of rights and a spiritual message, within a *strict scrutiny standard* forum 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". (App.27a)

Petitioner maintains his *protected speech* or by regulating the contents of his *pure speech* or *petition speech* via Court Orders or Memorandums is an *invasion of constitutional protected interests* or curtails

essential rights, when errors of law and fact are the sole predominant factors in this case. (App.498a-540a) (App.541a-544a) (App.545a-557a) (App.558a-573a). Herein, case in point, the district court evoking then striking this complaint/petition as a legal fiction or using an expired edition of Fed. R. Civ. P. (App.464a-467a). Declaring this case as a *civil right case* or as “Bivens claim” or “To the extent Plaintiff seeks to bring his cause of action under § 7422, his cause of action is barred for failure to exhaust administrative remedies.” (App.10a-12a). Correspondingly, manifesting the Anti-Injunction Act to bar claims (App.9a-10a). Also, misrepresenting Petitioner’s claims “To the extent Plaintiff seeks monetary damages relating to the assessment of taxes . . .” (App.12a). Judge Fleissig has held that FSID or its waiver somehow prevails over a First Amendment case.

Petitioner maintains his protected speech and expression is to free from [a]ny system of prior restraint of expression or from unnecessary burdens, content-based restrictions, vague rules or self-censorship, *inter alia*. In this case Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(a) violates protected speech (pure speech) and expression of religious beliefs and conscience. This pure speech of religious beliefs and conscience was in the form of a written complaint/petition, that was manifested *within* the Petitioner’s home. It was accepted by the Clerk of the Court Office, not as commercial speech but as free speech.

Petitioner maintains the only two forums used in this case by Petitioner were the Clerk’s Office of the district courthouse and *from or within the confines*

of his home; with strict scrutiny standards based upon “the access sought by the speaker”.

Petitioner has maintained he has a spiritual stake in First Amendment values sufficient to give standing to raise issues and claims concerning the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause regarding unalienable or essential rights *See Data Processing Svc. Orgs. v. Camp*, (App.64a) and (App.574a-576a) (App.596a-597a).

Petitioner presented this question for the writ of prohibition, however, Federal Judge Fleissig, at that time, was listed as the Respondent with the Real Party in Interest as the “United States” government in that petition to Eighth Circuit, to wit:

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

Petitioner maintains his *pure speech* of religious beliefs constituted within [OVC/Petition] and “Other Amendments” as notice pleadings filed pursuant to FRCP 15(a)(2) or Declarations, Exhibits and briefs filed by Petitioner is protected speech.

Respondent’s judges and the district court’s actions in this case are *favoring viewpoint-based discrimination* or *restrictions* on (Doc. Nos. 1, 3, 28, 33, 34, 44, 45.).

Petitioner maintains IRS' Dominion Theology endorsed in U.S. Code § 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*.

The Eighth Circuit has sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power when that Court failed to properly consider:

JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF FUNDAMENTAL AND
SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS

3. For a Writ of Certiorari (App.29a-30a)

Petitioner presented this issue for the writ of certiorari, however, Federal Judge Fleissig, at that time, was listed as the Respondent with the Real Party in Interest as the "United States" government in that petition to Eighth Circuit, to wit:

Whether Petitioner is entitled to sue the Real Party in Interest as a necessary party to the suit 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 effectively leaving no adequate appellate remedy to exist; when Petitioner is in real danger of losing his fundamental and substantial rights.

Petitioner maintains '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, and *due process of law*. Such actions violate a principle in Declaration of Independence. (App.487a) *para. # 3*.

Petitioner maintains 28 U.S.C § 2403 Intervention by United States or a State; for constitutional question, is controlling law over FSID.

Petitioner maintains "United States" government is a necessary party or an indispensable party required for jurisdiction or the purpose of rendering a judgment. *See* FRCP, Rule 19.

Petitioner presented this question for the writ of certiorari, however, Federal Judge Fleissig, at that time, was listed as the Respondent in that petition to Eighth Circuit, to wit:

Did the District Court err as a matter of law, by failing to analyze or apply the controlling law correctly, when District Judge Fleissig reaches *a decision so arbitrary & unreasonable* as to amount to a clear and prejudicial error of law; 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?

Answer: Yes

Petitioner maintains *Langford v. United States*, and *Marbury v. Madison* is controlling law in this case. Matters of errors of law are set forth in (App.59a-64a).

Petitioner maintains District Judge Fleissig manifested irreparable harm with no adequate remedy by way of appeal for judicial enforcement of established rights nor provided *ultra vires relief* with constitutionally protected interests or essential rights that merits enforcement or protection by law.

B. Eighth Circuit Advancing First Amendment Burdens, Conflicts or Unconstitutional Activity and Religious Discrimination of a Public Benefit

The Petitioner presented to the Eighth Circuit compelling reasons or issues of exceptional circumstances or importance and of a general public importance, as well as, in interests of justice or resolve significant questions of law and conflicts or matters contrary to Court precedent. The direct and incidental First Amendment burdens or conflicts advanced by the Eighth Circuit concerns *protected speech* and *protected conduct*. The Eighth Court ignored, failed or refused to faithfully discharge all writs necessary, or appropriate, in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law. The constitutional and legal issues presented to the panel of the Eighth Circuit, with the Real Party in Interest set forth as “United States” Government and with the Respondent listed in those said petitions set forth at that time, as Federal Judge Fleissig, to wit:

“First, whether the panel’s [decision] curtailed First Amendment rights as it pertains to petition speech and in the pure speech with

religious beliefs of Appellant, that is unfavorable to the panel, Respondent & the Real Party in Interest of a public benefit; while exercising their official duties or a sworn oath to uphold the U.S. Constitution and the laws made in pursuant thereof. Did the panel not fathom *Trinity's* breadth?" (App.55a).

"Second, whether the panel's determination effectively abrogates protected speech or manifests a profound and pervasive chilling effect on pure speech of religious beliefs or creates uncertainty on the legitimate exercise of natural and legal rights or inhibits the sacred rights of conscience; thereby the panel's [decision] renders them meaningless as protected speech or as expressive conduct of the First Amendment." (App.55a).

"Third, whether the Court *En Banc* should review and grant a rehearing to determine if *substantive & procedural due process of law* should be considered or was violated, notwithstanding cure the uncertainty in the precedent of strict scrutiny review within the circularly type of forums used in this case, thus resolving conflicts with the Fifth Amendment which guarantees "*No person shall be . . . deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law*". Did the panel forsake the *Supremacy Clause*?" (App.55a).

"Fourth, whether the panel's [decision] properly considers Petitioner's appeal of the Respondent's Court Order, when a *verified petition* for a writ of mandamus and writ of

probation or, in the alternative, a *verified petition* for a writ of certiorari, pursuant to FRAP, Rule 21(c)—other extraordinary writs were sought. Nonetheless, the panel’s judgment, devoid the cognitive embodiment of a vital opinion; revealed that evidently only a single petition for *extraordinary writ* was considered by the panel.” (App.55a).

“Fifth, whether the panel’s [decision] is a lack of enforcement or implementation of the *separation of church and state doctrine* or other U.S. Supreme Court doctrines that mark a radical shift away from the Court’s judgment, for specified woes that prompt a panel to uphold the U.S. Constitution & the laws made in pursuant thereof.” (App.56a).

“Sixth, whether the panel’s judgment, choice or mandate not to issue an extraordinary writ(s) to Respondent, or the panel’s disposition of the matter serves as a sweeping *sua sponte* decision regarding religious status or the application of the United States Constitution for two hundred million citizens, that mark a radical shift away from the Court’s judgment, Judiciary Act and Article III, for specified woes enmeshed or to cultivate fear factor[s] of this panel’s [decision] for such purposes as *stare decisis*.” (App.56a).

“Seventh, whether the panel sidestepped Court precedent, a remedy or the controlling law of *Langford v. United States*, which marks a radical shift away from the Court’s judgment or ignored to incorporate the

modified standard this Court *articulated* in *Phelps-Roper*. Did the panel reject or fail to consider a Ninth Amendment protection articulated in Quintessential Rights of the First Amendment with the knowledge “*it is always in the public interest to protect constitutional rights*” by failing to evoke such principles in the inherent equitable powers of the Court to issue such *Writs?*” (App.56a).

C. The Eighth Circuit Not Preserving the Breadth, Practicing or Conflicting with U.S. Supreme Court’s Doctrines, Precedents or Controlling Law

Petitioner seeks review on Certiorari based on considerations stated in Rule 10(c) whereby the Eighth Circuit has decided an important question of federal law that have not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court. The Petitioner submits the following, with the meaning or weight in these citations are self-evident or serves as controlling law:

i. Relevant Decisions of This Court

1. *Ashcroft v. American Civil Liberties Union*,
535 U.S. 564, 573 (2002)
See (App.60a)
2. *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*,
535 U.S. 234, 253 (2002)
See (App.60a)

3. *Calif. Motor Transport v. Trucking Unlimited*,
404 U.S. 508, 510-511 (1972)
See (App.60a)
4. *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940)
See (App.61a-62a) (App.49a) (App.106a) (App.130a)
(App.258a) (App.260a) (App.265a) (App.267a)
(App.268a-269a) (App.320a) (App.503a) (App.580a).
5. *Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for the Dist. of
Columbia*, 542 U.S. 367, 380 (2004)
See (App.112a-113a) (App.320a-322a).
6. *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 U.S. 2 Dall. 419 419 (1793)
See (App.63a).
7. *Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye v. City of Hialeah*,
508 U.S. 520 (1993)
See (App.281a) (App.322a).
8. *Data Processing Svc. Orgs. v. Camp*,
397 U.S. 150, 154 (1970)
See (App.64a).
9. *Employment Div. v. Smith*,
494 U.S. 872, 887-888 (1990)
See (App.280a-281a).
10. *In Re Slaughter-House Cases*,
83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36, 116 (1872)
See (App.62a-63a).
11. *La Buy v. Howes Leather Co., Inc.*,
352 U.S. 249 (1957)
See (App.324a-325a).

12. *Langford v. United States*, 101 U.S. 341, (1879)
See (App.44a-45a) (App.124a-126a) (App.325a-327a).
13. *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971)
See (App.284a-285a) (App.289a) (App.327a-328a).
14. *Marbury v. Madison*,
5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 137, 163 (1803)
See (App.59a) (App,173a) (App328a-329a).
15. *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. 4, 421-422 (1819)
See (App.216a-218a) (App.329a).
16. *Rhode Island v. Massachusetts*,
37 U.S. 12 Pet. 657 657 (1838)
See (App.63a-64a) (App.329a).
17. *Perry v. Sindermann*, 408 U.S. 593, 597 (1972)
See (App.61a) (App.168a) (App.225a) (App.329a-330a).
18. *Schneckloth v. Bustamonte*,
412 U.S. 218, 229 (1973)
See (App.60a-61a) (App.168a) (App.330a).
19. *Trinity Lutheran Church of Columbia, Inc. v. Comer*, 582 U.S. ____ (2017)
See (App.352a-357a)
20. *United States v. Morgan*, 346 U.S. 502, 503 (1954)
See (App.23a) (App.47a) App.59a). (App.138a-140a).
21. *Western Pac. Ry. Corp. v. Western Pac. Ry. Co.*,
345 U.S. 247, 262-63 (1953)

See (App.330a-332a).

22. *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886)

See (App.59a) (App.163a) (App.253a-254a).

**ii. Important Question of Federal Law
and/or Essentials Issues of Exceptional
Importance**

1. Law respecting an establishment of religion

See (App.404a-457a)

2. Judiciary Act of 1789, SEC 32.

See (App.48a) (App.148a-151a) (App.296a-302a).

3. The Panel's Actions Raise Issues of Exceptional
Importance, *inter alia*.

The panel's misplaced [decision] raised question[s] of exceptional circumstances or of general public and exceptional importance or in the interests of justice, as set forth in section A of this petition. However, it is the Panel's actions of not obtaining the records of Petitioner's case No. 4:17-CV-750, nor providing some assemblance for the doctrines of substantive and procedural due process as an impermissible end that raises vital issues of exceptional importance, *inter alia*. The Panel's actions or inactions have advanced "*Rex non potest peccare*"—*the king can do no wrong*—*a maxim of law* that has come down to us from Roman times. It is a theology doctrine in its most traditional forum. Petitioner believes this feudal doctrine should protect the public purse rather than perpetuating a theology or the current legal notions of sovereign power and incapacity to err. Despite this well-settled principle of law or as a theology doctrine, the Court's

medieval doctrine of Federal sovereign immunity (“the King can do no wrong”) is misplaced and barred without the due process of law, a provision in the Fifth Amendment, and thereby furnishes no remedy at law concerning the merits of Petitioner’s case. Due to limitations, no additional or further legal argument can be properly presented, with the binding precedent articulated in *Langford v. United States*; “while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government” under a fixed autonomy of, *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370. (App.66a-67a).

The three branches of the “United States” Government, *de facto* the Respondent are evolving a Dominion Theology, that has established, endorsed or is advancing:

[IRS] [Creed] [Taxology] [Taxing Trinity]
 [To LIVE as EVIL] [Purpose-Driven Life]
 [Worthship] [Theology Forum] [THE WORDS]
 [THE CODE] [Ministries] [Temple Taxes]
 [Auditing] [Legalism] [Ceremony] [Collective
 Experience] [FAITH] [Mammon] [Taxism],
 inter alia. Such matters are within, Lemon
 civil case 4:17-cv-00750. (App.67a).

As listed in the Table of Citations or Other Authorities:

Glossary (App.53a) {TOC and TOA Omitted}

- [Internal Religious Service *aka* IRS] [IRS] (App.183a) Exhibit G-#3.
- [“Our core values guide our path to achieving our vision.”] [Creed]. (App.174a).

- [Organized Religion of THEIRS] [Taxology]. (App.179a) Exhibit F-#15.
- [IRS existing as “The Bureau” + “The Agency” = “The Service”] [Taxing Trinity]. (App.193a) Exhibit J-#3.
- [A Complacent Policy of Indifference to Evil] [To LIVE as EVIL] (App.200a-204a).
- [The Fruits of the Purpose-Driven Life of THEIRS] [Purpose-Driven Life]. (App.175a) Exhibit E-#2
- [Worship of Argumentative Wealth, Words & Wants of Materialism] [Worthship]. (App.190a) Exhibit I-#19, 29.
- [“Your Voice at the IRS”] [Theology Forum] (App.188a) Exhibit I-#2.
- [Force and Effect of Law Respecting an Establishment of Religion] [THE WORDS].
- [Enactments of Law &/or Application of Internal Revenue Laws] [THE CODE].
- [The Church Without Walls Ministries] [Ministries]. (App.193a) Exhibit J-#1.
- [Penalties & Interests of THEIRS] [Temple Taxes]. (App.196a) Exhibit K-#5, 6.
- [“Auditing is precise, thoroughly codified and has exact procedures.”] [Auditing]. (App.186a) Exhibit H-#12, 13, 14.
- [Black Theology of Legalism via Involuntary Servitude] [Legalism]. (App.199a).

- [An adopted “set of fundamental rights” of THEIRS] [Ceremony]. (App.178a).
- [THE CODE] and [THE WORDS] [Collective Experience]. (App.175a).
- [FAITH]–The Ten Tax Commandments. (App.185a). Exhibit H-#2.
- [The Worship of Money and Egregious Wealth] [Mammon] (App.185a). Exhibit H-#5.
- [Institutionalized Faith in Taxism] [Taxism]. (App.186a). Exhibit H-#10.

The myriad of subtle ways in which Establishment Clause values can be eroded.



CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Hinds respectfully requests that the Petition for Writ of Certiorari be granted and set the case for full merits briefing, and reverse the Judgment, Mandate and Order below.

Respectfully submitted,

TERRY LEE HINDS
PETITIONER PRO SE
438 LEICESTER SQUARE DRIVE
BALLWIN, MO 63021
(636) 675-0028
ALPHAOMEGA44@OUTLOOK.COM

MAY 24, 2018