

## PETITION SENT TO THE DEA OCTOBER 2017

The Guidance Document says to send this to Joe Rannazzisi, but it seems that he does not think the DEA should exist anymore, so I called and asked who to send it to

[https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/pubs/rfra\\_exempt012209.pdf](https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/pubs/rfra_exempt012209.pdf)

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/who-is-joe-rannazzisi-the-dea-man-who-fought-the-drug-companies-and-lost/2017/10/15/c3ac4b0e-b02e-11e7-be94-fabb0f1e9ffb\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.61e9706e8f28](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/who-is-joe-rannazzisi-the-dea-man-who-fought-the-drug-companies-and-lost/2017/10/15/c3ac4b0e-b02e-11e7-be94-fabb0f1e9ffb_story.html?utm_term=.61e9706e8f28)

### Executive Order on Religious Freedom from President Trump

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/05/04/presidential-executive-order-promoting-free-speech-and-religious-liberty>

Section 1.

Policy.

*It shall be the policy of the executive branch to vigorously enforce Federal law's robust protections for religious freedom. The Founders envisioned a Nation in which religious voices and views were integral to a vibrant public square, and in which religious people and institutions were free to practice their faith without fear of discrimination or retaliation by the Federal Government. For that reason, the United States Constitution enshrines and protects the fundamental right to religious liberty as Americans' first freedom. Federal law protects the freedom of Americans and their organizations to exercise religion and participate fully in civic life without undue interference by the Federal Government. The executive branch will honor and enforce those protections.*

The SHAIVITE TEMPLE OF COLORADO requests that the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) grant this Religious Institution the same rights and privileges as a Marijuana Importer, Manufacturer and/or Researcher such as Catalent or the University of Mississippi. And we would like to assert that THCv is not a Scheduled Substance and should be accepted by default for Religious use, as it can be used, sold, traded, and given away freely under current Federal Law and the UN Psychotropics Convention.

We ask that we be allowed to grow enough Marijuana Plants within our premises to supply a Congregation, as well as to institute a Breeding Program in which we can carefully choose from a number of Plants before flowering, and we ask to be able to grow no more plants than the Maximum

allowed to Medical Marijuana Patients (99, which we will not even use until we have a large enough place of Worship). We also ask that Members be allowed to use Marijuana Freely on Premise, within Colorado Personal Use Law, as well as for Ordained Temple Ministers to be allowed to distribute Marijuana freely to Temple Members in line with Gifting Laws, and we will not request donations from recipients. We also ask to be able to freely distribute Marijuana Infused Milk (Bhang) on Temple premises for Religious Festivals and at Celebrations such as Weddings. Our Religious Practice is currently burdened by our inability to do any of this Legally under Federal Law. One of our Temples has been raided in the past, at XXXXXXXXXXXX, Mckinney, TX, 75070 in 2010, we moved to Colorado as Refugees during that time; and the State withdrew from the case and the case was dismissed in 2015 after Rev. Ryan "Sasha" Gallagher returned to present the case. But in 2012 his 12 year old brother (Mason Ryan Wight) died from Brain Edema, and could have been saved by Cannabinoids (evidence of Edema reversing qualities attached, his Death Certificate can also be provided).

Hinduism has existed since at least 4500 years ago, and is the only Major World Religion which has existed for that long, and the Population of India has never been replaced by an Invading Population or their Temples destroyed by such an Invading Population. Pashupati, an early version of Shiva (whose is still Worshipped and whose Temples are still used today) existed even in the Indus Valley Civilization. In the most Ancient Hindu Text, the Text we use, known as the Rig Veda; a Sacred "Drug" called Soma is mentioned over and over. Soma is mentioned to be a plant from which an extraction is created, 4500 years ago in the texts they specifically used a Wool Sieve. Marijuana is currently the most commonly accepted form of Soma throughout the Indian Subcontinent, and is used regularly as the Sacred Soma plant.

Our belief system involves a Series of Gods, primarily those that are either forms of Shiva, or closely associated with Shiva, such as his wife Parvati. We believe that Shiva is the Supreme Lord of the Universe, and that Cannabis or Marijuana is his Physical form on Earth; similarly to Agni being manifested as Fire, or Surya being manifested as the Sun, or Kali being Manifested in Cremation, or even Jesus being manifested in Wine and Bread. We believe in Fasting and Meditation as Spiritual Practices well. As Sadhus, derived from the word Sadhana (meaning: Spiritual Practice), our Priests study Religion and History from all over the World. We believe in studying Chemistry and Neuroscience in order to better understand the Plants and World around us, and growing various Non-Scheduled Plants in the name of various Gods.

Our structure is based on Initiation Rites, and Rituals involve the Procedures used in Manufacturing and Breeding for THCv, as well as various Ceremonial Rites involving outdoor Fire Pits and various plants. Holidays are based on the Cycle of the Sun, the Cycle of the Moon, the Seasons, and various Memorial Occasions; and happen on almost a Weekly basis. The Temple is currently located in Rev.

Ryan “Sasha” Gallagher’s home, at XXXXXXXXXXXX, Aurora, CO, 80013; but we intend to get a larger place of Worship soon. The Temple is currently a Non-Profit Organization in Colorado and is operated like a Trust (currently solely for the purpose of breeding THCv strains for Religious Use), with Rev. Ryan “Sasha” Gallagher as the sole Owner. As is mentioned later, Congress has caused Religious Institutions such as ours to operate in Secret; Church of the Holy Light of the Queen v. Mukasey, 615 F. Supp. 2d 1210 (D. Or. 2009).

#### Amount

We request that we be allowed to grow up to 99 plants at a time, not all being Flowered for product, but for the purpose of selecting Parent Strains for Breeding. And the plants that are Flowered will be used to supply the Congregation for Ceremonies, Holidays and Special Services.

Bhang (Marijuana Milk) will be produced in Gallon batches and Charas (Hashish) will be produced in Ounces.

#### Conditions

At a home, until we can acquire Warehouse space, or a large Temple building with various rooms.

#### Location

Currently, XXXXXXXXXXXX, Aurora, CO, 80013; but we plan on relocating to a larger location soon.

Our Religious Practices which require exemption include:

- ⑩ Growing and Breeding plants for high THCv content, which we would be willing to provide seeds from to the USDA GRIN program. As well as distributing Clones and Seeds to Temple Priests.
  
- ⑩ Sadhus (Priests) using Marijuana, Bhang (Marijuana Milk), and Charas (Hashish) as a Sacrament regularly on Temple Premises. And members using the same on special Occasions and Holidays, and as a Eucharist in some services.

- ⑩ Production of Charas (Hashish) and Bhang (Marijuana Infused Milk) on Premise.
  
- ⑩ Serving Bhang and Charas at events such as Weddings, possibly off Premise.
  
  
- ⑩ Importing Seeds for the purpose of getting the proper Genetics for THCv, and Exporting Seeds for the purpose of spreading the new Higher THCv plants.

Practices that do not require exemptions, but we will mention for the sake of Transparency:

- ⑩ Transporting THCv (an Unscheduled Substance) across State lines, between Temples for Religious Use
  
- ⑩ Importing and Exporting THCv (an Unscheduled Substance) for Religious Use
  
- ⑩ Buying, Selling, Trading or Giving Away THCv (an Unscheduled Substance) for Religious Use
  
- ⑩ Distributing THCv to Doctors and Hospitals, for use as they see fit, but in the name of Mason Wight, who died from Edema and could have been saved by a Cannabinoid.

“There is a part of us that longs for something tangible [that reminds us of, and connects us to God, Grace, & Spirit], that....interacts with the senses. The sacraments, those sacred mixtures of matter and the Holy Spirit, fulfill that need.”

From: ‘The Sacramentals: What are they?’ Regina Doman

All Sacrament(s) – being ‘Sacred Food’ – offered by the Shaivite Temple is not a ‘drug’ as defined under 21 U.S.C., Title 21, §321(g)(1) of the FD&C Act which defines a drug as an ‘article that is intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals and articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or function of the body of man or

other animals.’

“The term “religious exercise” includes any exercise of religion, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religious belief”, see 42 U.S. Code § 2000cc–5 (7) (a). “the general characteristics of Schedule I substances cannot carry the day”, see *Gonzales v. O Centro Espírita Beneficente União do Vegetal* 546 U.S. 418 (2006); *Church of Holy Light of the Queen V. Eric Holder, Jr.*, No. 13-35058 (9th Cir. 2014). “Congress must first enact a law criminalizing an activity, attach a penalty, and give the Federal courts Jurisdiction”, see *Hudson v. United States* 522 U.S. 93 (1997). “Congress shall make no laws prohibiting the Free Exercise of Religion”, see FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE, I AMENDMENT. “If a Government confronts an individual with a choice that pressures the individual to forgo a Religious practice, whether by imposing a penalty or withholding a benefit, then the Government has burdened the individuals free Religious Exercise.”, see *Sherbert v. Verner* 374 U.S. 398 (1963). “Even neutral laws can be used unconstitutionally”, see *Yick Wo v. Hopkins* 118 U.S. 356 (1886); 42 U.S. Code § 2000bb (a) (2). “failing to accommodate petitioners’ exercise of their “nonmainstream” religions in a variety of ways”, see *Cutter v. Wilkinson*, 544 U.S. 709 (2005). “conduct business in accordance with their religious beliefs”, see *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.* 573 U.S. \_ (2014).

For Information on Hindu Temple Hierarchical Structures, refer to this New York Supreme Court Case

<https://www.becketlaw.org/case/hindu-temple-society-north-america-v-new-york-supreme-court/>

The Latin phrase SUB ROSA means “under the rose”, and is used in English to denote secrecy or confidentiality, similar to the Chatham House Rule. The literal rose and its essence or attar has also played a role in religious and spiritual rites which often would have been held in secret.

Persecution under the modern ULTRA VIRES actions of the US Congress has forced many religions and religious practitioners to operate SUB ROSA or in CLANDESTINE settings AB INVITO, in violation of the FREE EXERCISE CLAUSE which is AD GRAVE DAMNUM to these Religions, see *Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah* 508 U.S. 520 (1993). During this time of ULTRA VIRES, CAUSA SINE QUA NON religious practitioners have been CASTIGATED, COERCED and brought to CARCER with no method of ASYLUM established. CESSANTE CAUSA.

**Shaivite Temple Rites of Beneficence**

## **PREAMBLE**

**I: Expectant and/or nursing Parishioners should not partake Molecular Sacrament.**

**II: Parishioners undergoing pharmaco-therapy for a physical or neurological condition are advised to consult with the prescribing physician before partaking Molecular Sacrament.**

**III. The ingestion of Molecular Sacrament is not without risk; the ingestion of any given substance necessarily and inevitably is associated with some degree of risk including medical complication(s) that may result in hospitalization and/or death. Each individual assumes the risk associated with the use of Molecular Sacrament and agrees to indemnify and hold harmless Shaivite Temple, its Pastor, and any affiliates, suppliers or other associated individuals, corporations or entities for any loss, damages, medical complication, hospitalization, or death that may arise from the use of Molecular Sacrament.**

**IV: Molecular Sacrament, as a physical form of Shiva, are offered, and intended for, the discovery and realization of their Inherent Beneficence including the fosterance of a heightened awareness of The Divine Creator(s)/The Grand Architect(s)/God & Grace; the promotion of more joyful relationships; and the cultivation of greater appreciation of the Magnificent Beauty, Immeasurable Worth & Miraculous Nature of Ourselves, of Others, of the Planet Earth & of the Greater Cosmos.**

**V: Molecular Sacrament are instruments for discovery and development of the ability to constructively and lovingly experience and process the infinite and ever-changing range of emotional, psychological, and spiritual states; Molecular Sacrament do not provide for 'temporary escape' from Existence nor do Molecular Sacrament foster or support the avoidance, masking, or concealing of difficult emotions, unpleasant psychological states, and/or moments of spiritual unrest; partaking Molecular Sacrament for such purposes shall be unfruitful.**

**VI: Reverent, and proper, partakence of Molecular Sacrament shall not increase the likelihood of harm to any person, creature, or property.**

**VII: Reverent, and proper, partakence of Molecular Sacrament shall augment, rather than diminish, the miraculous gift of being able to regulate one's action(s)/behavior(s).**

**VIII: The privilege of access to Molecular Sacrament thru the Shaivite Temple shall be forfeited for an indeterminate period of time in the event that the Parishioner:**

- 1. Signals a willful intent to disregard Rites of Beneficence – or is known to have done so.**
- 2. Is known to have caused or aided in the partakence of Molecular Sacrament by any person or without His or Her express knowledge & informed consent.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Through and by the Infinitely Wise Design of The Divine Creator(s) /The Grand Architect(s)/God, partaking Molecular Sacrament by means of oral ingestion (swallowing) usually provides for Optimal Beneficence. Alternative methods of partakence should be avoided (unless justified by a specific circumstance/condition such as gastro-intestinal unrest).**

**References to Model Partakence provide guidance for realizing Optimal Beneficence in partaking Molecular Sacrament; Parishioners are encouraged to adjust partakence to their individual case(s) and arrive at the least amount of Sacrament sufficient to realize the desired Beneficent effect(s)/outcome(s).**

**If You believe you are having an undesirable response from partaking Molecular Sacrament rather than enjoying Beneficence, either reduce, or discontinue partakence.**

**Partaking, in a single instance, an amount greater than three times (3x) that of Model Partakence is strongly discouraged. If it is deemed You have willfully mis-used or if there is reason to believe You intend to deliberately misuse Molecular Sacrament your privilege of access to Molecular Sacrament shall be forfeited for an indeterminate period of time.**

**The achievement of Optimal Beneficence of Molecular Sacrament is best realized and maintained by engaging in at least one (1) day of mindful abstinence in any seven (7) day period – and by limiting partakence of any single given Molecular Sacrament according to the 'For Optimal Beneficence' guidance provided with the educational insert that accompanies any given Molecular Sacrament. Partakence in excess of the provided guidances tends to detract from Beneficence and is discouraged.**

**Partakence of two (2) or more types of Molecular Sacrament together, at the same time (e.g. EASE & BRIGHT), is generally advised against; doing so should be approached with great care.**

**Partakence of Molecular Sacrament by means of insufflation (snorting), and/or by burning and inhaling is strongly discouraged and should only be utilized when justifiable circumstances to do so exist.**

**Partakence of Molecular Sacrament™ by means of injection into the body/bloodstream shall only be acceptable if justified by medical circumstances & done under medical supervision.**

**Beneficence of Molecular Sacrament may be amplified by partaking together with others in Fellowship & Goodwill.**

**Under no circumstance should You make it so that another Human Being partakes Molecular Sacrament without His/Her express knowledge and fully informed consent.**

**Partaking alcohol in conjunction with Molecular Sacrament in other than modest amounts, is strongly discouraged – as alcohol tends to interfere with the realization of Optimal Beneficence .**

**Do not drive or operate any type of machinery or heavy equipment after partaking Molecular Sacrament until You have become familiar with the various dimensions and aspects of Beneficence and are certain You are able to do so without increasing the likelihood of putting Yourself and/or Others in harms way.**

**Partaking modest amounts of water (most preferably) and/or other liquids that do not contain alcohol at regular intervals before, during, & after partaking Molecular Sacrament aids in the realization of Optimal Beneficence.**

**For reasons that remain largely unknown to the neurosciences, Female Human Beings (i.e. Goddesses in Human Form) tend to be more sensitive to partakence of Molecular Sacrament, and therefore may realize Optimal Beneficence by partaking smaller amounts of Molecular Sacrament than their male counterparts.**

**Before partaking Molecular Sacrament reflect upon your familiarity with Molecular Sacrament, your mind-set, your setting/surroundings & your purpose for partaking Molecular Sacrament.**

**At all times, & in all places, treat Yourself & Others Kind & Bright.**

**In All Things Give Thanks – Especially things You do not like.**

**Remind Yourself each & every day of the Miraculous& Wondrous nature of Your Own Being & of Your Innermost, Immeasurable Beauty; as well as that of Everyone & Everything surrounding You.**

**Give Thanks each & every day to The Divine Creator(s)/The Grand Architect(s)/God & Grace who gave You Life & provide Each of Us with an Ever-Wondrous Planet Earth & Universal Galaxseas in which to Swim, live, discover and above all love.**

Our primary Sacrament is not listed on the UN Psychotropics Treaty

## **THCv**

First, just to address Standing. I have been a Hindu Shaivite Minister since 2009, and have been Hindu since 2005. I follow and teach the lessons of the Rig Veda. You do not have to be from India to be Hindu, Shiva is not Racist, Marijuana is not Racist. And we are breeding African Strains in order to create THCv Strains, similarly to the “Low THC” strains containing high CBD in Texas and Louisiana, we will be growing “Low THC” strains containing high THCv. THCv suppresses appetite, and is used by Priests of the Shaivite Temple for fasting, as well as a Eucharist within the Church.

Here is a page on a US Government Website that explains the Religion and its Historicity

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22742944>

*“...Cannabis Indica has been used for literally thousands of years in the worship of the god Shiva. Cannabis is used in an orally administered form called bhang which can be either the wet resinous leaves formed into pills of a drink made of milk, cannabis, and various spices consumed by worshipers of Shiva on festival days or by smoking the flowering buds of cannabis-a practice generally reserved*

*for holy men who dedicate their lives to ascetic practice and the worship of Shiva. This practice is codified in the Vedas as well as in legends about the origin of cannabis and its relationship to Shiva.”*

The Encyclopedia of Religion, used in the Case Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye V City of Hialeah, Vol. 6 covers the Holiday known as Holi, and Marijuana Consumption during that Holiday

Vol. 6

[http://e-reading.club/bookreader.php/133758/Jones\\_-\\_Encyclopedia\\_of\\_religion.\\_vol.\\_06\\_of\\_14\\_%28GODDESS\\_WORSHIP\\_-\\_ICONOCLASM%29.pdf](http://e-reading.club/bookreader.php/133758/Jones_-_Encyclopedia_of_religion._vol._06_of_14_%28GODDESS_WORSHIP_-_ICONOCLASM%29.pdf)

### **Largent v. Texas 318 U.S. 418 (1943)**

[This] appeal brings here for review the conviction of appellant for violation of Ordinance No. 612 of the City of Paris, Texas, which makes it unlawful for any person to solicit orders or to sell books, wares, or merchandise within the residence portion of Paris without first filing an application and obtaining a permit. The ordinance goes on to provide that “if, after investigation, the Mayor deems it proper or advisable, he may issue a written permit to said person for the purpose of soliciting, selling, canvassing, or census taking within the residence portion of the city, which permit shall state on its face that it has been issued after a thorough investigation... Mrs. Largent offered some of these books to those upon whom she called for a contribution of not to exceed 25 cents for a bound book and several magazines or tracts. If the contribution was not made, the appellant, in accordance with the custom of the Witnesses, would frequently leave a book and tracts without receiving any money. Appellant was making such distributions when arrested. She had not filed an application for, or received, a permit under the ordinance.

### **Gonzales v. O Centro Espírita Beneficente União do Vegetal 546 U.S. 418 (2006)**

They show that the Government can demonstrate a compelling interest in uniform application of a particular program by offering evidence that granting the requested religious accommodations would seriously compromise its ability to administer the program. Here the Government’s uniformity argument rests not so much on the particular statutory program at issue as on slippery slope concerns that could be invoked in response to any RFRA claim for an exception to a generally applicable law, *i.e.*, “if I make an exception for you, I’ll have to make one for everybody, so no exceptions.” But RFRA operates by mandating consideration, under the compelling interest test, of exceptions to “rule[s] of general applicability.” §2000bb–1(a). Congress’ determination that the legislated test is “workable ... for striking sensible balances between religious liberty and competing prior governmental interests,” §2000bb(a)(5), finds support in *Sherbert, supra*, at 407,

and *Cutter v. Wilkinson*, 544 U. S. \_\_\_, \_\_\_. While there may be instances where a need for uniformity precludes the recognition of exceptions to generally applicable laws under RFRA, it would be surprising to find that this was such a case, given the longstanding peyote exemption and the fact that the very reason Congress enacted RFRA was to respond to a decision denying a claimed right to sacramental use of a controlled substance. The Government has not shown that granting the UDV an exemption would cause the kind of administrative harm recognized as a compelling interest in, e.g., *Lee*. It cannot now compensate for its failure to convince the District Court as to its health or diversion concerns with the bold argument that there can be no RFRA exceptions at all to the Controlled Substances Act. Pp. 13–16.

### **Follett v. Town of McCormick 321 U.S. 573 (1944)**

We pointed out in the *Murdock* case that the distinction between “religious” activity and “purely commercial” activity would at times be “vital” in determining the constitutionality of flat license taxes such as these. 319 U.S. p. 319 U. S. 110. But we need not determine here by what tests the existence of a “religion” or the “free exercise” thereof in the constitutional sense may be ascertained or measured. For the Supreme Court of South Carolina conceded that “the book in question [Footnote 2] is a religious book,” and it concluded “without difficulty” that “its publication and distribution come within the words, *exercise of religion*’ as they are used in the Constitution.” *We must accordingly accept as bona fide appellant’s assertion that he was “preaching the gospel” by going “from house to house presenting the gospel of the kingdom in printed form.” Thus, we have quite a different case from that of a merchant who sells books at a stand or on the road.*

### **Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc. of N. Y., Inc. v. Village of Stratton 536 U.S. 150 (2002)**

Petitioners contend that a village ordinance making it a misdemeanor to engage in door-to-door advocacy without first registering with the mayor and receiving a permit violates the First Amendment. Through this facial challenge, we consider the door-to-door canvassing regulation not only as it applies to religious proselytizing, but also to anonymous political speech and the distribution of handbills.

...

1 Section 116.01 provides: “The practice of going in and upon private property and/or the private residences of Village residents in the Village by canvassers, solicitors, peddlers, hawkers, itinerant merchants or transient vendors of merchandise or services, not having been invited to do so by the owners or occupants of such private property or residences, and not having first obtained a permit pursuant to Section 116.03 of this Chapter, for the purpose of advertising, promoting, selling and/or explaining any product, service, organization or cause, or for the purpose of soliciting orders for the

sale of goods, wares, merchandise or services, is hereby declared to be a nuisance and is prohibited.” App. to Brief for Respondents 2a. The Village has interpreted the term “canvassers” to include Jehovah’s Witnesses and the term “cause” to include their ministry. The ordinance does not appear to require a permit for a surveyor since such an individual would not be entering private property “for the purpose of advertising, promoting, selling and/or explaining any product, service, organization or cause, or for the purpose of soliciting orders for the sale of goods, wares, merchandise or services.”

...

The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit affirmed. 240 F.3d 553 (2001). It held that the ordinance was “content neutral and of general applicability and therefore subject to intermediate scrutiny.” *Id.*, at 560. It rejected petitioners’ reliance on the discussion of laws affecting both the free exercise of religion and free speech in *Employment Div., Dept. of Human Resources of Ore. v. Smith*, 494 U. S. 872 (1990),<sup>8</sup> because that “language was dicta and therefore not binding.” 240 F. 3d, at 561. It also rejected petitioners’ argument that the ordinance is overbroad because it impairs the right to distribute pamphlets anonymously that we recognized in *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm’n*, 514 U. S. 334 (1995), reasoning that “the very act of going door-to-door requires the canvassers to reveal a portion of their identities.” 240 F. 3d, at 563. The Court of Appeals concluded that the interests promoted by the Village-“protecting its residents from fraud and undue annoyance”-as well as the harm that it seeks to prevent-“criminals posing as canvassers in order to defraud its residents”-though “by no means overwhelming,” were sufficient to justify the regulation. *Id.*, at 565-566. The court distinguished earlier cases protecting the Jehovah’s Witnesses ministry because those cases either in- “The only decisions in which we have held that the First Amendment bars application of a neutral, generally applicable law to religiously motivated action have involved not the Free Exercise Clause alone, but the Free Exercise Clause in conjunction with other constitutional protections, such as freedom of speech and of the press, see *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U. S., at 304-307 (invalidating a licensing system for religious and charitable solicitations under which the administrator had discretion to deny a license to any cause he deemed nonreligious); *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105 (1943) (invalidating a flat tax on solicitation as applied to the dissemination of religious ideas); *Follett v. McCormick*, 321 U. S. 573 (1944) (same), or the right of parents, acknowledged in *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U. S. 510 (1925), to direct the education of their children, see *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U. S. 205 (1972) (invalidating compulsory school-attendance laws as applied to Amish parents who refused on religious grounds to send their children to school).”

### **Busey v. District of Columbia 319 U.S. 579 (1943)**

In this case, petitioners, who are Jehovah’s Witnesses, were convicted of selling on the streets of the District of Columbia, magazines which expound their religious views, without first procuring the license and paying the license tax required by § 47-2336 of the District of Columbia Code (1940). In affirming the conviction, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia below had two questions

before it: whether the statute was applicable to petitioners, and, if so, whether its application as to them infringed the First Amendment. The court construed the statute as applicable, and sustained its constitutionality (75 U.S.App.D.C. 352, 129 F.2d 24), following the decision in *Cole v. City of Fort Smith*, 202 Ark. 614, 151 S.W.2d 1000, the judgment in which was affirmed by this Court in *Bowden v. Fort Smith*, 316 U. S. 584, one of the cases argued together with *Jones v. Opelika*, 316 U. S. 584. Since the decision below, and after hearing reargument in the *Opelika* case, we have vacated our earlier judgment and held the license tax imposed in that case to be unconstitutional. *Jones v. Opelika*, 319 U. S. 103; *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105. Petitioners urge us to construe the District of Columbia statute as inapplicable in order to avoid the constitutional infirmity which might otherwise exist — an infirmity conceded by respondent on the oral argument before us. In view of our decisions in the *Opelika* and *Murdock* cases, we vacate the judgment in this case and remand the cause to the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to enable it to reexamine its rulings on the construction and validity of the District ordinance in the light of those decisions. *Cf. New York ex rel. Whitman v. Wilson*, 318 U. S. 688, and cases cited.

### **Murdock v. Pennsylvania 319 U.S. 105 (1943)**

But the mere fact that the religious literature is “sold” by itinerant preachers, rather than “donated,” does not transform evangelism into a commercial enterprise. If it did, then the passing of the collection plate in church would make the church service a commercial project. The constitutional rights of those spreading their religious beliefs through the spoken and printed word are not to be gauged by standards governing retailers or wholesalers of books. The right to use the press for expressing one’s views is not to be measured by the protection afforded commercial handbills. It should be remembered that the pamphlets of Thomas Paine were not distributed free of charge. It is plain that a religious organization needs funds to remain a going concern. But an itinerant evangelist, however misguided or intolerant he may be, does not become a mere book agent by selling the Bible or religious tracts to help defray his expenses or to sustain him. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion are available to all, not merely to those who can pay their own way.

### **THE INDIAN HEMP DRUGS COMISSION REPORT**

Before Indian Independence during the time of Gandhi, India was a British Colony, and the British Empire did the largest most comprehensive study of Marijuana use and the Impact of Marijuana use on Society, and concluded that it was harmless, and decided to legalize it and tax it. This study included everyone from Marijuana prescribing Doctors and Marijuana using Patients and Gurus, to Hash smugglers and Crazy people. It is so large and comprehensive that it is actually comprised of many Volumes, like an Encyclopedia or Lawbook set.

<http://digital.nls.uk/indiapapers/browse/pageturner.cfm?id=74908458>

First Cause of Action. According to the Supreme Court, Schedule I substances are not enough to bar a substance from Religious Use. The wording they used is that calling a substance Schedule I as an argument against Religious use “can not carry the day”.

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/546/418/>

Laws must be Neutral and can not Overtly or Covertly ban Religions. The DEA allows large corporations to Manufacture, Import and Posses Schedule I and II Substances using DEA form 225, protocol can be found in 21 CFR 1301.18, the Constitution allows the regulation of Commerce, but not the Regulation of Religion. The Controlled Substances Act is not a Neutral Law.

<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/508/520/case.html>

<http://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/cadc/02-1211/02-1211a-2011-03-24.html>

Second cause of Action, Gerrymandering causing Death. Cannabinoids have been proven to have various uses, such as reducing edema, but Hospitals even in Medical Marijuana States are unwilling to use Marijuana products on patients. Doctors are either Unable or Unwilling to retrieve Cannabinoids for this purpose due to the current operations of the DEA. The University of Mississippi was a protected Monopoly until August 2016 for Marijuana, at which time the DEA admitted it was allowing this Monopoly and opened up registration to more companies. Mallinckdrot has been allowed to Synthesize Tetrahydrocannabinoids (THC derivatives) but, due to this Gerrymandering, Hospitals do not have access.

<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/08/12/2016-17955/applications-to-become-registered-under-the-controlled-substances-act-to-manufacture-marijuana-to>

[https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/fed\\_regs/manufact/reg/2016/index.html](https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/fed_regs/manufact/reg/2016/index.html)

[https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/fed\\_regs/impert/app/2016/index.html](https://www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/fed_regs/impert/app/2016/index.html)

<https://www.justice.gov/atr/memorandum-antitrust-division-united-states-department-justice-amicus-curiae-support-application>

Third Cause of Action, laws are not Amendments. And if we look at the Volstead Act, the Act of Congress which made Alcohol Prohibition (the 18th Amendment) an actual Enforced Law; the Volstead Act included Religious Exemptions for Alcohol use. You can not stop people from using their Sacraments, Celebrating their Festivals, and Consuming the Body of their Lords and Saviors.

[http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/curriculum/social\\_studies/ne/ne\\_volstead.pdf](http://mdk12.msde.maryland.gov/instruction/curriculum/social_studies/ne/ne_volstead.pdf)

**Contact Info**

Rev. Ryan "Sasha" Gallagher

MahatmaJapa@gmail.com

720-369-8172

XXXXXXXXXXXX

I submit under penalty of perjury that this information is true to the best of my knowledge.

---

Rev. Ryan "Sasha" Gallagher