

**UNITED STATES 8<sup>th</sup> CIRCUIT COURT  
Of APPEALS**

BRYAN ANTHONY REO,	)	
Plaintiffs-Appellee,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No: 15-3756
	)	
PASTOR MARTIN LINDSTEDT,	)	
Defendant – Appellant.	)	

**DEFENDANT-APPELLANTS’ PETITION FOR REHEARING**

COMES NOW for the Defendant(s)/Appellant Pastor Martin Luther Dzerzhinsky Lindstedt on behalf also of his church non-profit corporation The Church of Jesus Christ Christian / Aryan Nations of Missouri (hereafter Pastor Lindstedt’s Church) to timely file within the 14 day time limit this Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure Rule 40 Motion for a Petition of Rehearing of this Court’s May 25, 2016 Ruling to Affirm the Judgment of U.S. Magistrate Judge Matthew Jeffrey Whitworth. Judge Whitworth dismissed the fraudulent and harassing lawsuit *in forma pauperis* of Bryan Reo of Mentor Ohio claiming that there was a Digital Millennium Copyright Act (hereafter DMCA) claim for Pastor Lindstedt publishing a Facebook public profile picture of Bryan Reo (which Facebook picture was Reo’s 2004 Mentor High School graduation picture) on a Forum belonging to Pastor Lindstedt’s Church just before Bryan Reo threats of legal action in Lake County Ohio Court of Common Pleas against the Church Internet Service Provider (CrisisHost.com) forced another move to DreamHost.com.

**RECEIVED**  
JUN - 8 2016  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS  
EIGHTH CIRCUIT

(Presently there are now four separate Reo lawsuits against Pastor Lindstedt and Lindstedt's Church in Lake County Ohio -- #27 and #42 of 42 and a bogus stalking order against Pastor Lindstedt 900 miles away created by Bryan Reo perjuringly forging death threats Reo attributed to Lindstedt on yet another non-Church forum and a lawsuit before the Mentor Municipal Court against Pastor Lindstedt, Lindstedt's Church and Lindstedt's 60-year-old, 400+ pound, bed-ridden semi-literate domestic partner whose only crime is being a Director of the Church which that municipal court booted up to Lake County.) Bryan Reo also sued for mythical emotional damages of \$10+ million upon a variety of delusional reasons. (On April 30, 2016 Pastor Lindstedt found out that the Church web pages regarding Bryan Reo being a non-white "White Supremacist" was the likely reason Reo was fired from working in the North Perry Nuclear Power Plant after numerous problems there brought about security checks. Reo blames Pastor Lindstedt for Reo being unable to get employment in law enforcement or sensitive jobs in places requiring mental screening.) Since Judge Whitworth granted Bryan Reo the ability to sue *in forma pauperis* the fact that there was not any DMCA jurisdiction or real damages over \$75,000 to overcome diversity of citizenship challenges to jurisdiction, Whitworth decided to finish off the case, particularly because Pastor Lindstedt joindered forty or so Bryan Reo co-conspirators on April 22, 2015. (See Doc. #24, April 22, 2015 which was Stricken and Sealed by Judge Whitworth & Appellant's Motion to Supplement the Record on Appeal with the Stricken Document #24 and Exhibit #1). This Appeals Court has improperly decided to narrowly interpret this case as Judge Whitworth dismissing Bryan Reo's spurious and frivolous *in forma pauperis* lawsuit against Pastor Lindstedt (and claiming then that there was no actual incorporated Church) and then declaring

“moot” Pastor Lindstedt’s appellate motions and requests for relief that the Digital Millennium Copyright Act was used for the improper and fraudulent purpose of violating Pastor Lindstedt and Lindstedt’s Church of their First Amendment right to free speech and practice of religion. Thus this federal appeals court has enabled Bryan Reo to use and abuse this Act imposed by the Congress of the United States and signed by the President of the United States created to benefit the commercial interests of large corporations like Disney and other media corporations to destroy the non-commercial religious Internet communications of a Church which is at religious and political odds with the present federal regime. The DMCA actually has provisions for Pastor Lindstedt’s counter-suit against Bryan Reo and Reo co-conspirator co-counter-defendants as well as penalties against perjury, *but only if these federal courts decide to obey their own DMCA federal law*. Thus this federal appeals court has violated its own pretend Constitution and Bill of Goods paper “protections” claiming that this regime’s subjects have freedom of speech and religion when any importunate homosexual mongrel all butt-hurt over being ridiculed then driven out from White Supremacist and Christian Identity circles as being non-white and a likely agent provocateur from several states and hundreds of miles away can file a perjurous and frivolous federal lawsuit for \$10.75 million under color of federal law, then when this idiotic case falls apart there is no penalty, civil or criminal for abuse of this federal DMCA law. How can there be when this federal Appellate Court rules that delusional homosexual mongrel agent provocateur behavior abusing the DMCA is protected by “We deny as moot Lindstedt’s appellate motions and requests for relief.” ??? (Page 2, Opinion.)

This Appellate Court has created yet another *Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 60 U.S. 393 dictum / precedent in that they have [d]ruled that the White Adamic Aryan

Christian Israelite True-Man, with His belief in their inherent racial superiority, has absolutely no rights that this Mighty Evil Empire of numerous parasitic and degenerate mongrel races and predominantly Marxist creeds need respect. That they have to power to do whatever they please as long as they get away with it. That the pretense that this Appellate Court is a “special priesthood” equipped to “interpret” its own murky bowels of corrupt precedent to where there is no such thing as freedom of speech or of religion given that some Act of Congress can be used and abused to allow some “Social Justice Warrior” and federal agent provocateur to sue Pastors and Churches for millions and get a pre-emptive gag order against publication indefinitely by their White Christian Male victims.

If this Appellate Court isn't going to protect Pastor Lindstedt and Pastor Lindstedt's Church of Jesus Christ Christian and their CONstitutional and Bill of Goods “Priviledges” by pretend rule of law, then it is likely the old fashioned way will have to be attempted. The American Civil War I was a loss, but the Reformation Thirty Years War was a success, even though it killed over half of Germany.

This Court has a number of options under Rule 40 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure:

This Court could declare the Digital Millennium Copyright Act unconstitutional as it is used routinely for improper purposes for abuse of legal process, harassment and censorship of non-infringing intellectual property and in this particular case against the practice of religion.

This Court could uphold the DMCA by bringing it back to the Western District of Missouri, but with Pastor Lindstedt and Pastor Lindstedt's Church as the

plaintiffs and Bryan Reo and Bryan Reo's co-conspirators as the defendants, and with there being an investigation as to Bryan Reo and Reo co-conspirators perjury and criminal activity against Pastor Lindstedt and Lindstedt's Church.

Or this Court can cling to its own corrupt and regimeist-serving dictum like happened in Dred Scott until matters get sorted out through religious and racial civil warfare. This matter certainly isn't going to be let to lie in the darkness like a dead rat swept under the rug. If this Petition for Rehearing is denied, then Pastor Lindstedt's Church will of course appeal to the Supremes *in forma pauperis* on the one hand and issue, like Elijah did with Jehu, Hazael, and Elisha religious anointing letters of marque & reprisal. (I Kings 19:15-18).

Wherefore, let this Appellate Court do as it thinks best, as shall Appellant Pastor Martin Lindstedt and The Church of Jesus Christ Christian / Aryan Nations of Missouri.

Hail Victory!!!



Pastor Martin Luther Dzerzhinsky Lindstedt, Appellant *Pro Se*  
ArchBishop of Missouri, Church of Jesus Christ Christian/Aryan Nations of  
Missouri  
338 Rabbit Track Road, Granby Missouri 64844  
417-472-6901, pastorlindstedt@gmail.com

Exhibit #1: Bryan Reo lawsuit against Pastor Lindstedt, the Church before the Mentor Municipal Court and now another Lake County Court case.

Certificate of Service

On the 6<sup>th</sup> Day of June, 2016, the undersigned party served the following:  
Appellant's Petition for Rehearing in paper format on:

Bryan Anthony Reo  
7143 Rippling Brook Lane  
Mentor Ohio 44060

By delivering it by U.S. Mail.

  
Martin Lindstedt, Appellant *Pro Se*

By *Stephan C. T. O. A. / A.*  
*P.*

Exhibit H

STATE OF OHIO  
IN THE MENTOR MUNICIPAL COURT  
CIVIL DIVISION

**BRYAN ANTHONY REO**  
7143 Rippling Brook Ln.  
Mentor, OH 44060

Plaintiff,

v.

**THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST  
CHRISTIAN/ARYAN NATIONS OF  
MISSOURI**

c/o Roxie Fausnaught  
338 Rabbit Track Rd.  
Granby, MO 64844

and

**MARTIN LINDSTEDT**

338 Rabbit Track Rd.  
Granby, MO 64844

and

**ROXIE FAUSNAUGHT**

338 Rabbit Track Rd.  
Granby, MO 64844

Defendants.

Case No. 16 CV 245

Hon.

FILED & JOURNALIZED  
2016 MAR 22 A 11:44  
MENTOR MUNICIPAL COURT

**PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**  
**(JURY DEMAND ENDORSED HERON)**

NOW COMES Bryan Anthony Reo ("Plaintiff"), *pro se*, and hereby propounds upon The Church of Jesus Christ Christian/Aryan Nations of Missouri ("Church"), Martin Lindstedt

(“Lindstedt”), Roxie Fausnaught (“Fausnaught”) (collectively “Defendants”), and this Honorable Court Plaintiff’s Complaint:

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiff is suing Defendants for engaging in a vicious campaign of defamatory and criminal harassment against Plaintiff via the medium of the World Wide Web, which has become so severe that Plaintiff was awarded a civil stalking protection order against Lindstedt by the Lake County Court of Common Pleas after an evidentiary hearing. (Exhibit A – Civil Stalking Protection Order).

### **II. PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff is a natural person who resides in and is a citizen of the State of Ohio.

3. Church is a non-profit corporation existing by and through the law of the State of Missouri, which has Lindstedt as a director and Fausnaught as both a director and its registered agent.

4. Lindstedt is a natural person who resides in and is a domiciliary of the State of Missouri.

5. Fausnaught is a natural person who resides in and is a domiciliary of the State of Missouri.

### **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6. This Court enjoys subject matter jurisdiction because Plaintiff seeks a money judgment against Defendants in an amount of money no greater than \$15,000.00. R.C. § 1901.17.

7. This Court enjoys personal jurisdiction over Defendants because Defendants have intentionally caused tortious injury—via the medium of an interactive website on the World Wide Web—to Plaintiff in the State of Ohio by an act outside the State of Ohio which Defendants might reasonably have expected would cause Plaintiff to be injured thereby in the



State of Ohio. R.C. § 2307.382(A)(7); Civ.R. 4.3(A)(9); *Kauffman Racing Equipment, L.L.C., v. Roberts*, 126 Ohio St.3d 81, 2010-Ohio-2551 (Ohio 2010).

8. Venue is proper with this Court because Defendants are residents of the State of Missouri, and Plaintiff resides in the territorial jurisdiction of the Court. Civ.R. 3(B)(7).

#### IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

9. Plaintiff is a private figure for purposes of substantive defamation and invasion of privacy law. *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan*, 376 U.S. 254 (1964); *Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.*, 418 U.S. 323 (1972).

10. Church maintains an interactive and publicly-accessible website on the World Wide Web at <<http://christian-identity.net/forum>> (“Church Website”).

11. Lindstedt published onto Church Website at <<http://christian-identity.net/forum/showthread.php?1639-Bryan-Reo-s-Fraudulent-amp-Perjurous-Stalking-Complaint-against-Pastor-Lindstedt-16CS000102>> on January 12, 2016, at 9:48 p.m. that Plaintiff’s petition for a civil stalking protection order against Lindstedt was “perjurious.”

12. Perjury is a crime in the State of Ohio. R.C. § 2921.11.

13. Lindstedt’s statement that Plaintiff committed perjury is false.

14. Lindstedt published onto a publicly-accessible webpage on the World Wide Web at <[http://www.hateandflame.com/cgi-bin/bbs62x/webbbs\\_config.pl?md=read;id=105524](http://www.hateandflame.com/cgi-bin/bbs62x/webbbs_config.pl?md=read;id=105524)> on January 23, 2016, at 3:02 p.m. that Plaintiff should be killed by castration. Lindstedt also published on the same webpage Plaintiff’s photograph, Plaintiff’s residential address, and Plaintiff’s phone number.

15. Lindstedt published onto a publicly-accessible webpage on the World Wide Web at <[http://www.hateandflame.com/cgi-bin/bbs62x/webbbs\\_config.pl?md=read;id=108286](http://www.hateandflame.com/cgi-bin/bbs62x/webbbs_config.pl?md=read;id=108286)> on

February 18, 2016, at 5:34 a.m., “BRYAN REO MUST DIE CASTRATE THE NIGGER LIPS FUCKER TIME TO KILL[.]” (Emphasis in original).

16. Lindstedt published onto a publicly-accessible webpage on the World Wide Web at <[http://www.hateandflame.com/cgi-bin/bbs62x/webbbs\\_config.pl?md=read;id=104595](http://www.hateandflame.com/cgi-bin/bbs62x/webbbs_config.pl?md=read;id=104595)> on January 18, 2016, at 1:43 p.m., “Bryan Reo needs castrated. Kill that fucking Mamzer[.]”

17. Lindstedt published onto Church Website at <<http://christian-identity.net/forum/showthread.php?1639-Bryan-Reo-s-Fraudulent-amp-Perjurous-Stalking-Complaint-against-Pastor-Lindstedt-16CS000102&p=14091#post14091>> on February 9, 2016, at 11:06 p.m. that Plaintiff engages in “ass-to-mouth” sex acts with Attorney Kyle Bristow (“Attorney”), a licensed Michigan and Ohio lawyer for whom Plaintiff performs legal research and document drafting assignments.

18. It is inherently injurious to Plaintiff’s professional reputation for Lindstedt to publish to third-parties that Plaintiff engages in “ass-to-mouth” sex acts with Attorney.

19. Lindstedt’s statement that Plaintiff engages in “ass-to-mouth” sex acts with Attorney is false.

20. Lindstedt published onto Church Website at <<http://christian-identity.net/forum/showthread.php?1643-Reo-Bryan-Anthony-vs--Callvation-LLC-Case-16CV000331>> on February 23, 2016, at 10:27 p.m. that Plaintiff is a “catamite.”

21. The *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* defines “catamite” as “a boy kept by a pederast.” *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*. <<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/catamite>>. Accessed 20 March 2016.

22. Upon information and belief, a catamite plays the subservient and feminine roll in homosexual sex acts.

23. It is inherently injurious to Plaintiff's professional reputation for Lindstedt to publish to third-parties that Plaintiff is a catamite.

24. Lindstedt's statement that Plaintiff is a catamite is false.

25. Lindstedt published onto a publicly-accessible webpage on the World Wide Web at <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=X4mqgt4MoOQ>> a video in which Lindstedt refers to Attorney as "Bryan Reo's 'butt-buddy.'" "

26. Upon information and belief, "butt-buddy" is synonymous with catamite.

27. It is inherently injurious to Plaintiff's professional reputation for Lindstedt to publish to third-parties that Plaintiff acts as a "butt-buddy" of Attorney.

28. Lindstedt's statement that Plaintiff is a "butt-buddy" of Attorney is false.

## **V. CAUSES OF ACTION**

### **1. COMMON LAW LIBEL PER SE AGAINST LINDSTEDT AND CHURCH**

29. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

30. Lindstedt and Church published false statements of fact about Plaintiff to third-parties via the medium of the World Wide Web.

31. The false statements of fact published by Lindstedt and Church about Plaintiff were published negligently.

32. The false statements of fact published by Lindstedt and Church about Plaintiff were published by Lindstedt and Church without privilege.

33. The false statements of fact published by Lindstedt and Church about Plaintiff impugn Plaintiff's professional character or standing and/or reflects upon the character of Plaintiff by bringing him into ridicule, hatred, or contempt, and/or state or implies that Plaintiff has

committed a crime of moral turpitude. *Becker v. Toulmin*, 165 Ohio St. 549, 138 N.E.2d 391 (Ohio 1956).

34. Due directly and proximately to Lindstedt and Church publishing false statements of fact about Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his reputation and has caused Plaintiff to suffer mental anguish in the form of vexation, irritation, anxiety, frustration, and hatred.

35. Lindstedt and Church are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for common law libel per se.

## **2. COMMON LAW INVASION OF PRIVACY – FALSE LIGHT – AGAINST LINDSTEDT AND CHURCH**

36. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

37. Lindstedt and Church published false statements of fact about Plaintiff to third-parties via the medium of the World Wide Web, thereby giving publicity to what Lindstedt and Church stated about Plaintiff.

38. The false statements of fact about Plaintiff published by Lindstedt and Church placed Plaintiff before the public in a false light.

39. The false statements of fact about Plaintiff published by Lindstedt and Church are highly offensive to a reasonable person.

40. Lindstedt and Church are at fault and/or knew or were reckless as to the falsehood of the statements Lindstedt and Church published about Plaintiff.

41. Due directly and proximately to Lindstedt and Church publishing false statements of fact about Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his reputation and has caused Plaintiff to suffer mental anguish in the form of vexation, irritation, anxiety, frustration, and hatred.

42. Lindstedt and Church are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for common law invasion of privacy – false light.

### **3. COMMON LAW INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS AGAINST LINDSTEDT AND CHURCH**

43. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

44. By and through publishing false statements of fact about Plaintiff to third-parties via the medium of the World Wide Web, Lindstedt and Church engaged in extreme and outrageous conduct.

45. Lindstedt and Church acted with an intentional or reckless *scienter* when Lindstedt and Church published false statements of fact about Plaintiff.

46. Due directly and proximately to Lindstedt and Church publishing false statements of fact about Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress in the form of vexation, irritation, anxiety, frustration, and hatred.

47. Lindstedt and Church are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for common law intentional infliction of emotional distress.

### **4. STATUTORY CRIMINAL LIABILITY AGAINST LINDSTEDT AND FAUSNAUGHT**

48. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

49. It constitutes a criminal act in the State of Ohio to solicit someone to commit a criminal offense. R.C. § 2923.03(A)(1).

50. It constitutes a criminal act in the State of Ohio to purposefully cause the death of another. R.C. § 2903.02(A).

51. By and through Lindstedt's published statements onto the World Wide Web, Lindstedt committed against Plaintiff the crime of solicitation to murder.

52. It constitutes a criminal act in the State of Ohio to engage in a pattern of conduct that is knowingly designed to cause another person to believe that the offender will cause physical harm or mental distress to the other person. R.C. § 2903.211(A)(1).

53. It constitutes a criminal act in the State of Ohio for a person to use a computer to post a message with the purpose of urging or inciting another to commit an act that will cause physical harm or mental distress to another person. R.C. § 2903.211(A)(2).

54. By and through Lindstedt's published statements onto the World Wide Web, Lindstedt committed against Plaintiff the crime of menacing by stalking.

55. It constitutes a criminal act in the State of Ohio to use a telecommunications device to abuse, threaten, or harass another person. R.C. § 2917.21(B).

56. Content posted onto the World Wide Web constitute "telecommunications" as that term is defined by R.C. §§ 2913.01(X) and 2917.21(E)(3).

57. By and through Lindstedt's published statements onto the World Wide Web soliciting the murder and/or castration of Plaintiff, Lindstedt committed against Plaintiff the crime of telecommunications harassment. R.C. § 2917.21(C)(1).

58. It constitutes a criminal act in the State of Ohio to actively participate in a criminal gang, with knowledge that the criminal gang engages in a pattern of criminal gang activity, to purposefully promote, further, or assist any criminal conduct. R.C. § 2923.42(A).

59. Church is a "criminal gang" as that term is defined by R.C. § 2923.41(A) which engages in a "pattern of criminal gang activity" as that term is defined by R.C. § 2923.41(B)(1).

60. Fausnaught actively participates in Church by serving as a director and as its registered agent.

61. Upon information and belief Fausnaught has actual knowledge that Church engages in a pattern of criminal gang activity.

62. Upon information and belief, Fausnaught furthers Church's criminal activities by serving as a director and as its registered agent.

63. Lindstedt actively participates in Church by serving as a director, by publishing materials onto Church Website, and by controlling Church's finances.

64. Lindstedt has actual knowledge that Church engages in a pattern of criminal gang activity.

65. Lindsedt furthers Church's criminal activities by serving as a director and by publishing materials onto Church Website and by controlling Church's finances.

66. Lindstedt and Fausnaught victimized Plaintiff by and through Lindstedt's and Fausnaught's criminal gang.

67. Due directly and proximately to Lindstedt and Fausnaught committing crimes against Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his reputation and has caused Plaintiff to suffer mental anguish in the form of vexation, irritation, anxiety, frustration, and hatred.

68. Lindstedt and Fausnaught are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for engaging in criminal acts. R.C. § 2307.60.

##### **5. COMMON LAW CIVIL CONSPIRACY AGAINST DEFENDANTS**

69. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

70. Defendants are two or more legal entities.

71. Defendants acted in a concerted action to tortiously injure Plaintiff.

72. The actions engaged in by Defendants against Plaintiff were committed for an unlawful purpose.

73. Due directly and proximately to Defendants engaging in a civil conspiracy to cause tortious injury to Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered injury to his reputation and has caused Plaintiff to suffer mental anguish in the form of vexation, irritation, anxiety, frustration, and hatred.

74. Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for common law civil conspiracy.

#### **6. PUNITIVE DAMAGES AGAINST DEFENDANTS**

75. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

76. The actions or omissions of Defendants against Plaintiff were consciously, deliberately, and intentionally committed with actual malice.

77. Defendants are jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for punitive damages. R.C. § 2315.21.

#### **7. PIERCE THE CORPORATE VEIL OF CHURCH**

78. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations contained in the foregoing Paragraphs of this Complaint as if each were fully set forth herein.

79. Lindstedt and Fausnaught exercise complete control over Church to such an extent that Church has no separate mind, will, or existence of its own.

80. Lindstedt and Fausnaught control and utilize Church in such a manner so as to commit illegal acts against Plaintiff.

81. Due directly and proximately to Lindstedt and Fausnaught using Church to tortiously injure Plaintiff, Plaintiff has suffered injury.



82. It is unjust for Lindstedt and Fausnaught to hide behind the corporate veil of Church to avoid liability to Plaintiff.

83. The corporate veil of Church should be pierced so that its owners and employees will be jointly and severally liable for any money judgment rendered against Church in the instant civil action. *Dombroski v. WellPoint, Inc.*, 119 Ohio St.3d 506, 2008-Ohio-4827.

#### VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court will award Plaintiff against Defendants, jointly and severally, a money judgment in the amount of exactly fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000.00)—which is inclusive of special, general, exemplary, and punitive damages and costs—, statutory interest on any money judgment entered by the Court in Plaintiff's favor, and that the Court will refer the case to the Lake County Prosecutor's Office and/or the Federal Bureau of Investigation for criminal prosecution of Lindstedt and/or Fausnaught if the Court determines that Lindstedt and/or Fausnaught engaged in criminal acts against Plaintiff.

Respectfully submitted,


  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bryan Anthony Reo  
7143 Rippling Brook Ln.  
Mentor, OH 44060  
(P): (440) 313-5893  
(E): roodeplaat1983@gmail.com  
*Plaintiff*

Dated: March 21, 2016

**JURY DEMAND**

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all triable issues of fact. Civ.R. 38.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Bryan Anthony Reo  
7143 Rippling Brook Ln.  
Mentor, OH 44060  
(P): (440) 313-5893  
(E): roodeplaat1983@gmail.com  
*Plaintiff*

Dated:

March

21,

2016

**Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals**

**PRO SE Notice of Docket Activity**

The following was filed on 06/08/2016

**Case Name:** Bryan Reo v. Martin Lindstedt  
**Case Number:** 15-3756

**Docket Text:**

PETITION for rehearing by panel filed by Appellant Mr. Martin Lindstedt w/service 06/08/2016 by USCA8 [4409371] [15-3756]

**The following document(s) are associated with this transaction:**

Document Description: Pro Se Petition for Panel Rehearing

**Notice will be mailed to:**

Mr. Martin Lindstedt  
338 Rabbit Track Road  
Granby, MO 64844

Mr. Bryan Anthony Reo  
7143 Rippling Brook Lane  
Mentor, OH 44060

**Notice will be electronically mailed to:**