

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA, ET AL

vs

Case No. 3:10cv91 RV/EMT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL

**MOTION TO INTERVENE BY RIGHT**

UNINSURED INDIVIDUAL TAXPAYER SALAMONE discovers his pleadings categorized, by on-line reporting of this case under Item Number 20, as a Motion to Intervene and requests the court to take judicial notice of that finding despite deficiencies in this individual's earlier articulation of his pleadings in that manner. Under Rule 24 (a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this petitioner moves to intervene by right, given he defends interests that (relating to the subject of the case) disposition of this case will otherwise directly threaten his ability to protect, since existing parties have utterly failed already to represent his interests. In fact, the principal plaintiffs and defendants in this case do not represent or protect the Constitutional rights and property interests of uninsured taxpayers at all, for **they have already approved exploiting this uninsured taxpayer financially**, not to mention others similarly situated, to pay for the personal health care of others, while this uninsured taxpayer—as well as my peers—goes without the health protection that I could otherwise reasonably expect with use of those same funds, money from my household budget, for my own health needs. Now, the defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA, ET AL

vs

Case No. 3:10cv91 RV/EMT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL

propose, through the law at issue, to increase the injury they have inflicted on this uninsured taxpayer, not least of all, by threatening him with a fine for not having the health insurance their tax earmarking for others' health benefits and services has prevented him from obtaining in the first place. Without the participation of this uninsured taxpayer in the case, there is no one to remind the existing parties that **this uninsured taxpayer and others are not second-class citizens**. In short, absorbed in their own agendas, those parties will not recognize that **we do not exist simply to be drained to pay for the government health benefits of others while we ourselves do without health insurance and even health services when needed**. But, then, under Rule 24(b) (1) (B) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, this uninsured taxpayer also qualifies for permissive intervention, at a minimum, insofar as my claim shares, in part, that common point of law with the plaintiffs which was stated earlier in the pleadings, though those parties substantially curtail this uninsured taxpayer's Constitutional right to be exempt from payment of a fine for lack of health-care coverage. In addition, participation of this uninsured taxpayer in the case will contribute toward an accurate and complete adjudication of the original parties' claims. After all, they will not otherwise have to

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA, ET AL

vs

Case No. 3:10cv91 RV/EMT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL

answer for the supposed, but actually discriminatory, **separate-but-equal health-care system** they have both supported, and which defendants now press to modify slightly. Defendants having argued, for legislation, that **lack of access to appropriate health care causes the deaths of an estimated 45,000 of us uninsured taxpayers every year**, plaintiffs who want to balance the health-care budget on my back and the backs of other uninsured taxpayers will not remind them that they need to make health coverage effective now, then, not in 2013 or 2014. Certainly, neither plaintiffs nor defendants want the court to provide **Constitutionally-prescribed relief**—the right to which this uninsured taxpayer continues to invoke—much less redress the grievances of this uninsured taxpayer and order repair, through award of \$400,000 in damages, of the financial damage their discriminatory health-care policies have caused me over the course of 32-plus years and will accentuate if the legislation under challenge is merely invalidated on select points, but not on all its Constitutional deficiencies.

Gary Paul Salamone (*Pro se*) *Gary Paul Salamone*  
P.O. Box 546  
Dorris, CA 96023  
(858) 492-8696; FAX: None connected.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA, ET AL

vs

Case No. 3:10cv91 RV/EMT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL

**EX PARTE UNINSURED TAXPAYER SALAMONE**

**CHANGE OF ADDRESS**

The uninsured individual taxpayer, Gary P. Salamone reports, to the Court, the following change in his direct mailing address, effective May 12,2010:

Gary P. Salamone (pro se)

P.O. Box 546

Dorris, CA 96023-0546

(858) 492-8696 remains message telephone

Signature: *Gary P. Salamone*

*Kvd*  
Filed 05/21/10 10:53 AM

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA, ET AL

vs

Case No. 3:10cv91 RV/EMT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH  
AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that copies of the one-page **EX PARTE UNINSURED TAXPAYER SALAMONE CHANGE OF ADDRESS** document and the three-page explicit Motion to Intervene By Right have been served by First Class mail upon both the State of Florida Attorney-General and the Acting General Counsel representing the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and, with the Court's leave, service of this document on the other plaintiffs and defendants referenced as "et al" will be suspended under the Local Rule 5.1 (D) provision for *ex parte* pleadings.

*Gary Paul Salamone*  
Gary Paul Salamone  
P.O. Box 546  
Dorris, CA 96023  
(858) 492-8696  
FAX: None connected.  
*Pro se*