

Exhibit

“B”

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis@CurtisNeeley.com"

Sent : Monday, June 04, 2012 12:16:26 AM UTC

To : "Microsoft Customer Support"

Subject : SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Mitigation time -no- Litigation time

This is a notice that Curtis J Neeley Jr has ALREADY begun litigation against your employer in the United States Court for the Western District of Arkansas. The case is labeled as follows.

Neeley v NameMedia Inc et al, (5:12-cv-05074). The prayer in the discovery seeks 125,000 from Google Inc for each image done by Mr Neeley that remains associated with the search "curtis neeley" after being advised this is a usage that is NOT DESIRED and after the personal name was removed. This was done years ago in US Court with Google Inc but this very thread establishes MSFT as grossly negligent for these two CONTINUING after advised it was inappropriate and not supported by current page content. One is documented conclusively as changing last over 150 days ago and remaining changed.

The request for punitive damages will now be supported for a greater amount than is paid for every person working in Bing Customer Support including the reader and all persons in this dialog.

The wild, woolly "open Internet" was interesting for the last 10-20 years but violated scores of laws besides the Constitution and will no longer exist as it does now very soon.

Good-luck Bing Customer Service in your job searches.

> Hi,

>

>

>

> Just like what my colleague inform you on the previous interactions.

> The best way for the URL's that you are requesting to be removed is for

> you to contact the site owner. Please be informed that site owner has a

> tool that they can utilize in removing the URL's that you are referring

> to from Bing.

>

>

>

> Once the site owner has made the necessary changes or removal of the

> said URL's it will reflect in Bing on our normal refresh cycle.

>

>

>

> Thank you for your patience and understanding.

>

>

>

> Michael

>

> Bing Technical Support

>

>

>

>

>

>

The following image will remain PERPETUALLY at Wikipedia Foundation and the website was revised LONG AGO.

There is no use of use of the text "curtis neeley" except in a very abstract and hidden portion of this page.

http://www.bing.com/images/search?q_curtis%20neeley%20site%3Awikipedia.org&go=&form=QBIL&qs=n (replace ?q_ with ?q=)

This search returns Neeley's 1992 car wreck image and the nude from the cs.wikipedia.org subdomain.

http://www.bing.com/images/search?q_figure nude%20site%3Awikipedia.org&go=&form=QBIL&qs=n#x0y0 (replace ?q_ with ?q=)

This search reveals the same nude image from several other wikipedia.org subdomains as well as another nude.

These searches demonstrate that MSFT(Bing) search results here again prove the fact that the websites were revised AT THE SAME TIME but the MSFT(Bing) results associate "curtis neeley" with the cs.wikipedia.org results but NOT the jp.wikipedia.org, it.wikipedia.org or en.wikipedia.org subdomains. This is proof enough for requesting summary judgment for the MSFT(Bing) neglect and Catherine should advice a lawyer for MSFT(Bing).

47 USC §230 preclusions or preemptions will be found invalid.

The following two images should not be associated with the text "curtis neeley".

Perpetual-1. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46954005845781> (add last two of 48)

Perpetual-1A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46954005845781> (add last two of 48)

<http://curtisneeley.blogspot.com/2012/06/srx1177334446id-msft-litigation.html>

Sincerely,
Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA
2619 N. Quality Ln, Ste 123
Fayetteville, AR 72703
Voice: 479-263-4795

DISCLAIMER: Curtis Neeley suffered a severe traumatic brain injury that often very negatively impacts his communications. He is often perceived as blunt, tactless, self-centered and rude. Although Curtis has a severe disability, he is determined to continue creating meaningful visual art. The Curtis Neeley Foundation will be created to preserve and promote his artistic photographic legacy.

From: Microsoft Customer Support [mailto:SERCH.SRCH.VVV.00.EN.STR.SHW.AU.T01.SPT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com]

Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 7:37 PM

To: curtis@curtisneeley.com

Subject: RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Mitigation time -no- Litigation time

Hello Curtis,

We do apologize for any inconvenience this has caused you.

With regards to the search result, we have reviewed and validated that the images you reported is no longer visible in Bing Search Result under Off, Moderate and Strict SafeSearch settings.

Please note that Adult Content is not removed from Bing.com and should only show when Safe Search Setting are set to Off.

If this result does not reflect on your end, for simple troubleshooting you may need to Clear your browser's Cache then restart your computer.

Notes:

? Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results.

Thank you,

Catherine

The Online Safety Team

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis Neeley Jr."

Sent : Tuesday, June 12, 2012 12:16:23 PM UTC

To : "Microsoft Customer Support"

Subject : RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

Catherine, Safety Support Team, et al,

MSFT(Bing) may not currently prevent adult content from returning in searches. This adult content suppression will begin very soon as a result of laws passed in 1934 but not enforced or followed now.

Mr Neeley advises the Online Safety Team report was self-contradictory. Catherine wrote, "[a]fter the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results". Hardly; The fact that the harmful information continues to return after the website has been revised is still harmful to Neeley. The one original nude by Neeley that was once on the site has been removed. MSFT (Bing) is aware of this website revision and no longer returns this one image. MSFT(Bing) however still associates every other nude or inappropriate image from the revised website with the text "curtis neeley" despite having searched the revised page and discovering removal of this text.

Mr Neeley does not wish MSFT(Bing) still associate his personal name or the text "curtis neeley" with ANYTHING nude. MSFT(Bing) may allege this is because of the website's past use of the text "curtis neeley". This leaves MSFT(Bing) legally liable for defamation and presenting Mr Neeley in a false negative light due to gross negligence.

The following eight nude images should no longer return for uses of the text "curtis neeley". These are shown in searches for "curtis neeley nude".

1. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 81)

1A. <http://www.bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 81)

2. <http://ts2.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 82)

2A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 82)

3. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 83)

3A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 83)

4. <http://ts4.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 84)

4A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 84)

5. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 86)

5A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 86)

6. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 87)

6A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 87)

7. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 92)

7A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 92)

8. <http://ts1.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 93)

8A. <http://bing.com/th?id=I46524122442631> (add last two of 93)

The obviously unconstitutional "CDA" law follows.

47 USC § 230 - Protection for private blocking and screening of offensive material

(c) Protection for "Good Samaritan" blocking and screening of offensive material

(1) Treatment of publisher or speaker

No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider.

Please send me a different reply and pretend like this issue is being revised or the hidden or cached rational is being updated.

Email tag - your it again.

Please do not use small text.

Sincerely,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA

DISCLAIMER: Curtis Neeley suffered a severe traumatic brain injury that often very negatively impacts his communications. He is often perceived as blunt, tactless, self-centered and rude. Although Curtis has a severe disability, he is determined to continue creating meaningful visual art. The Curtis Neeley Foundation will be created to preserve and promote his artistic photographic legacy

Neeley v NameMedia Inc et al, (5:12-cv-05074) Free Docket mirror.

Booklet Complaint in [HTML](#) or [PDF](#).

Attachment #1 Exhibit [232 A Bill](#). -PDF file.

FORM answer was from from further below from Sent: Monday, June 11, 2012 7:37 PM WORD for word:

Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results

From: Microsoft Customer Support [<mailto:SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.AU.TD1.HOT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 11, 2012 12:44 PM
To: curtis@curtisneeley.com
Subject: RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

Hello Curtis,

Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results.

Thank you,

Sincerely,

Catherine
The Online Safety Team

From: Microsoft Customer Support <SERCH.SRCH.WW.OO.EN.STR.SHW.AU.T01.HOT.OO.EM@css.one.microsoft.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 7:16 PM
To: curtis@curtisneeley.com
Subject: RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

Hello Curtis,

For us to be able to further review your request to disassociate your name "Curtis Neeley" with any inappropriate contents in Bing.com, Microsoft must first receive a valid subpoena or court order. Please address the appropriate legal document to Microsoft Corporation and include all pertinent information for Microsoft. The legal document may be faxed to 425-708-0096.

Law Enforcement Officials should refer to the Microsoft Online Services Legal Request Hotline:

In the United States: 425-722-1299

Outside the U.S.: (011) 425-722-1299

Criminal defense subpoenas: Microsoft requires a formally served subpoena and is unable to respond to faxed or mailed requests.

Sincerely,

Catherine
The Online Safety Team

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis Neeley Jr."
Sent : Wednesday, July 11, 2012 10:46:24 PM UTC
To : "Microsoft Customer Support" , "Bridget A Hauler" , "Hwallen" , "Jdoan" , "Jhane" , "Mpage" , "Willie S. Haley"
Subject : SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Litigation

"Catherine", et al,

Bing DOES control the content harvesters called "bots" and then Bing is the original content provider for the sampled content given in a new context. The portions of the "Communications Decency Act" that survived the *Reno v ACLU* mistake causes this statute to violate common sense, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

The content has been **HEAVILY REVISED** a long time as suggested. The following pages do not retain the text "Curtis Neeley" and have not for months or even years.

1. <http://www.michelle7.com/covers/2002/08/index.php>
2. <http://www.creative-nude.net/cnpn.html>
3. <http://www.michelle7-erotica.com/covers/2002/02/index.php>
4. [http://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akt_\(v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%C4%9Bn%C3%AD\)](http://cs.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akt_(v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%C4%9Bn%C3%AD))

DOES ANYONE THERE ACTUALLY READ THIS before the "SAME FORM" response is sent repeatedly?

Please send me your individual contact information so that I may eventually issue a subpoena or the contact information for your immediate department employer.

> --- Original Message ---

>

From : "Curtis@CurtisNeeley.com"

> Sent : Friday, June 01, 2012 7:00:27 PM UTC

> To : "Microsoft Customer Support"

> Subject : RE: SRX1177334446ID - MSFT Mitigation time

>

> Renan says, "we do not remove pages in the index on request. After the

> published content is removed or corrected, it will be corrected in the

> search database by our normal content refresh processes".

>

> MSFT will regret allowing an employee to send this type "ignorant"

> email. The message thread below reveals that the content was altered

> December 20th 2011 and has not been refreshed normally in the ensuing

> 150 days. Either MSFT alters the index expeditiously or Neeley will

> sue them.

>

> Whoops, Neeley v NameMedia Inc, et al, (5:12-cv-05074) has already been

> filed and MSFT is already sued therein.

> The <michelle7-erotica.com> image is entirely gone!

> <http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=AB>

> BEC5D7FF89C0D7A05C8790D16E4925E61D000D&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR

>

> The NUDE image MSFT alleges to have indexed and associated with "curtis

> neeley" in text/image searches on the page above is no longer there!

> This trivial factual matter is in addition to the fact that "curtis

> neeley" had been gone for months on the page above. How long does MSFT

> need to realize that 2 + 2 is NOT 3? TIME IS UP! People are going to

> soon learn, along with MSFT.

>

> <http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=98>

> 949B22D20868D1629531C9A03C6ED9912B3E0B&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR

>

> The image/page §230 <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/47/230>>

> link remaining above is despite the fact that "curtis neeley" text has

> not been on this page since December 20, 2011 at 18:13 as can be seen

> documented HERE

> <[http://cs.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Akt_%28v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%](http://cs.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Akt_%28v%C3%BDtvarn%C3%A9_um%C4%9Bn%C3%AD%29&action=history)

> C4%9Bn%C3%AD%29&action=history> ! This image will remain at Wikipedia

> Foundation perpetually. The entire image at <michelle7-erotica.com

> <<http://www.bing.com/images/search?q=curtis+neeley+nude&view=detail&id=A>

> BBEC5D7FF89C0D7A05C8790D16E4925E61D000D&first=0&FORM=IDFRIR> > was

> removed in demonstration of the First Amendment harm of the negligence

> now on display with the "idiotic" reply.

>

> "Idiotic" and "ignorant" are terms that are not normally found in

> scholarly white papers or legal texts. This offensive use of text will,

> however, be published and be searchable by Bing relatively quickly.

> The Magistrate Judge, Erin L. Setser, now considering this case as well

> as the general public are able to search the entire wire communications

> venue disguised as the Internet. The Internet was created by the

> Supreme Court in 1997 by egregious legal error of an aged court. The

> Supreme Court will ultimately be involved in this case again as will

> Congress.

>

--- Original Message ---

From : "Curtis Neeley Jr."

Sent : Friday, September 28, 2012 11:02:32 PM UTC

To : "SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.TS.T01.SPT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com"

Subject : RE: SRX1184898261ID - Bing:Content Removal Request:Result removal:Other

Search query of "curtis neeley site:salon.com" returns the following two images.

1. <http://ts4.mm.bing.net/th?id=I.4662664469809171&pid=1.7&w=230&h=153&c=7&rs=1>
2. <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=i.4662664469809170&pid=1.7&w=154&h=153&c=7&rs=1>

Both images above cite the following BLOG post as the third party source per §230.

1. http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2011/09/18/notice_to_dmca_msft_agents_of_record

The page above has no images whatsoever but has the full non-linked url for the following.

1. http://www.curtisneeley.com//NameMedia/bing/electronic-publication_Bing-Images9-16CC.pdf

The PDF above has both of these obscene images but this PDF is located in a directory that is excluded from being indexed by the robots.txt as follows.

User-agent: MSNBot
Disallow: /Google/
Disallow: /NameMedia/

User-agent: MSNBot-Media
Disallow: /Google/
Disallow: /NameMedia/

User-agent: MSNBot-NewsBlogs
Disallow: /Google/
Disallow: /NameMedia/

User-agent: MSNBot-*
Disallow: /Google/
Disallow: /NameMedia/

This continued violation will be shown to a jury while seeking damages in the following Federal Court Litigation.

Neeley Jr. v FCC et al, (5:12-cv-5208)

This is currently pending in the United States Court for the Western District of Arkansas.

Please stop these results as well as the eight indecent or obscene images that return in the following search.

curtis neeley site:michelle7-erotica.com

These all allege the following third party source.

1. <http://www.michelle7-erotica.com/covers/2002/02/index.php>

This webpage has absolutely no usage of "curtis neeley".

Please begin mitigating damages. This email will be filed as an evidential exhibit in a motion to amend and add the claim of negligence.

Please do not send another form response.

Sincerely,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA
2619 N. Quality Ln, Ste 123
Fayetteville, AR 72703
Voice: 479-263-4795

From: Microsoft Customer Support [mailto:SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.TS.T01.SPT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 30, 2012 12:01 AM
To: curtis@curtisneeley.com
Subject: RE: SRX1184898261ID - Bing:Content Removal Request:Result removal:Other

Hello Curtis,

Thank you for contacting Bing Technical Support. This is Mark and I am glad to assist you with the Service Request 1184898261.

I understand that there are obscene images appearing when "curtis neeley site: michelle7-erotica.com" and "curtis neeley site: salon.com" is being searched on Bing. I can see how this concerns you. I tried searching for "curtis neeley site: michelle7-erotica.com" and "curtis neeley site: salon.com" on **Strict** and **Moderate** Safe Search settings and the obscene images didn't come up as a result. However after changing the Safe Search Setting to **Off**, the obscene images did come up.

Please be advised that Bing doesn't control the operation or design of websites indexed by Bing. Bing also doesn't control what these websites publish. If you have concerns about any content on the website, contact the owners of the website that publishes the information. If you have data privacy concerns, contact the data provider directly or go to their help to learn how to change your privacy settings. After the website removes the information and Bing has crawled the website again, the offensive or harmful information won't appear in our results. Please be advised that we don't intervene with the automated algorithm process unless we have received a court order to do so. Should you have the court order, please send it to us on pdf format so that we can process your image removal request.

We apologize for any inconvenience that this issue has caused you. We're all hoping that this issue will be resolved with full understanding of the circumstances involved.

Kindest regards,

Mark
Bing Technical Support

To: Microsoft Customer Support
Subject: SRX1184898261ID - Bing:Content Removal Request:Result removal:Other

Corporate Counselors,

Please be advised that Bing or Microsoft Corporation Customer Support has communicated clearly being aware of the ability to prevent OBSCENE image results in searches when "curtis neeley site: michelle7-erotica.com" and "curtis neeley site: salon.com" are being searched on Bing. Furthermore; Microsoft Corporation Customer Support understands this to be "concerning" and yet professed no duty to discontinue this association.

Please be advised of the following searches that are concerning.

1. "curtis neeley site:michelle7-erotica.com"
2. "curtis neeley site:creative-nude.net"
3. "curtis neeley site: salon.com"
4. "curtis neeley nude site:fineartamerica.com"

47 USC §230(c)(1) is currently used to remove any duty to not prevent minors from viewing these when used in conjunction with the ACLU v Reno free speech error.

The first and second and third searches above continue after the associated §230(c)(1) pages have been revised to no longer support this association whatsoever. The images returned in the second and fourth search results are not OBSCENE but are indecent and should not be shown to minors.

The third search results are OBSCENE as well as demonstrating violation of the robots exclusion protocol and bypassing medium filtrations and converting PDFs to JPGs.

"Mark", "Manny", "Christine", "Batman", "Robin", "Other alias" may simply not reply as this is intended for a Microsoft Counselor and the jury while considering damages that will be sought in an amount higher than the entire budget of Microsoft Corporation Customer Support including the salaries of everyone reading this advisement.

There remains the text "curtis neeley" on the associated §230(c)(1) pages in search number four due to past comments on these images. This text-image association has been communicated to the site owners and the comments are sought removed or made anonymous though the responses of Microsoft Corporation Customer Support in one through three reflect this removal request would not make any difference even after suggested by Microsoft Corporation Customer Support. The portions of the complaint dealing directly with Microsoft Corporation are linked and follow.
<http://www.curtisneeley.com/FCC/booklet-complaint.pdf>

From the bottom of page 7 and concluding on 8.

II. Inappropriate Text-image Associations Left Harassing by Microsoft Corporation after Advised of Inappropriateness

1. Microsoft Corporation creates the false appearance the Plaintiff desires or desired anonymous minors to see Plaintiff's indecent creations or other indecency using "curtis neeley" in searches of unsafe simultaneous wire and radio communications called the open "inter" net, though perhaps not intentionally.
2. Microsoft Corporation refuses to halt this association without court orders after requested. Plaintiff has repeatedly requested all indecent images be removed from search results for searches using the text "curtis neeley".
3. Microsoft Corporation advised the Plaintiff that ceasing the text-image association of "curtis neeley" with indecency requires court orders. See exhibit "B".
4. Injunctions requiring disassociating "curtis neeley" text searches from indecent images are now sought regardless of other terms used by unidentified searchers who may be minors or where identities can't be checked.

and then in concluding from page 13...

3. Google Inc and Microsoft Corporation should pay compensatory and punitive monetary damages as the jury feels is just. The damages ordered paid by Defendant Google Inc should be heavily impacting percentages of gross profits for the last three years due to ignoring vociferous advisements regarding unwanted indecent image-text associations and even expanding these violations while facing the Plaintiff in Federal Court.

This will be indexed fairly quickly and may be further ignored from the following URL.

<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4996048263971998>

<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4996048263971998>

<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>

<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>

<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>

<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4996048263971998>

>

> The previous three "wholly unregulated wire locations" (URLs) are the
> same file and are "Holy Ghost" graphics and are not generally
> considered explicit.

> DELETE THESE FOUR

> FILES IMMEDIATELY!

> (Speak to your boss and other MSFT stockholders)

>

>

> http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporation
> [_stockholders](http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporation)

> <[http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporatio](http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporation)
> [n_stockholders](http://open.salon.com/blog/curtisneeley/2012/06/01/microsoft_corporation)>

>> Hello Curtis,

>> Thank you for writing back.

>> I apologize for the inconvenience that this issue may have caused you.

> As what had been mentioned, we do not remove pages in the index on
> request. After the published content is removed or corrected, it will
> be corrected in the search database by our normal content refresh
> processes. There are times when content located in Bing differs from
> the original page, as the webmasters/site owners have recently adjusted
> their content. Furthermore, there are times when this produces
>> non-relevant results. These non-relevant results will adjust
> themselves

> over time, and due to the possible click through popularity of a
> particular page, it might take longer than desired.

>> I hope that this information was helpful. If you have further
>> questions, feel free in replying back on this email.

>>Regards,

>>Renan

>>Bing Technical Support

- > Use of the offensive term "ignorant" for Renan's response is more than
- > likely true despite MSFT attempting to train Renan in search software.
- > Searching or indexing software is EXTREMELY simple to most programmers
- > but Renan is obviously not a programmer. The ability to "program" is
- > apparently not common. No programmer caliber intellectual works in
- > customer service and Renan's intellect may exceed most programmers in
- > communications ability. The fact that the normal mind can excel in one
- > genre and lack another entirely is an aspect that Neeley is struggling
- > now to accept. Mr Neeley is the severely brain injured polymath
- > struggling to explain the illegal and inappropriate nature of the open
- > Internet to the US Courts and the public.
- > "[A service] provider that gains knowledge or awareness of infringing
- > activity retains safe-harbor protection if it 'acts expeditiously to
- > remove, or disable access to, the material.' Thus, the nature of the
- > removal obligation itself contemplates knowledge or awareness of
- > specific infringing material, because expeditious removal is possible
- > only if the service provider knows with particularity which items to
- > remove." - -

From 2nd Circuit decision on *Viacom et al v YouTube, et al*

> <<http://madisonian.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/Viacom-v-YouTube-2d-ci>

- > r.pdf>
- > The four files that MUST BE DELETED quickly are as follows except
 - > switching the trailing numerals (1: "76" with "74"), the trailing
 - > numerals (2: "84" with "94"), the trailing numerals (3: "94" with
 - > "06"), and the trailing numerals (4: "00" with "50"). Delete files
 - > A)I4695400564261674, B) I4695400571142894, C)I4652412231090506, and
 - > D)I4652412237775150.

- > 1. <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>>
- > <http://bing.com/th?id=I4695400564261676>
- > <<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4695400564261676>>
- > 2. <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>>
- > <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>
- > 3. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4695400564261676>
- > 4. _____
- > 5. <http://bing.com/th?id=I4695400571142884>
- > <<http://bing.com/th?id=I4695400571142884>>
- > 6. <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400571142884>
- > <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4695400571142884>>
- > 7. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4695400571142884>
- > 8. =====
- > 9. <http://bing.com/th?id=I4652412231090594>
- > <<http://www.bing.com/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
- > <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
- > 10. <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>
- > <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
- > 11. <<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>>
- > <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412231090594>
- > 12. _____
- > 13. <http://bing.com/th?id=I4652412237775100>
- > <<http://bing.com/th?id=I4652412237775100>>
- > 14. <<http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>>
- > <http://ts3.mm.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>
- > 15. <http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>
- > <<http://ts3.explicit.bing.net/th?id=I4652412237775100>>

- > This alteration was done so that MSFT and GOOG do not use this post to
- > try to §230 <<http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/47/230>> justify
- > "reporting on the Internet" and finding these nudes again.
- > Addition trivia that customer service might be interested in knowing is
- > that the server aliases of ts3.explicit.bing.net and ts3.mm.bing.net
- > have absolutely NOTHING separating these files from non-explicit files
- > in content.

From: Microsoft Customer Support [mailto:SERCH.SRCH.WW.00.EN.STR.SHW.TS.T01.SPT.00.EM@css.one.microsoft.com]
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2012 5:24 PM
To: curtis@curtisnealey.com
Subject: RE: SRX118489826IID - Bing:Content Removal Request:Result removal:Other

Thank you for contacting Bing Technical Support. We have received your request and one of our representatives will be contacting you within 1 business day to discuss your issue.

If you wish to provide additional information, please reply to this email. Filling out a new Service Request for the same issue will not expedite service as we are responding to inquiries in the order they were received.

We're looking forward to helping you to resolve this issue.

Bing Technical Support

To make sure that you can receive a reply from Microsoft, add the "microsoft.com" domain to your e-mail "safe list". If you do not receive a response in your email inbox within 24 hours, check your "bulk mail" or "junk mail" folders.

1 **A BILL**

2 To improve public awareness in the United States regarding
3 safe use of the Internet wire communications through the
4 establishment of an Office of Internet Wire Communications
5 Safety, Licensing, and Public Awareness within the Federal
6 Communications Commission.

7 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of*
8 *the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

9 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

10 This Act may be cited as the 'Safeguarding Wire
11 Communication Appropriateness Act' or the 'SAFER Wire
12 Communications Act'.

13 The Federal Communications Act of 1976 shall be amended
14 such that Section 232 is as follows.

15 **Wire Communication Appropriateness**

16 1. **Electronic devices capable of networked wire**
17 **communications, including the wire communication**
18 **network generally called "the Internet", will have a**
19 **robots.txt file disclosing the content of each storage**
20 **subdivision or directory containing ratings**
21 **consistent with United States movie ratings that**
22 **would apply to the content if it were displayed or**
23 **read out loud such that;**

24

25

- 1 a. material presented by wire originating in a
2 directory, or subdivision of data must be
3 rated by data subdivision in the robots.txt
4 file stored in the most general directory.
5 Data subdivisions or directories may not
6 have content exceeding the data subdivision
7 or directory "rating" thereby determining
8 appropriate allowed data viewership.
- 9 b. photographs, video, text, audio, or any other
10 content must be in an appropriate rated
11 directory or data subdivision and rating
12 'metadata' will be listed internally in each
13 file, though not necessarily visible directly to
14 the viewer of the file as soon as technically
15 possible using current technology.
- 16 2. Software capable of presenting wire
17 communications, generally known as "the Internet",
18 must be able to detect and analyze the robots.txt
19 file as described in (1)(a) and present content so
20 rated;
- 21 a. only if the purchaser of the device allows
22 content so rated to be presented and the
23 current user has authenticated;
- 24 b. and blocking content presentation based on
25 the ratings allowed by the device owner;
- 26 3. Display devices capable of displaying wire
27 communications but not equipped to block indecent
28 content shall not be left unattended by an adult on
29 penalty of the device owner or owner's designated
30 agent being guilty of contributing to delinquency of
31 minors and being fined by the FCC.

1

2 4. Devices capable of displaying wire communications
3 must test the user of the display software for
4 authentication if activity ceases for five minutes to
5 ensure adult material is not left accessible to
6 minors accidentally. No content may be displayed
7 without authentication if left unattended for five
8 minutes unless authenticated for an uninterrupted
9 continual content display for periods not exceeding
10 the time needed to display the continuous
11 presentation by five minutes.

12 5. Devices capable of displaying wire communications
13 must present adult material only if record of each
14 adult material access is stored on the device for 30
15 days including wire locations(URLs) and time
16 accessed so all recent uses of wire communication
17 are verifiable at all times by the device owner or
18 other authority authorized by the device owner.

19 6. The Federal Communications Commission shall
20 establish and maintain wire communications search
21 interfaces, otherwise known as search engines, so
22 content of electronic devices connected to wires, -
23 often called only "the Internet", may be indexed and
24 searched if the device owner "Robot Exclusion
25 Protocol"(REP) robots.txt allows such aggregation.

26 a. Advertising by wire communications will be
27 sold by the FCC and displayed with income
28 used to offset taxes.

29 b. Search interface usage data will not be stored
30 in any way that violates searcher privacy.
31

- 1 c. Search usage that is reasonably suspected by
2 the FCC wire division to indicate criminal
3 intent will automatically send wire
4 communications to law enforcement and alert
5 the user of this suspicion and notification.
- 6 7. The Federal Communications Commission will
7 establish a regulatory committee for addressing
8 data subdivisions or directories rated
9 inappropriately and establish criminal and civil
10 liabilities for violations.
- 11 8. The Federal Communications Commission will
12 maintain copies of all robots.txt files accessible by
13 wire. Wire communications display devices will
14 check the FCC registry for prohibited locations
15 periodically for sites that are determined not to be
16 allowed presented by wire access software due to:
- 17 a) presenting wire communications not presented
18 according to this section.
- 19 b) presenting wire communications promoting
20 criminal activity. All wire locations blocked in
21 (8)(a) or (b) may appeal being listed in
22 competent courts of law and rulings by Federal
23 District Courts will be recognized by the FCC
24 wire division.
- 25 c) Wire Locations improperly blocked may recover
26 lost income due to being blocked by the FCC if
27 improperly blocked and if the claim is brought
28 promptly in any District Court.

29
30
31

1 9. Wire Communications, including those once
2 called simply "the Internet", have never been
3 anything but the logical technical progression of
4 communications once referred to as telegraph or
5 telephone and are subject to the same regulations
6 found elsewhere in this Act.

7
8 10. The Federal Communications Commission Wire
9 Division shall develop and oversee the licensure
10 and rating of published content so that
11 republication or aggregation of content requires the
12 republishing user to accept the "REP" licensing fee
13 disclosed along with ratings of the licensed content
14 such that:

- 15
16 a) payment of the licensing fee incentivizes broad
17 disclosure of knowledge.
18 b) undisclosed directory licensing fees prevent
19 disclosure of content found and exempts the data
20 from being indexed regardless of the source of
21 disclosure of the data location.
22 c) the "REP" would also provide for exclusive
23 audience control if desired by authors.

24