

No. 10-2255

**In The
United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit**

Curtis J Neeley JR., MFA
pro se party

Petitioner,

v.

**Network Solutions LLC
NAMEMEDIA INC
Google Inc**

Respondents.

Regarding the Petition for rehearing

**MEMO SUPPORTING PETITION FOR
REHEARING**

Curtis J Neeley Jr.
2619 N Quality Ln Ste 123
Fayetteville, AR, 72703-5523
479-263-4795

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE REHEARING

1. The issues the Appellant brought before the Court have not been considered in the least. The initiating order given alleging to address Docket 140 and Docket 139 reads as follows:

Originating court document filed consisting of notice of appeal, Supporting Brief w/ Exhibits, **amended notice of appeal w/ amended Support Brief**, Order dated 3/1/10, and Order dated 5/20/10, docket entries link. [3671802] [10-2255] (EDG)

2. The only rational that the Appellant could assign the Eighth Circuit ignoring the issues in the record as badly as they obviously did was failure to include the Docket entries alleged to be included. When Appellant opposed the frivolous motion to dismiss, the Eighth Circuit obviously again ignored the section titled “D Neeley’s Appeal” as follows:

Curtis J Neeley Jr., MFA appealed the previous issues and goes on to appeal the impending denial of (Docket 130), (Docket 132), and (Docket 134) due to evidence on the record.

3. The Court Clerks continually assured the Appellant that the Eighth Circuit had access to the full record and these perpetually pending orders were not needed to be included again in the Brief since they had not yet been ruled on.

4. These orders are still pending and the Eighth Circuit Court Panel successfully ignored them EXACTLY as it appears everyone except the Appellant has done.

CONCLUSION

Appellant asks the Eighth Circuit to consider the perpetually pending orders that were plead as denied in the Brief and in the Opposition to the Frivolous Joint Motion to dismiss and call it reconsideration in spite of the fact that it will be the very first time they were ever considered. The Courts in the United States are obviously committed to protecting the trafficking of pornography and Appellant seeks relief or a quick denial to reaffirm courtroom immorality. Yes, X plus X is always divisible by two and is therefore not usually a prime number. The statement that X + X is never prime due to the axiomatic results of evenness is approximately as close as the Eighth Circuit has gotten to Justice in this case. Two is, however, a prime number and $1 + 1 = 2$. Law is either logical or WRONG.

Respectfully and humbly submitted,
s./Curtis J Neeley Jr. . . .
Curtis J Neeley Jr. MFA

**CERTIFICATES OF
SERVICE**
FOR DOCUMENTS FILED USING CM/ECF

**Certificate of Service When All Case
Participants Are CM/ECF Participants**

I hereby certify that on 7/20/2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit by using the CM/ECF system. I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

s/ **Curtis J Neeley Jr.** _____