
No. 10-2255

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

NameMedia Inc.,
Network Solutions Inc.,
Google Inc.
Appellees,

v

Curtis J Neeley Jr., MFA
Appellant.

OPPOSITION TO JOINT MOTION FOR STAY OF APPEAL

The Appellant respectfully comes now and opposes granting of the Joint Motion for Stay and also the Alternative request of Extension of Time to File Appellees' Brief Pursuant to Eighth Circuit Rule 27(B)(a)(2) and states concisely in similar form:

1. Appellees previously filed a frivolous Joint Motion to Dismiss Interlocutory Appeal ("Joint Motion to Dismiss"). Therein, Appellees demonstrated ignoring Appellant's filing of Docket 140. Docket 139 failed to call attention to Docket 140. Appellant did not repeat Docket 140 in the Appellant Brief and will not again here. That legal error by a pro se litigant is the only thing preventing calling the "Joint Motion to Dismiss" frivolous.

2. On July 16, 2010, the Court held the Joint Motion to Dismiss in abeyance pending the filing of Neeley's Corrected Brief. Appellant filed the Corrected Brief on or about July 27, 2010. There is no substantive difference in the Corrected Brief except correcting several referrals to the wrong Amendment and ceasing use of language that demonstrated outrage. Nothing was needed to be reasserted from Docket 140 as the Eighth Circuit Court regularly dismiss Appeals and had not overlooked Docket 140 as the fourteen paid counselors did.

3. Appellees now ask the Court to consider their frivolous Joint Motion to Dismiss and stay Appellees' briefing schedule until such time as the Joint Motion to Dismiss is denied. This request is strongly opposed by the Appellant.

4. Appellees admitted requiring them to fully research and brief the issues would require them to work on a reply that has needed consideration since July 1, 2010. This request for a stay asks the Court Clerk to reward treating this United States Court Litigation flippantly and increase defamation of Appellant and the resulting outrage each minute of each day sought.

5. Appellant asserts that an infinite amount of time will not be sufficient to produce an Appellee Brief that will avert the ruling to allow amending and the injunction to cease defaming. The Internet will be ordered regulated by the nonfeasant FCC upon resolution of this action, The FCC will be ordered to begin regulating wire communications, as has been their statutory mission since before the telegraph wire came to be called the Internet or since 1936.

6. Appellees requested an extension of time of twenty-one (21) days beyond their current deadline of August 23, 2010 to file their Briefs in the above-captioned matter so they could continue profiting in the trafficking of pornography that will be greatly reduced due to the regulation of communications via wire.

7. Appellees have not previously considered acknowledging the current deadline of August 23, 2010 because they do not care if the Appellant's honor is harmed or if the Appellant's children or other minor friends might do an image search using the Appellant's personal name. Every minute of every day this defamation continues and risks further harm.

8. This Opposition to the Motion alleges the Joint Motion for a Stay was sought to delay the ruling regardless of how much delay is sought and therefore the delay is for an improper, futile purpose. The result of the ruling is clear now.

9. The Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren is very likely to rule in District Court and grant every claim now pending and was advised in Docket 163 that doing so would save all Appellees cost. Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren may be offended by Appellant's use of statutorily relevant terms expressing outrage but is now aware of the District Courts logical errors. The outrage expressed by Appellant in error was quoted quickly in the frivolous Joint Motion to Dismiss. Attachment A on Docket 163 is sought to replace the complaint in the addendum.

10. Appellant filed an opposition to the frivolous motion to dismiss the day it was made. This opposition will be as well. Simply reading the objection to the frivolous Joint Motion to Dismiss was all the time needed and Appellees should already have begun preparing their Appellee Briefs that will be futile regardless of the time allowed. It is impossible to litigate truth into claims that even numbers are never prime as law is either logical or wrong.

Whereas the Appellant's name in image searches results in continual defamations by Appellee Google Inc as well as every American Search Engine preliminary injunctions were sought added against, The Honorable Jimm Larry Hendren has graciously scheduled Appellee NAMEMEDIA INC and Appellee Google Inc for a JURY trial March 28, 2011. ANY STAY permits Appellee Google Inc more time to continue defamation of Appellant and traffic pornography to children. Appellant did not ask for sanctions for the frivolous Joint Motion to Dismiss due small legal omission of referring to Docket 140 or the "Supporting Brief". Appellant asks that the Court not grant one-day of delay at all while considering the frivolous Motion that will quickly be denied. The Court should not hereby reward Appellees for flippant behavior. Appellee Google Inc gains millions of dollars for every day the injunctions are postponed and, of course, will seek delays flippantly.

Respectfully 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.

Furthermore, I certify the docket is publicly available online to anyone with Internet access to the following URL where EVERY filed document is accessible including the letter to the Court that is now locked and unavailable via PACER and certify that several Senators are aware of this.

CurtisNeeley.com/5-09-cv-05151/Docket

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



About 6,360 results (0.29 seconds)

Advanced search

Everything

Images

More

- Any size
- Large
- Medium
- Icon
- Any type
- Face
- Photo
- Clip art
- Line drawing
- Any color
- Full color
- Black and white
- Reset tools



photographs he shoots now. 200 x 200 - 5k - jpg en.wikipedia.org



neeley 3026 x 3026 - 2459k - jpg picsdigger.com



Curtis Neeley has severe brain 491 x 350 - 26k - jpg curtisneeley.com



curtis neeley photographs, 600 x 426 - 52k - jpg fineartamerica.com



by Curtis Neeley. Tags: 540 x 700 - 91k - jpg fineartamerica.com



Curtis Neeley still with the 600 x 450 - 219k - jpg curtisneeley.com



Curtis Neeley, Batesville, AR 3872 x 2592 - 3407k - jpg motaa.com



Neeley's complaint. YEAH! 783 x 816 - 220k - jpg curtisneeley.com



Ronald "Ron" Curtis Neeley 120 x 159 - 46k - jpg legacy.com



Curtis Neeley 100 x 100 - 10k - jpg cityevents.tv



Curtis Neeley of Jay Bee BBQ 800 x 600 - 163k - jpg cbbqa.org



photographs he shoots now. 200 x 200 - 4k - jpg commons.wikimedia.org



Curtis Neeley of Jay Bee BBQ 800 x 600 - 86k - jpg cbbqa.org



Foto de Curtis Neeley 320 x 238 - 10k - jpg nimril.blogspot.com



by Curtis Neeley. Tags: 540 x 700 - 53k - jpg fineartamerica.com



Read Curtis Neeley's reply and 270 x 161 - 62k - jpg curtisneeley.com



Curtis Neeley Jr MFA 100 x 100 - 3k - jpg open.salon.com



Curtis Neeley, Batesville, AR 3872 x 2592 - 3443k - jpg motaa.com



only one and Curtis Neeley 427 x 288 - 59k - jpg photographyboard.net



Fine art photography refers to 150 x 200 - 14k - jpg capturing-motions.blogspot.com