

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS**

CURTIS J NEELEY JR, MFA

VS

CASE NO. 5:09-cv-05151-JLH

NameMedia Inc.

Network Solutions Inc.

Google Inc.

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF SUPPORTING MOTION
TO DENY DEFENDANT GOOGLE'S MOTION TO
DISMISS AND REMEDIAL COPYRIGHT LESSON**

The Plaintiff agrees that enough is enough and states that he failed to notice Docket #73 among the "scattered" exhibits in the docket. Still, Plaintiff believes the Plaintiff is preceding *pro se* fairly well and has not yet neared the bounds of leeway often granted pro se litigants. Separate Defendant Google acted astonished the docket entries numbered in the SEVENTIES. The case in New York where they are conspiring with the Author's Guild to extinguish copyrights is nearing 1000 and the Plaintiff's Docket #73 Attachment #1 Exhibit CHIN has not yet been added. It will be added there since received in time by certified mail.

TRAFFICS-IN

“Traffics-in” domain names is a principal business of Separate Defendant Google and if Google did not traffic in domain names there would not be a need for the Lanham act at all because it would not be profitable to speculate on domain values licensed to Google Inc. “AdSense for Domains”.

COPYRIGHT HISTORY

Separate Defendant Google Inc has blatantly demonstrated glaring violations of registered copyright by scanning millions of books with copyright registered in NY and there purports to create a copyright alternative with their fiscal settlement. The Attorney General has already objected to Google attempting to bypass congress and settle.

This case is extremely short in comparison and will serve as instruction for an apparently copyright law-misunderstanding client. Copyright laws have NEVER given copyrights but have only inadequately recognized them. The law recognized by Queen Anne in 1709 that was copied verbatim for the first two sentences about eighty years later by Benjamin Huntington and Samuel Webster in HR 10 June 23, 1789 in the United States and finally signed by George Washington as the HR 43 to become copyright hoax on May 31, 1790. Lawyers and book publishers first conspired to disparage and license a fundamental right. Today they stand again together to change the way they disparage them in a Class Action Settlement that will create new law.

“

IMMORALITY

“When the woman saw that the fruit of the tree was good for food and pleasing to the eye, and also desirable for gaining wisdom....” *See* Genesis 3:6 Bible *NIV*

“A small group of Googlers officially launches the **secret** "books" project. They begin talking to experts about the challenges ahead, starting with a simple but crucial question: how long would it take to digitally scan every book in the world? It turns out, oddly enough, that no one knows.... University of Michigan president Mary Sue Coleman explains why the university has chosen to partner with [Google Inc] on the Library Project, underscoring the importance of digitizing books in the face of natural disasters like Hurricane Katrina and adding, ‘We believed in this forever’”. Google Inc displays this. *See* <<http://books.google.com/googlebooks/history.html>> Reading the history there you will see that Universities and Publishers have conspired from the beginning.

It turns out that Google is motivating immorality in humanity with exactly the same argument used in the Bible. Whether you believe the Bible is the Word of God or as an old fiction the desire for nearly instant access to knowledge is exactly the same.

One immoral motivator advises you to eat a fruit and you will know more and the other immoral motivator advises you to violate copyrights by clicking or signing and you can know anything learned by humanity.

REMEDIAL COPYRIGHT LESSON

The Ninth Amendment initially protected copyrights best until publisher Samuel Webster and attorney Benjamin Huntington conspired to use the desire for knowledge to generate desires to sell copyright licenses.

Copyrights are as fundamental as Free Speech and Google and the Authors Guild are conspiring to redefine it or destroy it finally. Children realize that taking credit for another person's work is wrong. They know this without being taught about copyright. This is because it violates a fundamental right they know already exists. This fundamental desire to be recognized for your own creation depends on copyrights. **The rights in US Title 17 106A do not allow for a single speck of fair-use.** The entire agreement in New York does not address the rights of individual authors to control attribution. This right does not need to be REGISTERED although registration of copyright did not slow the "secret" Google Inc books project violations of millions of books with **REGISTERED** copyrights.

Whereas, the brain injured and *pro se* plaintiff did not notice Docket #71, he screams agreement. **ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!** Google should be wiped out financially for blatant immorality with copyrights. The Plaintiff will never register a copyright because the law has always been wrong and a conspiracy between publishers and lawyers! The Third Amended Complaint will bring the Courts to bear to rein the conspirators in but awaits the outrageous motion to dismiss DOCKET #63 being ruled on and thrown out.

Respectfully but angrily submitted,

Curtis J Neeley Jr, MFA